6-1-2004

Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion

Quinetta M. Roberson
Cornell University, qmr3@cornell.edu

Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion

Abstract

Given the emergence of a new rhetoric in the field of diversity, which replaces the term 'diversity' with the term 'inclusion', this study comparatively investigates the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. The findings of Study One, which used a qualitative methodology to explore the construct definitions and to derive a measure of attributes to support diversity and inclusion, revealed conceptually distinct definitions. The reliability and factor structure of the scale was evaluated in Study Two and cross-validated in Study Three. The results supported a five-factor model of diversity and inclusion and suggest a distinction between the concepts although the terms may not describe separate types of work environments, but different approaches to diversity management.

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion

Quinetta M. Roberson

Working Paper 04-05

CORNELL ilr School of Industrial and Labor Relations

Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion

Quinetta M. Roberson
Cornell University
School of Industrial and Labor Relations
393 Ives Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
Phone: 607-255-4454
Fax: 607-255-1836
Email: qmr3@cornell.edu

June 2004

http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrs

Abstract

Given the emergence of a new rhetoric in the field of diversity, which replaces the term 'diversity' with the term 'inclusion', this study comparatively investigates the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. The findings of Study One, which used a qualitative methodology to explore the construct definitions and to derive a measure of attributes to support diversity and inclusion, revealed conceptually distinct definitions. The reliability and factor structure of the scale was evaluated in Study Two and cross-validated in Study Three. The results supported a five-factor model of diversity and inclusion and suggest a distinction between the concepts although the terms may not describe separate types of work environments, but different approaches to diversity management.

Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity
and Inclusion in Organizations

Consistent with labor predictions, the workforce of the 21st century may be characterized by increased numbers of women, minorities, ethnic backgrounds, intergenerational workers and different lifestyles (Langdon, McMenamin & Krolik, 2002). Further, organizations have realized that the extent to which these demographic workforce changes are effectively and efficiently managed will impact organizational functioning and competitiveness (Harvey, 1999; Kuczynski, 1999). As demonstrated by the more than 75% of Fortune 1000 companies that have instituted diversity initiatives (Daniels, 2001), the management of diversity has become an important business imperative. Despite a pervasive awareness of the need for management to concern itself with diversity-related issues, organizations have adopted different approaches to diversity management. Common perspectives on managing *diversity* focus on targeted recruitment initiatives, education and training, career development and mentoring programs to increase and retain workforce heterogeneity in organizations (Cox, 1993; Morrison, 1992). However, some organizations have begun to rely on a broader set of programs and initiatives including employee participation, communication strategies and community relations (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 2000), which emphasize the removal of barriers that block employees from using the full range of their skills and competencies in organizations (Harvey, 1999). As such, some organizations espouse a focus on *inclusion* in the management of diversity (Mehta, 2000).

Despite this move from diversity to inclusion in the practitioner literature, we have a limited understanding of whether it represents a material change in organizational actions and outcomes, or simply a change of phrasing to reduce backlash against the same initiatives (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). Some research, which explores varying organizational approaches to diversity management, suggests that there are practical differences in focusing on diversity and inclusion. For example, Cox (1991) and Thomas and Ely (1996) propose typologies that distinguish between organizations and their diversity management paradigms based on the

degree to which diversity exists and is integrated into organizational structures, strategies and processes. Research on diversity climates, which highlight workforce demography, personal value for and comfort with diversity, fairness, and inclusion as dimensions of employees' diversity climate perceptions, also suggest a distinction between the concepts of diversity and inclusion (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Mor Barak et al., 1998). However, little research has empirically investigated the specific attributes and practices for diversity and inclusion in organizations. The results of a study by Pelled and her colleagues (1999), which examined and found support for decision-making influence, access to information, and job security as indicators of workplace inclusion, provide some understanding of the construct of inclusion and practices to support inclusion in organizations. Yet, research is needed to explore additional indicators of inclusion as well as to explore how indicators of inclusion parallel, or differ from, indicators of diversity.

This study comparatively investigates the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. First, I review definitions of diversity and inclusion and related research that explore the dimensionality of these constructs. I then describe three studies to develop and evaluate a scale for measuring attributes for diversity and for inclusion in organizations. In Study 1, information on these constructs was solicited from a sample of Fortune 500 organizations to generate items for the scale. The reliability and factor structure of the scale was evaluated using a sample of diversity professionals in Study 2 and retested using a sample of organizational development professionals in Study 3. I conclude with a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of this research as well as directions for future research.

Theoretical Background

In the organizational literature, diversity has been used to describe the composition of groups or workforces. For example, diversity is considered to be a characteristic of groups that refers to demographic differences among members (McGrath, Berdahl & Arrow, 1995). Similarly, Larkey (1996) defines diversity as differences in perspectives resulting in potential

behavioral differences among cultural groups as well as identity differences among group members in relation to other groups. Represented by particular differences of varying cultural significance (Cox, 1993), diversity may be defined in terms of observable and non-observable characteristics (see Milliken & Martins, 1996). Observable dimensions include such characteristics as gender, race, ethnicity and age, which are legally protected from discrimination, particularly in the United States. However, definitions and measurements of diversity have evolved to include a wider array of non-observable characteristics that include cultural, cognitive and technical differences among employees (Kochan et al., 2003). For example, research has shown underlying attributes such as education, functional background, organizational tenure, socioeconomic background, and personality to influence patterns of interaction between group members (Jackson, May & Whitney, 1995; Tsui, Egan & O'Reilly, 1992). Thus, the concept of diversity more accurately represents "the varied perspectives and approaches to work which members of different identity groups bring" (Thomas & Ely, 1996: 80).

Research suggests that by focusing on the advantages of employing members of different identity groups in organizations, the theme of diversity largely ignores the dynamics and consequences of exclusion (Prasad, 2001). More specifically, by approaching diversity management as activities related to the hiring and utilization of personnel from different cultural and social backgrounds (Cox & Blake, 1991), current research has assumed the inclusion of diverse individuals into organizations. Thus, little attention has been given to the concept of inclusion in the organizational literature. Given research which shows that individuals from diverse social and cultural groups are often excluded from networks of information and opportunity in organizations (Ibarra, 1993; Pettigrew & Martin, 1989), inclusion has been used in other areas to describe worker participation and empowerment. For example, Mor Barak and Cherin (1998) define inclusion as the extent to which individuals can access information and resources, are involved in work groups, and have the ability too influence decision-making processes. Rather than emphasizing difference as an organizational commodity that has

exchange value in terms of economic performance, inclusion is focused on the degree to which individuals feel a part of critical organizational processes. Thus, inclusion represents a person's ability to contribute fully and effectively to an organization (Miller, 1998; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998).

Researchers have proposed different organizational approaches to the management of diversity that incorporate the definitional distinction between diversity and inclusion. For example, Cox (1991) proposed a typology of organizations based on the degree of acculturation, structural and informal integration, lack of cultural bias, organizational identification and intergroup conflict, which are considered to be conditions that influence whether organizations can fully realize the value in diversity. More specifically, Cox (1991) suggests that organizations can be characterized as monolithic, plural or multicultural, which differ based on the level of structural and cultural inclusion of employees across varying group memberships. Thus, while plural organizations may be characterized by a focus on employment profiles (i.e., workforce composition) and fair treatment, multicultural organizations may be characterized by policies and practices that facilitate the full utilization of human resources and enhance employees' abilities to contribute to their maximum potential.

Thomas and Ely (1996) also proposed a typology of organizational approaches to diversity that can be distinguished based on the degree to which diversity is considered as the varied knowledge and perspectives that members of different identity groups bring and is incorporated into the organization's strategies, operations and practices. More specifically, Thomas and Ely (1996) identify the discrimination-and-fairness paradigm, which involves a focus on equal opportunity, fair treatment, recruitment and compliance, and the access-and-legitimacy paradigm, which focuses on matching workforce demographics with those of key consumer groups to expand and better serve specialized market segments, as the most common approaches to diversity management. However, they highlight a new, emerging approach – the learning-and-effectiveness paradigm – which links diversity to organizational

strategy, markets, processes and culture. More specifically, diverse employee perspectives and

approaches are incorporated into business processes to leverage the benefits of diversity to

enhance organizational learning and growth. Thus, while organizations functioning under the

other paradigms approach the management of diversity from assimilation and/or differentiation

perspectives, those under a learning-and-effectiveness paradigm are organized around the

overarching theme of integration and inclusion.

Although research distinguishes between concepts of diversity and inclusion through the

articulation of different organizational cultures and systems, little research has empirically

investigated the specific attributes and practices for diversity and inclusion in organizations. Ely

and Thomas (2001) investigated the effects of their proposed diversity management paradigms

on work group functioning in a qualitative study of three professional services organizations.

Although the results provided support for these varying approaches to diversity management

and their relationships to specific group outcomes, the study's design was intended for theory

development regarding diversity management paradigms rather than for examining the

practices and processes that may support each paradigm. Thus, the present study attempts to

build on Ely and Thomas' (2001) work by using a more generalizable sample of organizations to

explore the structures, systems and policies that support diversity and inclusion.

A small body of research on diversity climates, which refers to employee perceptions of

the organizational context related to women and minorities (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Mor Barak,

Cherin & Berkman, 1998), offers some insight into the meanings of diversity and inclusion.

Kossek and Zonia (1993) explored the effects of organizational and group characteristics on

employee perceptions of diversity climate, which was described as the value placed by

employees on efforts to promote diversity in an organization and their attitudes toward the

beneficiaries of these efforts. More specifically, diversity climates were assessed as employee

perceptions of the relationship between organizational excellence and the recruitment and

retention of women and minorities, their qualifications and performance, and their access to

resources and rewards in comparison to others. Using a sample of faculty and academic staff at a university with a demonstrated commitment to diversity, the authors found for support the proposed dimensions of diversity climate, which emerged to explain 66% of the variance. More importantly, the results of Kossek and Zonia's (1993) study highlight workforce composition and equality as components of employees' diversity climate perceptions. Mor Barak et al. (1998) also examined the composition of diversity climates, which was represented as having a personal dimension – individuals' views and feelings toward people who are different from them – and an organizational dimension – management's policies and procedures targeted toward women and minorities. Conducted by measuring employees' perceptions of issues and practices that are important to understanding and managing diversity, the results of the study suggested four dimensions of diversity climate – personal value for diversity, personal comfort with diversity, organizational fairness, and organizational inclusion – which explained 57% of the variance. Thus, building on Kossek and Zonia's (1993) research, this study identifies personal and organizational dimensions of diversity climate. In addition, the results highlight the influence of specific practices for structurally including or excluding people from diverse backgrounds – i.e., employee network support groups, mentoring programs, diversity awareness training – on employee diversity climate perceptions.

Although research on diversity climates provides some insight into the relationship between diversity and inclusion, only one study in the management literature has empirically investigated the construct of workplace inclusion. Building on prior conceptualizations of inclusion as centrality or one's position within exchange networks (O'Hara, Beehr & Colarelli, 1994; Schein, 1971), Pelled and her colleagues (1999) defined inclusion as "the degree to which an employee is accepted and treated as an insider by others in a work system" (p. 1014), and examined the relationships between demographic dissimilarity and three indicators of inclusion – the degree of influence that employees have over decisions that affect them at work, the degree to which employees are kept well-informed about the company's business strategies

and goals, and the likelihood that employees will retain their jobs. Although the results of the study demonstrated differential effects on inclusion based on type of demographic dissimilarity (e.g., gender, race, tenure, education) (Pelled et al., 1999), the study's findings provided support for decision-making influence, access to information and job security as indicators of organizational inclusion. However, the authors suggest that future research should broaden the treatment of the inclusion construct to explore other indicators, such as influence over organizational practices. Accordingly, this study takes a more comprehensive approach and examines multiple indicators of inclusion in organizations.

The present investigation builds upon and extends prior research through a comparative, empirical investigation of the meanings of diversity and inclusion. As suggested by prior research, diversity and inclusion characterize different although related approaches to the management of the diversity. More specifically, diversity focuses on organizational demography, while inclusion focuses on the removal of obstacles to the full participation and contribution of employees in organizations. Given these conceptual distinctions, attributes that support each may differ. Thus, three studies were designed to explore the following research questions: 1) What are the meanings of diversity and inclusion; and 2) What are the organizational attributes that identify or support climates for diversity and climates for inclusion?

Study One – Scale Development

Sample

The data for this study were obtained from survey responses collected from human resource or diversity officers of 51 large, publicly-traded organizations. Participation was solicited from organizational affiliates of a business center established to facilitate a partnership between industry and academe to advance the study of global human resource management. Given that larger organizations tend to have more established and comprehensive diversity initiatives and programs (Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 2000), this sample was chosen because of their experience with the implementation of organizational diversity management practices. 51

of the 58 affiliated companies (88%) voluntarily participated in the study. Participating

organizations had an average size of 75,367 employees and represented a variety of industries

(classified by single-digit SIC codes) – 62.7% in manufacturing; 19.6% in finance, insurance,

and real estate; 7.8% in services; 5.9% in transportation, communications, electric, gas and

sanitary services; and 4.0% in retail trade. In addition, respondents for these companies were

72% female, ranged in age from 38-62 and had an organizational tenure of 2-18 years.

Procedures

An email survey was sent to the human resource officers of the center affiliates who

were informed that the purpose of the study was to understand the meanings of diversity and

inclusion in organizations. For those organizations with diversity officers, the human resource

officers were asked to pass the survey onto the appropriate person. The survey contained four

open-ended questions, which were: (1) How would you define diversity? (2) How would you

define inclusion? (3) What are the attributes of a diverse organization? (4) What are the

attributes of an inclusive organization? For their participation, companies were offered a

summary of the study results. Respondents were asked to forward the completed survey via

email to a research assistant, who was unfamiliar with the diversity literature and blind to the

study's purposes.

Analyses

The content analysis of definitions and attributes for diversity and inclusion followed an

inductive, grounded theory development process (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). First, two doctoral

research assistants (white male and Asian female), who had no prior knowledge of the study's

dimensions of interest, independently analyzed the responses to identify key words or themes

and developed separate lists of attributes for diversity and inclusion. Although dimensions

suggested by the previously reviewed diversity literature were used as a starting point for

developing the instrument, the coders were open to the possibility of additional attributes that

would evolve from the survey responses. The coders then created one common list of attributes

for diverse organizations and attributes for inclusive organizations. Interrater agreement

(Cohen's kappa) across all attributes was .86. A third coder independently coded all comments

given in the survey to derive a second attribute list. The interrater agreement between the first

two coders and the additional coder across all attributes was .81. In cases of disagreement, the

coders reviewed the content issues and reached consensus as to how to categorize the

attributes listed by respondents.

Results

In the survey, participants differentiated between the terms 'diversity' and 'inclusion' and

indicated that the terms describe separate types of work environments. Specifically, definitions

of diversity focused primarily on differences and the demographic composition of groups or

organizations, while definitions of inclusion focused on organizational objectives designed to

increase the organizational participation of all employees and to leverage diversity effects on

the organization. Sample definitions are provided in Table 1.

Table 1
Sample Definitions of Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity
"The unique differences and similarities that our employees, customers, suppliers and communities bring to our global business environment."
"Diversity encompasses the many ways people may differ, including gender, race, nationality, education, sexual orientation, style, functional expertise and a wide array of other characteristics and backgrounds that make a person unique."
"Variation in the human capital profile of the organization/people from different races, religions, perspectives, etc, therefore different cultures, values, beliefs, and reactions to the organizational environment."
Inclusion
"We define inclusion as seeking out, valuing and using the knowledge and experiences of diverse employees for business benefit."
"Recognizing, understanding and respecting all the ways we differ, and leveraging those differences for competitive business advantage."
"A competitive business advantage that we build and maintain by leveraging the awareness, understanding and appreciation of differences in the workplace to enable individuals, teams and businesses to perform at their full potential."

"The environment that makes people feel included and considered part of the system.

"The content analyses yielded 30 overall attributes for diversity and inclusion in organizations.

Several of the attributes that were identified in the study were similar to those suggested in

other diversity studies, namely affirmative action policies, representation of different

demographic groups, respect for differences, diversity education and training (Cox, 1991;

Morrison, 1992). There were other attributes, however, that appeared to be representative of

broader human resource management systems such as 360-degree communication and

information sharing, participatory work systems and employee involvement, and equitable

systems for recognition, acknowledgment and reward. All 30 attributes were used to generate

individual items to assess dimensions of diversity and inclusion. Because the primary objective

of this study was to establish content validity, which is the minimum psychometric requirement

for measurement adequacy (Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner & Lankau, 1993), the

results should not be taken as providing conclusive evidence for the existence of a particular set

of dimensions of diversity or inclusion. The question of whether these attributes are an accurate

reflection of the underlying constructs, or alternatively, are an artifact of our data collection

methods, analyses, or both were addressed in Study 2.

Study Two – Scale Construction

Pilot Test Sample

The pilot sample consisted of 74 attendees of a two-day diversity networking forum,

which was sponsored by two public organizations to link diversity practitioners and policymakers

and facilitate discussion on emerging issues regarding diversity and inclusion. The factor

structure of the initial set of items was examined using this sample. Participants completed

questionnaires during one of the forum sessions and responses were anonymous. The sample

was 77% female with an average age of 46 years. In addition, respondents were 52% white,

33% black, 9% Hispanic, 3% Native American, 1% Asian, 1% Middle-eastern/Indian, and 1%

other.

Sample

1020 surveys were mailed to conference attendees of a national diversity conference

held to provide organizational executives with the opportunity to share practical business

experiences with managing diversity. Accordingly, this sample was utilized given their

knowledge of, and experiences with, diversity management. Participation in the study was

voluntary. 186 surveys were returned for a response rate of 18.2%. Respondents represented

organizations with an average size of 13,522 employees and represented a variety of industries

– 29.3% in manufacturing; 28.8% in services; 18.3% in finance, insurance, and real estate;

14.5% in retail trade; 6.2% in transportation, communications, electric, gas and sanitary

services; and 2.9% in wholesale trade. Respondents were 54% female and had an average age

of 48 years. In addition, respondents were 52% white, 30% black, 7% Hispanic, 3% Asian, 2%

Middle-eastern/Indian, 2% Native American, and 4% other.

Survey Instrument

Items were written to represent each of the attributes for diversity and inclusion identified

in Study 1. The language for the items was taken from the qualitative survey responses. The

survey indicated that the purpose of the study was to understand the meanings of diversity and

inclusion in organizations, including the attributes or characteristics that identify those

workplaces. Based on definitions of diversity included in prior diversity research as well as

reported by respondents in Study 1, *diversity* was described in the survey as the spectrum of

human similarities and differences. Accordingly, diversity in organizations would be

characterized by the representation of people with a range of similarities and differences.

Similarly, *inclusion* was described as the way an organization configures its systems and

structures to value and leverage the potential, and to limit the disadvantages, of differences.

Accordingly, inclusion in organizations would be characterized by different perspectives and by

structures, policies and practices to recognize and utilize these perspectives. Because diversity

research describes diversity and inclusion as related rather than as mutually exclusive

concepts, this study examined the extent to which specific characteristics supported both

diversity and inclusion. Thus, participants were asked to rate the extent to which each attribute

describes diverse organizations and inclusive organizations. In other words, participants were

asked to rate each attribute twice (to allow for both a distinction and relationship between the

concepts) rather than rating attributes as supportive of either diversity *or* inclusion (which would

imply no relationship between the concepts). All ratings were made on a 9-point Likert-type

scale ranging from 'not at all' to 'completely'.

The initial survey was administered to the pilot test sample of forum participants. An

exploratory analysis with principal components and varimax rotation was conducted on each set

of 30 attributes. However, given the small sample size, the analysis was to assess content

adequacy and whether sufficient variance among respondents could be generated for

subsequent statistical analysis. Respondents were also asked to comment on the wording of

the items. Based on respondent feedback and the analyses, three of the items were omitted

from the survey and language adjustments were made to three additional items. Therefore, 54

items (27 items each for diversity and for inclusion) were included in the final survey.

Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis with principal components and varimax rotation was

conducted using all 54 attributes simultaneously. Although such analyses have been shown to

be susceptible to sample size effects (Schwab, 1980), research has found that a sample size of

150 observations should be sufficient to obtain an accurate solution as long as item

intercorrelations are reasonable strong (Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988). Inspection of the

correlation matrix for all items revealed that over 50% of the correlations were significant at the

.05-level, which provides an adequate basis for proceeding to an examination of the factors

(Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998).

A latent root criterion was used to determine the number of factors to be retained.

Therefore, only those factors having eigenvalues greater than 1 were considered significant. I

also examined the scree plot to identify the optimum number of factors that could be extracted

before the amount of unique variance begins to dominate the common variance structure (Hair

et al., 1998). In order to ensure that each item represented the construct underlying each factor,

a factor weight of .40 was used as the minimum cutoff (Ford, MacCallum & Tait, 1986). In

addition, a .10 difference between the weights for any given item across factors was maintained

so that each item was clearly defined by only one factor (Ford et al., 1986).

Results

Although the five factors emerged from the analysis, three factors, which accounted for

70.81% of the variance, were retained. 51 of the 54 items were found to load significantly (> .40)

on the three factors. Item descriptions and their factor loadings are shown in Table 2. As shown

in the table, three items ('respect for differences', 'accommodation for physical and

developmental abilities', and 'employee support groups, networks or affinity groups') had

significant loadings on two factors. Accordingly, these items were omitted from further analyses.

Thus, the final survey included a total of 42 items (24 items each for diversity and for inclusion).

Table 2
Exploratory Factor Analysis

Item	Factor Loadings		
	1	**2**	**3**
1. Team, interdependence or collaborative work environments. (I)	**.98**	-.07	-.04
2. Diversity education and training. (I)	**.98**	-.06	-.04
3. Demonstrated commitment to continuous learning. (I)	**.98**	-.06	-.06
4. Focus on innovation and creativity. (I)	**.98**	-.06	-.06
5. Participatory work systems and employee involvement. (I)	**.98**	-.03	-.04
6. Employee support groups, networks or affinity groups. (I)	**.98**	-.07	-.03
7. Equitable systems for recognition, acknowledgment and reward. (I)	**.98**	-.04	-.04
8. Leadership commitment to diversity. (I)	**.98**	-.03	-.04
9. Alignment of unspoken organizational norms, rules and values with stated organizational goals and objectives. (I)	**.94**	.02	-.01
10. Representation of different demographic groups among internal and external stakeholder groups. (I)	**.94**	.02	.06
11. Accommodation for physical and developmental abilities. (I)	**.94**	.02	-.08
12. Fair treatment for all internal and external stakeholders. (I)	**.94**	-.09	-.03
13. Shared commitment to organizational goals. (I)	**.94**	-.05	-.05
14. Collaborative conflict resolution processes. (I)	**.93**	-.03	-.03
15. Shared accountability and responsibility. (I)	**.93**	-.05	-.05
16. Diversity mission, goals and strategies. (I)	**.92**	-.08	-.09
17. Demonstrated commitment to diversity. (I)	**.90**	.03	-.03
18. Organizational flexibility, responsiveness and agility. (I)	**.89**	-.02	-.04
19. Respect for differences. (I)	**.88**	-.03	-.10
20. Power sharing. (I)	**.86**	-.02	-.09
21. 360-degree communication and information sharing. (I)	**.84**	-.02	.02
22. Demonstrated commitment to community relationships. (I)	**.83**	-.02	-.03
23. Equal access to opportunity for all employees. (I)	**.82**	-.04	.09
24. Tolerance for differences. (I)	**.79**	-.01	.02
25. Affirmative action initiatives. (I)	**.75**	-.02	-.25
26. Representation of different demographic groups at all levels of the organization. (I)	**.75**	-.05	.11
27. Flat organizational structure. (I)	**.74**	.09	-.06
28. Shared commitment to organizational goals. (D)	-.08	**.89**	.09
29. Demonstrated commitment to continuous learning. (D)	-.08	**.87**	.10
30. Organizational flexibility, responsiveness and agility. (D)	-.06	**.84**	.16
31. Focus on innovation and creativity. (D)	.09	**.83**	.14
32. Collaborative conflict resolution processes. (D)	.06	**.81**	.34
33. Team, interdependence or collaborative work environments. (D)	.01	**.81**	.23
34. Participatory work systems and employee involvement. (D)	-.07	**.81**	.16
35. 360-degree communication and information sharing. (D)	.02	**.78**	.15
36. Fair treatment for all internal and external stakeholders. (D)	-.04	**.75**	.34
37. Power sharing. (D)	-.02	**.74**	.31
38. Equitable systems for recognition, acknowledgment and reward. (D)	.04	**.72**	.16
39. Demonstrated commitment to community relationships. (D)	-.03	**.69**	.24
40. Respect for differences. (D)	-.06	.60	.55
41. Equal access to opportunity for all employees. (D)	.04	**.57**	.39
42. Affirmative action initiatives. (I)	.06	**.54**	.26
43. Accommodation for physical and developmental abilities. (D)	-.04	.53	.49
44. Shared accountability and responsibility. (D)	.05	**.51**	-.02
45. Employee support groups, networks or affinity groups. (D)	-.07	.49	.49
46. Leadership commitment to diversity. (D)	-.07	.44	**.76**
47. Demonstrated commitment to diversity. (D)	-.10	.48	**.73**
48. Representation of different demographic groups at all levels of the organization. (D)	-.07	.36	**.69**
49. Diversity mission, goals and strategies. (D)	-.05	.48	**.69**
50. Diversity education and training. (D)	.03	.49	**.61**
51. Representation of different demographic groups among internal and external stakeholder groups. (D)	-.03	.48	**.61**

As shown by the results, one of the derived factors was represented by all of the attributes for inclusion. However, the attributes for diversity were separated across two factors. Closer inspection of those items representing each of the diversity factors revealed two different approaches to diversity in organizations. One factor was concerned with employee involvement in work systems as well as learning and growth outcomes that may stem from diversity in organizations. Consistent with Thomas and Ely's (1996) diversity management paradigms, this factor included learning and effectiveness outcomes resulting from the integration of diversity into work processes – e.g., innovation and creativity, organizational flexibility, etc. – as well as discrimination-and-fairness issues – e.g., fair treatment of all stakeholders, equitable systems, affirmative action initiatives, etc. Further, by incorporating such organizational attributes as interdependent work arrangements, collaborative conflict resolution processes, and power sharing, all of which center on employee participation in organizational processes, this factor also highlighted a focus on inclusion. The second diversity factor encapsulated items related to actual diversity and the integration of diversity management into an organization's strategy. Consistent with Thomas and Ely's (1996) access-and-legitimacy paradigm, this factor included the representation of different demographic groups both within and outside of the organizations. In addition, organizational attributes that highlight top management's support for diversity – e.g., leadership commitment to diversity, diversity mission and goals, etc. – loaded on this factor. The means, standard deviations, correlations and reliabilities for the three factors derived from the principal component analyses are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations and Reliabilities
For Factors in Study Two

	M	*SD*	1	2	3
Factor 1	7.28	1.59	(.96)		
Factor 2	6.77	1.77	.78**	(.95)	
Factor 3	7.59	1.55	.87**	.73**	(.91)
*Note. N = 186; ** = p < .01.*					

Study Three – Scale Validation

Sample

2000 surveys were mailed to an organizational development interest group of a national

human resources professional association. This sample was chosen given their general

familiarity with human resource management without a specific interest and/or focus on

diversity. Participation in the study was voluntary. 330 surveys were returned for a response

rate of 16.5%. Respondents represented organizations with an average size of 4,701

employees and represented a variety of industries – 47.8% in services; 26.6% in manufacturing;

11.0% in retail trade; 8.9% in public administration; 3.3% in finance, insurance, and real estate;

and 1.4% in transportation, communications, electric, gas and sanitary services; and 1.0%

construction. Respondents were 64% female, had an average age of 48 years, and were 81%

white, 13% black, 4% Hispanic and 2% other.

Analyses

Confirmatory factor analyses were performed to examine the stability of the factor

structure obtained in Study Two. Structural equations modeling with maximum likelihood

estimation (EQS 5 for Windows; Bentler & Wu, 1995) was used to evaluate the fit of the

measurement model. As suggested by Brown and Cudeck (1993), several fit indexes were used

to provide a more complete assessment of model adequacy. The conventional likelihood ratio

chi-square test (Brown & Cudeck, 1993) and three normed fit indexes – comparative fit index

(CFI), incremental fit index (IFI) and the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) –

were used to assess overall model adequacy. Models resulting in CFI and IFI values of .90 or

higher are considered acceptable (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). For the RMSEA index, values below .08

are considered indicative of good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Because an adequate fit does not necessarily mean a given model is the best

explanation of the relationships among the constructs, I also tested several alternative yet

theoretically defensible models to address model suitability (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Based

on a combination of the factors revealed in Study Two as well as the diversity management

paradigms proposed by Thomas and Ely (1996), I compared alternative models of increasing

complexity (from one factor to six factors), which a is technique that addresses possible issues

of common method variance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). The one-factor model combined all 42

items included on the final survey while the two-factor model separated the items for diversity

and for inclusion (24 items each). The four-factor model split the first factor in Study Two into

two constructs – i.e., one factor comprised of items indicating employee involvement, learning

and growth outcomes, and fair treatment, and one factor comprised of items indicating the

representation of diverse groups and top management's support for diversity – which were

similar to factors 2 and 3 in Study Two. The five-factor model separated items indicating

employee involvement and learning and growth outcomes, the representation of diversity

groups, top management's support for diversity and fair treatment issues into distinct constructs.

Building upon this model, the six-factor model separated items indicating employee involvement

and those indicating learning and growth outcomes into two constructs. A sequential chi-square

difference test ($\Delta\chi^2$), which is intended to assess changes in fit associated with models which

have a nested or hierarchical relationship (Loehlin, 1992), was used to compare the three-factor

model from Study Two to the alternative models. A nested model is considered more suitable if

its chi-square value is not statistically significantly worse compared with the less parsimonious

model in which it is nested (Loehlin, 1992).

Results

Fit indices for the proposed three-factor model as well as the alternative models are

summarized in Table 4. As shown in the table, most of the models demonstrated only marginal

levels of fit. However, the five-factor model reached an acceptable level of fit to the data. This

alternative model was comprised of latent factors for fair treatment issues (factor 1), the

representation of diverse groups among stakeholders (factor 2), top management's support for

diversity (factor 3), and employee participation and organizational outcomes (factors 4 and 5). In

the model, attributes for employee participation and organizational outcomes as indicators for diverse organizations (factor 4) and for inclusive organizations (factor 5) loaded on separate latent factors, thus resulting in a five-factor model. The paths from latent constructs to individual indicators were all significant (p < .01), with standardized loadings ranging from .35 to .87, as shown in Table 5.

Comparisons of this model with the four-factor model showed a significant difference in chi-square ($\Delta\chi^2$ = 1020.58, 82 df), thus suggesting that this model could be differentiated from the less complex model. Because the less complex models are nested within the five-factor alternative model, comparisons of model fit showed that the five-factor model provided a more suitable explanation of the relationships among the data. Means, standard deviations, correlations and reliabilities for the five latent factors are presented in Table 6.

Table 4
Structural Model Comparison Table

Model	χ^2	CFI	IFI	RMSEA	χ^2_{diff}
One-factor model	4445.26*	.65	.65	.13	
Two-factor model	3491.88*	.74	.74	.11	953.38**
Three-factor model (derived from Study 2)	2389.59*	.85	.85	.09	1102.29**
Four-factor model	2322.64*	.85	.85	.08	66.95**
Five-factor model	1302.06*	.91	.91	.07	1020.58**
Six-factor model	2197.05*	.86	.86	.08	(894.99)**
*Note. Each model was compared with the preceding lower-order model. N = 330; ** = p < .001.*					

Table 5
Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Item	Path Loadings				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. Equal access to opportunity. (D)	.62				
2. Equal access to opportunity. (I)	.78				
3. Equitable systems. (D)	.63				
4. Equitable systems. (I)	.79				
5. Fair treatment. (D)	.65				
6. Fair treatment. (I)	.77				
7. Affirmative action initiatives. (D)	.35				
8. Affirmative action initiatives. (I)	.38				
9. Representation at all levels of the organization. (D)		.68			
10. Representation at all levels of the organization. (I)		.78			
11. Representation among internal and external stakeholders. (D)		.60			
12. Representation among internal and external stakeholders. (I)		.74			
13. Demonstrated commitment to diversity. (D)			.78		
14. Demonstrated commitment to diversity. (I)			.87		
15. Diversity mission, goals and strategies. (D)			.65		
16. Diversity mission, goals and strategies. (I)			.76		
17. Leadership commitment to diversity. (D)			.79		
18. Leadership commitment to diversity. (I)			.86		
19. Diversity education and training. (D)			.69		
20. Diversity education and training. (I)			.74		
21. 360-degree communication and information sharing. (D)				.71	
22. Participatory work systems and employee involvement. (D)				.76	
23. Power sharing. (D)				.68	
24. Teamwork, interdependence or collaborative environments. (D)				.81	
25. Shared commitment to organizational goals. (D)				.84	
26. Focus on innovation and creativity. (D)				.77	
27. Organizational flexibility, responsiveness and agility. (D)				.82	
28. Demonstrated commitment to continuous learning. (D)				.80	
29. Collaborative conflict resolution processes. (D)				.76	
30. Shared accountability and responsibility. (D)				.74	
31. Demonstrated commitment to community relationships. (D)				.63	
32. 360-degree communication and information sharing. (I)					.70
33. Participatory work systems and employee involvement. (I)					.77
34. Power sharing. (I)					.68
35. Teamwork, interdependence or collaborative environments. (I)					.84
36. Shared commitment to organizational goals. (I)					.78
37. Focus on innovation and creativity. (I)					.72
38. Organizational flexibility, responsiveness and agility. (I)					.77
39. Demonstrated commitment to continuous learning. (I)					.74
40. Collaborative conflict resolution processes. (I)					.76
41. Shared accountability and responsibility. (I)					.84
42. Demonstrated commitment to community relationships. (I)					.69

Table 6
Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations and Reliabilities
For Factors In Study Three

	M	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
Factor 1	7.24	1.40	(.86)				
Factor 2	7.19	1.58	.66**	(.87)			
Factor 3	7.42	1.59	.70**	.67**	(.94)		
Factor 4	6.38	1.78	.66**	.48**	.56**	(.94)	
Factor 5	6.91	1.58	.67**	.57**	.64**	.75**	(.94)
Note. N = 330; ** = p < .01.							

Discussion

The purpose of this article was to explore the meanings of diversity and inclusion or more importantly, the attributes and practices to support each in organizations. The first study, the elicitation study, revealed conceptually distinct definitions of diversity and inclusion. Consistent with popular and scholarly diversity literature, definitions of diversity focused primarily on heterogeneity and the demographic composition of groups or organizations, while definitions of inclusion focused on employee involvement and the integration of diversity into organizational systems and processes. In addition, the results highlighted a number of attributes for diversity and inclusion ranging from practices to increase the representation of different demographic groups to broader human resource initiatives intended to facilitate employee participation and engagement. Based on these results, I constructed an instrument to measure the degree to which each of these attributes support diversity and inclusion in organizations.

In the second study, the empirical investigation of the reliability and factor structure of the new measure supported a three-factor model. One of the factors was represented by the attributes for inclusion. In other words, all of the attributes were described as characteristic of an inclusive organization. The other factors consisted of the organizational attributes for diversity although these factors differed in their foci. As shown by the results, one diversity factor was

comprised of items relating to employee involvement, outcomes derived from diversity in organizations, and fair treatment. Accordingly, this factor seemed to encapsulate the discrimination-and-fairness and learning-and-effectiveness diversity paradigms articulated by Thomas and Ely (1996). Interestingly, the second diversity factor, which was comprised of items relating to the representation of demographic diversity at all levels and outside of an organizations, seemed to incorporate Thomas and Ely's (1996) access-and-legitimacy paradigm. The second diversity factor was also represented by leader behaviors that exhibit a commitment to diversity. Thus, consistent with prior research that highlights the role of top management attitudes and interventions in support of diversity to the effectiveness of diversity management programs (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995; Morrison, 1992), this factor highlights leadership's commitment to diversity as a key attribute of organizations that are supportive of diversity.

A third study was conducted to cross-validate the results for the measure of diversity and inclusion. Although the proposed three-factor model did not reach an acceptable level of fit, the results suggest that the data could be accounted for by an alternative five-factor model. Three of these factors – i.e., fairness, representation, leader commitment to diversity – were conceptually distinct and emerged from the factors revealed in Study Two. The remaining factors were identical in that they were represented by items relating to employee involvement and diversity-related outcomes such as learning, growth and flexibility. As such, both factors incorporated indicators of inclusion similar to those described Pelled et al. (1996) as well as Thomas and Ely's (1996) learning-and-effectiveness diversity paradigm. However, because these factors differed in that attributes for diversity and attributes for inclusion were separated, the results suggest that inclusive work practices and diversity-related outcomes may be characteristic of organizations that are diverse and/or inclusive.

Overall, the results support a distinction between the concepts of diversity and inclusion although the terms may not describe separate types of work environments, but different

approaches to diversity management. Similar to the conceptual frameworks proposed by Cox (1991) and Thomas and Ely (1996), the findings suggest that diversity may be managed through a variety of methods. More specifically, diversity in organizations may be supported by sets of practices to manage fair treatment issues, increase stakeholder diversity, and demonstrate leadership's commitment to diversity, while inclusion may be supported by practices to integrate diversity into organizational systems and processes and encourage the full participation and contribution of employees. Thus, the management of diversity may be more complex than the two-dimensional categories of diversity and inclusion.

In the creation of systems for equal employment opportunity and affirmative action, Konrad and Linnehan (1995) distinguish between identity-blind structures, or formalized HRM practices designed to ensure that decision-making processes are the same for each individual regardless of group identity, and identity-conscious structures, which are formalized HRM practices that take both demographic group identity and individual merit into consideration. Although research shows that identity-conscious practices are positively related to the employment status of protected groups in organizations (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995), research has also highlighted backlash against such practices and diversity management programs in general (see Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). Given negative reactions to identity-conscious structures, organizations are retreating from practices that focus on the specific and unique concerns of historically excluded groups in favor of more identity-blind structures that are responsive to the fears of exclusion and displacement among members of privileged groups (Konrad, 2003; Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). As shown by the factors revealed in this study, the concepts of diversity and inclusion may potentially represent another iteration of the identity-blind versus identity-conscious debate. For example, the findings highlighted the importance of stakeholder diversity as well as fair treatment initiatives, which base decision-making on group membership and therefore, may be considered identity-conscious practices. In contrast, the inclusion factors highlighted broader human resource initiatives, such as collaborative work

arrangements and conflict resolution processes, which are designed involve all employees in

organizational decision-making processes. As such, these organizational attributes may be

considered identity-blind practices. Because a focus on inclusion in organizations may be

similar to identity-blind structures by representing a more palatable approach to diversity

management yet proving ineffective for promoting the interests of historically excluded groups,

research is needed to understand the individual and organizational effects of managing diversity

versus inclusion.

Limitations

One limitation of this research derives from the studies' samples. Although the results of

Study One are consistent with related research, and both qualitative investigation and a review

of the literature were used to derive lists of attributes for diversity and inclusion, the

characteristics of the organizations that responded may limit the generalizability of the research

findings. Specifically, because the diversity professionals in Study One were primarily from

publicly-traded organizations, the ability to say whether similar patterns of attributes would be

highlighted in smaller and/or public organizations is limited. As these types of organizations may

be constrained by resource availability or budgetary issues, the comprehensiveness of their

diversity management initiatives may be limited. Alternatively, the structure of such

organizations – particularly, small organizations – may better facilitate inclusion and integration.

Although people from a variety of organizations were surveyed and the sample sizes were

sufficient to run exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, some selection bias may also be

inherent in the samples. Those responding to the survey may have had a direct interest in, or

experience with, diversity issues, or may represent organizations with formalized diversity

initiatives. Similarly, each sample's familiarity with diversity management programs may have

influenced the complexity of the factor structures. For example, OD professionals in Study

Three may have approached the survey from a systems perspective, thus resulting in a more

nuanced or complex view of diversity and inclusion in organizations, while executives in Study

Two may have perceived a link between a broader array of organizational attributes and the management of diversity, thus resulting in a simpler factor structure. Because the results highlight the multifaceted nature of diversity and inclusion as well as variance in the interpretation of their meanings, future research is needed to examine attributes for each in different types of organizations and perceptions of each among different organizational groups.

The results of this study may also be limited by a potential biasing effect from providing definitions of diversity and inclusion to survey participants in Study Two and Study Three. As discussed in the literature review as well as shown in the results of Study One, there are many working definitions of diversity and inclusion. For example, Mor Barak et al. (1998) highlights practices for structurally including or excluding people from diverse backgrounds (e.g., employee network support groups and mentoring programs) as attributes for organizational inclusion while Pelled et al. (1996) represents inclusion as employee involvement, access to information and job security. Although providing definitions of the constructs of interest was beneficial in creating a consistent basis of interpretation among respondents, it also restricts the lens through which they may interpret the constructs of diversity and inclusion. Further, although the definitions used in the survey represented an amalgam of those included in prior diversity research as well as reported by respondents in Study One, the design of the survey created an inherent distinction between the concepts of diversity and inclusion. Accordingly, such a distinction may have biased respondents' interpretation of the dimensions and therefore, their ratings for each attribute – which may provide an alternative explanation for the existence of two identical factors (one for diversity and one for inclusion) in Study Two. Future research is needed to explore attributes for diversity and inclusion in organizations based on varying definitions of these constructs. Given the lack of empirical research that demonstrates a relationship between diversity and organizational variables, it would also be useful to know if the dimensions revealed in this study are related to performance, agility or other characteristics of organizations. Thus, the construct validity of the measure included here may also be

strengthened by additional research to demonstrate its discriminant and convergent validity as well as the existence of a nomological network of relationships with other variables (Hinkin, 1995).

Practical Implications

Given the move from diversity to inclusion in the practitioner literature, the results of this study provide practitioners with an understanding of the concepts of diversity and inclusion and the attributes to support each in organizations. More specifically, the findings may help managers to characterize their approaches to diversity management based on implemented types of initiatives. For example, an organization may be typified as managing diversity with an emphasis on fairness issues and/or the representation of diverse groups at all internal levels and external to the organization. By understanding their current approach to diversity management, managers may be better able to identify strategies for creating more diverse and/or inclusive organizations, such as actions to demonstrate leadership's commitment to diversity or the institutionalization of participatory work systems. The measure included in this study may also serve as an assessment tool for understanding the degree to which employees perceive specific attributes to be representative of their business unit or organization. By linking such information to individual attitudes and behavior as well as various diversity metrics (e.g., job yields or attrition by demographic group, promotion rates, etc.), this tool may be useful for assessing and improving the effectiveness of diversity management initiatives. Further, by linking such information to unit-level outcomes (e.g., sales, customer satisfaction, etc.), this tool may be useful for conducting intra-organizational comparisons on the relationships between various approaches to diversity management and unit performance.

Conclusion

Given the emergence of a new rhetoric in the field of diversity, which replaces the term 'diversity' with the term 'inclusion', this study comparatively investigates the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. More importantly, this research links the scholarly and practitioner literature to empirically examine whether this move from diversity to inclusion represents a material change in diversity management practices or simply a change in language. The results highlight a conceptual distinction between the concepts of diversity and inclusion as well as the attributes that support each in organizations. However, the results also suggest that the management of diversity is more complex than is currently articulated in both practitioner and scholarly research. Because there is a critical difference between merely having diversity in an organization's workforce and developing the organizational capacity to leverage diversity as a resource, this research provides an understanding of how to create conditions in which diversity not only exists in organizations but the potential individual and organizational advantages of diversity are maximized. From a theoretical perspective, this research underscores a need for future research to consider the concept as well as determinants and outcomes of inclusion as an approach to diversity management. Thus, by highlighting the similarities and differences between diversity and inclusion in organizations, both researchers and practitioners are better positioned to create, understand and support changes needed to both promote equality for historically disadvantaged groups as well as create organizations in which all employees can utilize their full portfolio of skills and talents.

References

Anderson, J., & Gerbing, D. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 411-423.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*, 74-94.

Bentler, P. M., & Wu, E. J. C. (1995). *EQS for Windows user's guide*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.

Brown, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K.A. Bollen & J.S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cox, T. H., Jr. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*, 34-47.

Cox, T. H., Jr. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cox, T. H., Jr., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*, 45-56.

Daniels, C. (2001, July 9). Too diverse for our own good. *Fortune, 144*, 116.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46,* 229-273.

Ford, J. K., MacCallum, R. C., & Tait, M. (1986). The application of exploratory factor analysis in applied psychology: A critical review and analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 39*, 291-314.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 265-275.

Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Harvey, B. H. (1999). Technology, diversity and work culture – key trends in the next millennium. *HR Magazine, 44*, 58-59.

Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management, 21*, 967-988.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.

Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 56-87.

Jackson, S. E., May, K. A., & Whitney, K. (1995). Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision making teams. In R. A. Guzzo and E. Salas (Eds.), *Team decision making effectiveness in organizations* (pp. 204-261). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Levine, D. & Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management, 42*, 3-21.

Konrad, A. M. (2003). Special issue introduction: Defining the domain of workplace diversity scholarship. *Group and Organization Management, 28*, 4-17.

Konrad, A. M., & Linnehan, F. (1995). Formalized HRM structures: Coordinating equal employment opportunity or concealing organizational practices? *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 787-820.

Kossek, E. E., & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field study of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 61-81.

Kuczynski, S. (1999). If diversity, then higher profits? *HR Magazine, 44*, 66-74.

Langdon, D. S., McMenamin, T. M, & Krolik, T. J. (2002). U.S. labor market in 2001: Economy

enters a recession. *Monthly Labor Review, 125*, 3-33.

Larkey, L. K. (1996). The development and validation of the workforce diversity questionnaire. *Management Communication Quarterly, 9*, 296-337.

Linnehan, F., & Konrad, A. M. (1999). Diluting diversity: Implications for intergroup inequality in organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 8*, 399-414.

Loehlin, J. C. (1992). *Latent variable models* (2nd edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mehta, S. N. (2000, July 10). What minority employees really want. *Fortune, 142*, 180-186.

McGrath, J. E., Berdahl, J. L., & Arrow, H. (1995). Traits, expectations, culture and clout: The dynamics of diversity in work groups. In S. E. Jackson and M. N. Ruderman (Eds.), *Diversity in Work Teams* (pp. 17-45). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Miller, F. A. (1998). Strategic culture change: The door to achieving high performance and inclusion. *Public Personnel Management, 27*, 151-160.

Milliken, F., & Martins, L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 402-433.

Mor Barak, M. E., & Cherin, D. (1998). A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity. *Administrative in Social Work, 22*, 47-64.

Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 34*, 82-104.

Morrison, A. M. (1992). *The new leaders: Guidelines on leadership diversity in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Hara, K. B., Beehr, T. A., & Colarelli, S. M. (1994). Organizational centrality: A third dimension of intraorganizational career movements. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 30*, 198-216.

Pelled, L. H., Ledford, G. E., Jr., & Mohrman, S. A. (1999). Demographic dissimilarity and workplace inclusion. *Journal of Management Studies, 36*, 1013-1031.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Martin, J. (1989). Organizational inclusion of minority groups: A social psychological analysis. In J. P. Van Oudenhoven & T. M. Willemsen (Eds.), *Ethnic minorities: Social psychological perspectives*. Berwyn, PA: Swets North America.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organization research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*, 531-544.

Prasad, A. (2001). Understanding workplace empowerment as inclusion. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 37*, 51-69.

Schein, E. H. (1971). The individual, the organization and the career: A conceptual scheme. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 7*, 401-426.

Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Lankau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper-and-pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management, 19*, 385-417.

Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organization behavior. In B. B. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior, Vol. 2* (pp. 3-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review, 74*, 79-90.

Tsui, A., Egan, T., & O'Reilly, C. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 549-579.

Wentling, R. M., & Palma-Rivas, N. (2000). Current status of diversity initiatives in selected multinational corporations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 11*, 35-60.