Is Diversity Management Sufficient? Organizational Inclusion to Further Performance

CITATIONS	READS
344	12,218

1 author:

Meghna Sabharwal
University of Texas at Dallas
128 PUBLICATIONS   **2,724** CITATIONS

Public Personnel Management

Is Diversity Management Sufficient? Organizational Inclusion to Further Performance

Meghna Sabharwal

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

⑤SAGE

Additional services and information for *Public Personnel Management* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://ppm.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://ppm.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

>> OnlineFirst Version of Record - Feb 19, 2014

What is This?

Is Diversity Management Sufficient? Organizational Inclusion to Further Performance

Meghna Sabharwal[1]

Abstract

This study focuses on the concept of organizational inclusion, which goes beyond diversity management, the dominant paradigm in the field of public administration. Although several studies in public administration mention the importance of inclusion, none of these studies have empirically tested its association with performance beyond diversity management. Data for this study comes from a survey conducted among public managers in Texas agencies. The study finds that diversity management alone is insufficient for improving workplace performance. What is required instead is an approach that promotes greater inclusion of employees in ways that takes their views into account and promotes self-esteem. The results show that productive workplaces exist when employees are encouraged to express their opinions, and their input is sought before making important organizational decisions. This requires supportive leadership and empowering employees with information and resources that will help them make important decisions about their jobs.

Introduction

Public organizations are hiring women and minorities to create a diverse workforce that reflects the demographics of the nation. Furthermore, they are providing diversity training that focuses on handling sexual harassment, valuing differences (race,

[1]The University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, USA

Corresponding Author:
Meghna Sabharwal, Assistant Professor, Public Affairs, School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences, The University of Texas at Dallas, 800 West Campbell Road, GR 31, Richardson, TX 75080, USA.
Email: meghna.sabharwal@utdallas.edu

ethnicity, gender, age, religion, disability, sexual orientation), and diversity management (offering mentoring, coaching, family/employee friendly policies, alternative work arrangements; Bozeman & Feeney, 2009; Kellough & Naff, 2004; Pitts, 2006, 2009; Pitts, Hicklin, Hawes, & Melton, 2010; Riccucci, 2002; Rice, 2004; Roberson, 2006). These are functional and structural changes that are instituted to recruit and retain minorities and women into the organization. The issue is not about diversity itself, but the challenge lies in integrating and utilizing a diverse workforce toward achieving organizational goals (Pless & Maak, 2004). While title VII of the Civil Right Act of 1964, affirmative action, and equal employment legislation have helped diversify the workforce, they have not always helped in creating an environment of inclusion wherein the full potential of diverse employees is realized (Mor Barak, 1999, 2011).

Several authors have stated that the concept of organizational inclusion is the crux of current diversity efforts (Broadnax, 2010; Miller, 1998; Rangarajan & Black, 2007; Riccucci, 2002; Wise, 2002). However, none of these studies have empirically measured organizational inclusive behaviors (OIB) and assessed its impact on performance in the public sector. Thus, the key questions that this study aims to address are (a) do managing diversity efforts improve performance? and (b) what inclusive behaviors should organizations exhibit to enhance performance? While no unified theory of inclusion exists, social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978, 2010), social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954; Mullen & Goethals, 1987), and optimal distinctiveness theory (ODT; M. Brewer, 1991) have been used to advance the concept of OIB.

The social identity theory, developed by social psychologist Henri Tajfel (1978, 2010), proposed that the groups that individuals belong to are a source of self-esteem. The belonging of an individual to a group provides social identity and a sense of fitting in. This theory further posits that we normally divide the world into "them" and "us" in an effort to create distinct out-groups and in-groups. The in-group discriminates against the out-group to enhance self-image. Employee perception is thus on an inclusion–exclusion continuum in which individuals are part of an organizational system where they are involved in both formal and informal decision-making (Mor Barak, 2011).

The social comparison theory similarly assumes that individuals have a need to compare their own opinions and abilities with that of others. Individuals normally compare themselves with those they think are similar in an attempt to maintain a positive self-image. This constant comparison creates perceptions of inclusion or exclusion based on the social interactions that individuals engage in. The ODT seeks to strike a balance between the need to find similarities with others while maintaining a unique identity (M. Brewer, 1991). To fulfill a basic need of belonging, individuals seek inclusion to a group where they are accepted and made to feel secure. The need that employees feel to belong to a group, and at the same time maintain a unique identity, has been argued to form the basis of inclusion literature (Shore et al., 2011).

Organizational Inclusive Behaviors (OIB) OIB is derived from the aforementioned theories of inclusion, and has been described in a variety of ways. Mor-Barak and Cherin (1998, p. 48), for example, defined it as "the degree to which individuals feel

part of critical organizational processes," indicated by work group involvement, access to information and resources, and the ability to influence decision-making. Pelled, Ledford, and Mohrman (1999) assessed inclusion on the basis of people's job security, their access to sensitive information, and their influence on decision-making. Gasorek (2000), in describing inclusion, considers the degree to which the following are successfully achieved: How employees and their ideas are valued and utilized; how people partner within and across departments; how current employees feel that they belong and how prospective employees are attracted to the organization; how people feel connected to each other and to the organization and its goals; and finally, how the organization continuously fosters flexibility, choice, and diversity. When individual employees experience inclusion, they feel valued and recognized for their efforts in the organization. This makes them feel safe and open to expressing their ideas and viewpoints. The experience of inclusion is comprised of various components: feeling valued, sensing that diversity matters in a positive way, being involved and engaged in the work group, being able to authentically bring the whole self to work, being able to influence decision-making, and feeling safe (Ferdman, Avigdor, Braun, Konkin, & Kuzmycz, 2010).

In line with previous research (Bendick, Egan, & Lanier, 2010; Davidson & Ferdman, 2002; Ferdman et al., 2010; Gasorek, 2000; Holvino, Ferdman, & Merrill-Sands, 2004; Miller, 1998; Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998; Pelled, Ledford, & Mohrman, 1999; Shore et al., 2011), the proposed study conceptualizes OIB into three broad areas: (a) commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion, (b) ability of employees to influence organizational decisions, and (c) fair/equitable treatment from management. Each of these concepts is measured on several dimensions that compose the OIB scale. Just being asked for input creates openness, inclusion, and indeed, diversity of opinions that can be hypothesized to lead to greater performance (Ferdman et al., 2010). Recognizing differences and having policies that promote employee friendly workplaces are important, but these guidelines do not necessarily translate into an organization that is inclusive and empowers members of all groups (Holvino et al., 2004). How does management create an environment that fosters inclusion and goes beyond just following the rules? This study argues that the focus needs to change from an overreliance on policies and structural changes to fostering an environment that promotes inclusiveness.

OIB in the Workplace

One of the essential factors that contribute toward creating inclusive environments is committed leadership that supports individual and cultural differences among employees (Miller, 1998; Pless & Maak, 2004; Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Shore et al., 2011). Such committed leadership would also utilize the talents of all members irrespective of their gender, race/ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, and so on. Simply by hiring a workforce for the sake of increasing representation is actually counter-productive (Bendick et al., 2010); leaders in the organization must devise strategies to eliminate systemic barriers and create avenues in which all employees are able to contribute to their fullest potential.

Building an inclusive environment is thus a combination of commitment from the top employers, respect for diverse opinions and perspectives, and an institution that fosters equitable policies (Bendick et al., 2010). Organizations that use an inclusive framework will consequently have better output (Stewart & Johnson, 2009). Such organizations go beyond hiring for diversity as a legal cover, but rather recognize that each individual is unique and has the potential to contribute toward the goals of the organization. Inclusive work environments are eager to tap into the differences of individuals by offering them a platform where employees are treated as an asset versus a liability. Workplaces that value employees for their opinions use a synergistic approach to problem-solving and decision-making (Sabattini & Crosby, 2008). Inclusion is neither affirmative action nor diversity, but a concept in which "different voices are sought and utilized as opportunities for added value. Different perspectives and frames of reference offer competitive advantages in teamwork, service delivery, product quality and work output" (Miller, 1998, p. 160). A productive organization recognizes this important difference and includes employees in decision-making, thereby making them a critical part of the organization (Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998).

Moving Beyond Diversity Management

In 1990, Thomas first introduced diversity management as a way of creating an environment toward an objective of enabling employees to reach their full potential in pursuit of organizational objectives. Similarly, Ivancevich and Gilbert (2000, p. 75) defined it as "the systematic and planned commitment by organizations to recruit, retain, reward, and promote a heterogeneous mix of employees." Pitts (2006, p. 235) argues "that diversity management is a multifaceted concept" and, as such, includes three components: recruitment programs, programs aimed to increase cultural awareness, and pragmatic management policies.

There is recent consensus that diversity management needs to move from a passive (valuing diversity) to an active (diversity management) approach. This active approach should include mentoring programs, succession planning, family-friendly programs, alternative work arrangements, training, and accountability (Bozeman & Feeney, 2009; Kellough & Naff, 2004; Morrison, 1992; Pitts, 2006, 2009; Pitts et al., 2010; Riccucci, 2002; Rice, 2004; Roberson, 2006; Strachan, Burgess, & Sullivan, 2004). While these efforts are critical to the success of an organization, they do not necessarily translate into an inclusive work environment (Groeneveld & Verbeek, 2012). While policies such as instituting mentoring and including alternative work arrangements are important management efforts, they are not always successful if they are not part of a larger organizational initiative headed by top-level management. Employees making use of work/life balance programs or alternative work arrangements report backlash and are often singled out as receiving preferential treatment (Gornick & Meyers, 2003; Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2002; Sabattini & Crosby, 2008; Sabharwal, 2013; Stone & Lovejoy, 2004; Tower & Alkadry, 2008). These programs will not be successful as long as they are viewed as "accommodations" that benefit one group more than the others. Employees taking advantage of such policies are deemed

to work in less desirable jobs. Single mothers taking advantage of alternative work arrangements are labeled to be on the "mommy track," are taken less seriously, and are often passed over for promotions (Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein, 2001). Very few men use such policies for fear of career derailment or of being labeled as "uncommitted" (Eaton, 2003; Cunningham, 2001; Wayne & Cordeiro, 2003). Such perceptions are strengthened by unsupportive organizational culture in which supervisors do more to create an exclusionary, rather than an inclusionary, work environment. Even mentoring programs have their challenges; women and minorities often gravitate around mentors of similar demographic backgrounds. This gravitation can have unintended negative consequences because the mentors themselves are often excluded from important networks and are less aware of the resources available within an organization (Sabattini & Crosby, 2008). Diversity management should thus go beyond existing rules and policies often created as a reaction to the shifting demographics in the workplace.

Are diversity management and inclusion different concepts? Inclusion, as a concept, goes beyond diversity management, which remains the dominant paradigm in the field of public administration (Choi & Rainey, 2010; Kellough & Naff, 2004; Pitts, 2006, 2009; Pitts et al., 2010; Riccucci, 2002; Rice, 2004; Roberson, 2006). Roberson (2006) empirically shows that diversity and inclusion are two different but overlapping concepts. In many ways, diversity management is the first step (or a precursor) toward creating inclusive environments. Inclusion goes beyond diversity management, wherein a certain group or demographic category is not the target for recruitment, training, or any other organizational activity (Pless & Maak, 2004). Pless and Maak (2004) argue that an inclusionary approach values the differences in individual employees and leverages diversity in creating a playing field that is not leveled but raised so that everyone feels supported and performs at his or her best. Different perspectives are heard, respected, understood, and integrated in the decision-making processes; differences in opinions and voices are further seen as legitimate avenues for problem-solving and improving organizational performance. Inclusion is on a continuum from exclusion on one end to inclusion on the other. The exclusive workplace is based on pre-established norms and values that dictate the day-to-day operations in the workplace, whereas inclusive attitudes are constantly evolving in accordance with the different perspectives within the organization with mutual trust and respect at its center (Cox, 2001; Mor Barak, 2011). Diversity management, although an integral aspect of inclusion, ignores the dynamics and outcomes of exclusion (Groeneveld & Verbeek, 2012). Furthermore, diversity management focuses on improving recruitment and training for mainly women and minorities in the workplace, whereas inclusion focuses on the removal of barriers to enable high performance from all employees (Miller, 1998; Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998; Roberson, 2006).

Diversity Management and Performance

Several studies have examined the impact of diversity and diversity management on organizational performance (Adler & Gundersen, 2008; Aghazadeh, 2004; Pitts, 2005,

2009). Policies such as alternative work arrangements, mentoring, flextime, and tele-work currently serve as the cornerstone of diversity management initiatives that are deemed important in improving performance (Choi & Rainey, 2010; Pitts, 2009). These programs can have an adverse impact on employee satisfaction and perfor-mance when not managed effectively (Sabattini & Crosby, 2008; Tower & Alkadry, 2008). However, hiring a diverse workforce is seen as a competitive advantage that results in increased organizational performance. In particular, Pitts (2009) found that diversity management had a positive impact on the performance of racial minorities in the federal workforce. Similarly, studies report that diversity positively impacts the productivity and commitment of employees (Cox & Blake, 1991; Ely, 2004; Ely & Thomas, 2001; McLeod & Lobel, 1992; Richard, 2000). Improved performance in diverse groups often is attributed to the problem-solving skills and varied perspectives diverse employees bring to the challenge at hand.

Another stream of research nonetheless indicates that diversity lowers performance or has no significant relationship (Chatman & Flynn, 2001; Foldy, 2004; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Typically, heterogeneous groups take longer time to come together and often have conflicting ideas. These issues consequently result in an adverse impact on performance, and, as such, diversity management becomes challenging (Steiner, 1972). Further evidence suggests that employees belonging to diverse groups are likely to be excluded from important networks and decision-making processes (Choi & Rainey, 2010; Cox, 1994; Ibarra, 1993). The lack of consensus on the impact of diversity and diversity management on performance is one of the reasons why inclu-sion has promise as an area of study, both as a concept and as a lens through which organizations can encourage full participation from the individuals rather than focus on a certain group or demographic.

OIB and Performance

Diversity management programs were largely a response to several legislative man-dates; organizations also made a case for diversity as a business imperative for suc-cess. However, diversity management programs will not be successful if they are unable to truly value the diversity employees bring to their work (Pless & Maak, 2004). Inclusion goes beyond diversity management wherein "people with multiple backgrounds, mindsets and ways of thinking to work effectively together and to per-form to their highest potential in order to achieve organizational objectives based on sound principles" (Pless & Maak, 2004, p. 130). Research has shown that perceptions of inclusion predict job commitment and performance (Cho & Mor Barak, 2008; Miller, 1998; Pless & Maak, 2004; Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Shore et al., 2011; Stewart & Johnson, 2009). Additional work demonstrates that an inclusive organizational environment enables participation from a diverse range of members, each with their unique perspectives and skills, and therefore, results in a better-performing and suc-cessful organization (Miller, 1998). Inclusive environments require strong and com-mitted leadership wherein individuals are treated with fairness and are encouraged to participate in decisions that impact their individual and organizational productivity

(Miller, 1998; Pless & Maak, 2004; Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Shore et al., 2011). In fact, the quality of support that employees receive from their leaders is positively related to performance, suggesting that leaders who work well with employees from all backgrounds increase overall output (Stewart & Johnson, 2009).

Shore et al. (2011) argue that uniqueness and belongingness work in concert toward creating an inclusive work environment, which ultimately drives performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship, intention to stay, and overall well-being of employees. Most literature on organizational inclusion concedes that willingness to engage in positive interactions, building a vision and an active strategy for inclusion, information sharing, recognition of employee contribution, creating a sense of belongingness among employees, and open communication are all ways to create an environment that positively impact performance (Mannix & Neale, 2005; Miller, 1998; Pless & Maak, 2004; Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Shore et al., 2011; Stewart & Johnson, 2009).

Organizational performance is the only outcome that this study will measure, given the emphasis on performance-based organizations in the public sector. Employee productivity can be lowered through exclusion from important networks or from information and resources that will help individuals make decisions about their jobs. Furthermore, a person who feels excluded and treated unfairly loses job interest, resulting in poor job performance (Ferdman et al., 2010; Wasserman, Gallegos, & Ferdman, 2008). Individuals who have a voice are more engaged and likely to work harder, thereby furthering performance. Thus, based on this research, the study hypothesizes:

> **Hypothesis 1:** Diversity management positively influences organizational performance.
> **Hypothesis 2:** Diversity management negatively influences organizational performance.
> **Hypothesis 3:** Controlling for all factors, diversity management has no influence on organizational performance.
> **Hypothesis 4:** Inclusive organizational behaviors that foster commitment from top leaders positively impact organizational performance.
> **Hypothesis 5:** Inclusive organizational behaviors that involve employees in individual and organizational decision-making processes positively impact organizational performance.
> **Hypothesis 6:** Inclusive organizational behaviors that treat employees with fairness and equity positively impact organizational performance.

Data and Methodology

Data for this study come from a survey of Texas public managers. The survey sample consists of senior employees, supervisors, and lower managers largely found in grades B23-B30. Five different departments were contacted: (a) Texas Department of Transportation (TXDoT), (b) Texas Education Agency (TEA), (c) Texas Department

of State Health Services (DSHS), (d) Texas Work Commission (TWC), and (e) State Governor's Office. The human resources (HR) department in the state of Texas is decentralized; two agencies that have employees working on state level HR issues are employed in TWC and the State Auditor's Office (SAO). A total of 815 employees from five agencies were contacted, out of which only 198 surveys were usable, resulting in a response rate of 24.3%.

Texas is a good example of a majority–minority state wherein the Caucasian population alone, not Hispanic or Latino, constitute less than half of the states' population (44.5%; United States Census Bureau, 2012). Data were collected using Qualtrics, the software for online surveys.[1] Despite informing participants about the upcoming survey and the two follow-ups, the response rates were low, which is documented as the biggest challenge of online surveys (Sheehan & Grubbs-Hoy, 1999; Yun & Trumbo, 2000). Over 115[2] closed-ended questions focused on measuring individual perceptions and experiences related to leadership, job performance, diversity, and job aspirations of public sector employees.

Dependent Variable

The study uses employee perceptions of overall quality and skill level to measure organizational performance. The survey items used to measure performance have been derived from past studies (G. A. Brewer & Selden, 1998; Choi & Rainey, 2010; Pitts, 2009) and include (a) The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year, (b) A spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my work unit, (c) My work unit's customers are satisfied with the quality of our work, (d) My work unit places emphasis on doing the job right the first time, (e) The overall quality of work done by my work group is high, (f) The overall quality of work done by my immediate supervisor/team leader is high, (g) We frequently develop innovative programs, and (h) Workplace productivity is high. The Cronbach's alpha for these items is .81. All items are on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

Key Independent Variables

Diversity management and OIB are the key independent variables used in this study. The diversity management index is comprised of five items that have been used in past studies (Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000; Pitts, 2006, 2009; Thomas, 1990), which include (a) informs employees of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) policies related to recruitment, (b) incorporates diversity into the organization's vision or mission statement, (c) has policies that are aimed at improving work/life balance (e.g., family-friendly policies like flexible hours, telecommuting, alternative work arrangements), (d) provide opportunities for informal mentoring, and (e) link diversity initiatives to the organization's strategic plan or performance plan. The Cronbach's alpha is .80.

OIB is measured using three key indices: (a) commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion, (b) ability of employees to influence work group decisions, and (c) treating employees fairly. Items under each of these indices are adopted from

past studies on inclusion (Bendick et al., 2010; Davidson & Ferdman, 2002; Ferdman et al., 2010; Gasorek, 2000; Holvino et al., 2004; Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998; Pelled, Ledford, & Mohrman, 1999; Shore et al., 2011). The Cronbach's alpha for commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion is .91, for ability to influence organizational decisions is .95, and for organizational fairness/equitable treatment is .93. The questions used to construct the OIB index are detailed in Table 2.

Controls

Several controls are used in the study that include results-oriented, organizational culture (Choi & Rainey, 2010; Lawrence, 1988; Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin, 1999), availability of resources (Fernandez, 2005; O'Toole & Meier, 1999; Pitts, 2005, 2009), employees' expectations for merit rewards (Kim, 2010), employees' expectations for opportunities (Kim, 2010), and demographics. Demographics include variables that measure minority status (minorities are coded as 0 and non-minorities as 1), gender (females as 0 and males as 1), years in the organization and the government, age, degree level (associates, bachelor's, master's, or doctorate). An additional variable was included as a control that measured if employees experienced any discrimination at work (0 for no discrimination experienced and 1 for experiencing discrimination).

Methodology and Model Specification

The current study uses hierarchical regression to test a model of the effects of diversity management and inclusion on organizational performance. This form of regression is well-suited to determine individual effects of independent variables on the criterion variable without entering all the predictors simultaneously in the model. The key independent variables (diversity management and indexes that measure OIB) are entered at every step of the model followed by interaction terms. The current study tests the main moderating effects of diversity management and inclusion using the hierarchical regression model. The interaction terms can have high multicollinearity problems due to its multiplicative effect. To check for this problem, collinearity diagnostics were run: none of the variance inflation factor (VIF) values were above 3.5, which is much below 10, the diagnostic commonly used to detect multicollinearity (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). Correlations also were reported as an additional check to detect multicollinearity. If the correlation values between the variables used in the interactions is not very high, there is less likelihood for problems with multicollinearity. There was no problem with multicollinearity or high correlations for these data.

Results

The average number of years respondents worked in their current organization was 13.5 years and 19 years in the government. The majority of the employees were female (60.6%), owing to the high response rates from DSHS, which typically hires more numbers of females than males (Guy & Newman, 2004; Kelly & Newman, 2001;

Table 1. Demographics.

	Overall % (N = 198)
% Male	39.4
% Age	
Under 35	3.1
35-44	18.7
45-54	36.8
55 and over	41.5
% Race/ethnicity	
Asian	5.8
Black	6.3
Hispanic, non-White	14.8
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.1
Other	1.6
White, non-Hispanic	70.4
% Degree type	
Associates	10.8
Bachelor's	39.2
Master's	34.4
Doctoral	15.6
% Familiarity[a]	98.5
Mean years in the organization	13.51
Mean years in the government	19.03
% Supervisory role	75.8
% Staff	76.9
% Line	23.1
% Experienced any form of discrimination at work[b]	17.5

[a]Very familiar or familiar with operations and performance in work unit.
[b]Types of discrimination experienced at work are as follows: race, gender, sexual orientation, and age.

Lowi, 1985; Saidel & Loscocco, 2005; Sneed, 2007). Two fifths were ages 55 years and over (41.5%), and three fourths of the employees were staff and in supervisory roles. Nine out of the 10 respondents had a bachelor's degree and higher, and close to one third of the respondents belonged to a minority group, which replicates the demographic of the United States. Less than one fifth of the respondents reported that they experienced any form of discrimination at work. These results are reported in Table 1.

The main predictor—OIB—is a measure of three indices with means and frequencies are reported in Table 2. The results suggest that five out of the seven variables used to measure commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion have a high percent agreement (50% and above) when asked if senior managers were committed to hiring a workforce that represents all segments of society, promotes diversity in the workplace, works well with employees of different backgrounds, incorporates diversity into the organization's vision or mission statement, and creates awareness and appreciation of individual and cultural differences among employees. Only 23.8%

Table 2. Mean, Frequency Distribution, and Cronbach's Alpha for Measures of Organizational Inclusion Behaviors.

Organizational inclusion behavior	M	Strongly agree%	Agree%	Somewhat agree%	Disagree%	Don't know%
[a]Commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion: In my organization, senior management . . .						
Is committed to hiring a workforce that is representative of all segments of society	5.29	14.4	42.3	17.0	8.2	18.0
Has policies and programs in place to promote diversity in the workplace	5.40	18.0	41.2	16.5	8.2	16.0
Works well with employees of different backgrounds	5.59	22.2	44.8	15.5	8.2	9.3
Incorporates diversity into the organization's vision or mission statement	5.06	13.0	36.3	18.1	15.0	17.6
Tries to create an awareness and appreciation of individual and cultural differences among employees	5.34	16.0	42.3	19.1	11.8	10.8
Helps employees understand their own feelings and attitudes about people who are different	4.41	4.1	19.7	26.9	23.9	25.4
Is held responsible for getting high performance from all their staff	4.63	7.3	30.1	22.3	24.9	15.5
[b]Ability to influence organizational decisions: My supervisor . . .						
Involves me in decisions about my job	5.58	26.7	42.1	16.4	13.9	1.0
Encourages all employees to express their opinions	5.39	22.1	39.0	20.5	14.9	3.6
Creates a synergistic approach to problem-solving and decision-making	5.18	17.5	35.6	23.7	17.6	5.7
Seeks my input before making important organizational decisions	5.09	15.9	36.9	22.6	20.5	4.1
Provides me with all information and resources that will help me make decisions about my job	5.22	11.8	45.1	22.1	16.4	4.6
Involves me in decisions about ways to improve productivity	5.34	18.5	42.6	18.5	15.9	4.6
Involves me in decisions about ways to improve quality of the work environment	5.24	16.0	40.7	21.1	17.1	5.2
[c]Fairness/equitable treatment: My supervisor . . .						
Evaluates employees fairly	5.42	22.6	41.0	13.3	11.3	11.8
Has a track record of promoting employees objectively	4.74	13.3	29.7	7.2	18.5	31.3
Takes action when employees show disrespect for each other	4.89	15.5	30.4	17.0	20.0	17.0
Assigns tasks based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities possessed by individual employees	5.38	14.4	45.6	20.5	10.9	8.7
Has fairly rewarded me considering my responsibilities	4.73	12.8	33.3	19.0	26.2	7.7
Has fairly rewarded me considering the amount of experience I have	4.49	12.4	27.3	19.1	32.9	8.2
Has fairly rewarded me when I consider the amount of effort that I have put forth	4.49	12.8	26.7	17.9	35.4	7.2
Has fairly rewarded me for the work well done	4.59	12.8	29.7	17.4	32.8	7.2
Has fairly rewarded me considering the stresses and strains of the job	4.30	11.3	23.7	18.0	36.6	9.3

Note. The responses to the above questions are on a 7-point scale with 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *somewhat disagree*, 4 = *don't know/can't say*, 5 = *somewhat agree*, 6 = *agree*, and 7 = *strongly agree*. *Somewhat disagree, disagree*, and *strongly disagree* are combined into one group *disagree*.
[a]Cronbach's alpha for commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion = .91.
[b]Cronbach's alpha for ability to influence organizational decisions = .95.
[c]Cronbach's alpha for organizational fairness/equitable treatment = .93.

agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisor helped employees understand their own feelings and attitudes about people who are different. More than half of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed on all questions that measured the ability of employees to influence important organizational decisions. The percentage agreement on the equity/fairness scale is lower than the other two indices, that is, higher percentages of employees (approximately one third) disagree that they received fair compensation for the effort, work performed, and experience they bring to their jobs. Table 3 describes the correlations of variables with organizational performance. The largest correlation between organizational performance and the predictor variables is .62 (results-oriented, organizational culture). Except minority status, age, gender, and degree level, all other predictors have a significant relationship with organizational performance.

Effects of Diversity Management

Results in Table 4 suggest that the effect of diversity management on perceived organizational performance was positive, thus supporting Hypothesis 1, which states that diversity management positively influences organizational performance (unstandard β = .601, p < .001). The results do not support Hypothesis 2. Diversity management by itself explains 27.2% of the variance in organizational performance. In other words, organizations that use diversity management strategies that include recruiting in accordance to the EEOC policies, linking diversity initiatives to the organizations' strategic and performance plan, and providing several work/life balance initiatives and opportunities for informal mentoring can expect improved performance from its employees.

However, controlling for all other factors, diversity management no longer predicts organizational performance in Model 2, thus supporting Hypothesis 3. While not significant, the variable has a negative sign. Among the OIB measures, commitment from top leadership (unstandard β = .207, p < .01) and ability to influence work group decisions (unstandard β = .23, p < .01) are positively associated with perceived organizational performance. Perceived fairness is not associated with performance. The study confirmed Hypotheses 4 and 5, whereas Hypothesis 6 remained unconfirmed. Thus, in organizations that effectively manage diversity, commitment from top leadership and ability to impact decisions in a work group is positively associated with organizational performance. The moderating effects of diversity management on commitment from top leadership (unstandard β = .016, p < .05) and ability to influence work group decisions (unstandard β = .029, p < .01) positively impact perceived organizational performance. Overall, the full model explains close to 53% of the variance in organizational performance, an improvement of 26% over Model 1.

Effect of Control Variables

Result-oriented, organizational culture (unstandard β = .527, p < .001) and availability of resources (unstandard β = .202, p < .01) are both positively associated with perceived organizational performance. Employees' expectations for merit rewards and

Table 3. Means, SDs, and Correlations.

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Organizational performance	44.00	7.01																
2. Diversity management	23.87	5.62	.51**															
3. Commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion	35.66	7.90	.52**	.83**														
4. Ability to influence organizational decisions	36.98	9.32	.54**	.42**	.44**													
5. Fairness/equitable treatment	42.96	12.40	.51**	.41**	.40**	.69**												
6. Results-oriented organizational culture	23.86	5.44	.62**	.49**	.46**	.45**	.59**											
7. Availability of resources	21.87	6.07	.51**	.45**	.40**	.30**	.47**	.48**										
8. Employees' expectations for merit rewards	10.52	3.74	.32**	.27**	.27**	.51**	.54**	.53**	.51**									
9. Employees' expectations for opportunities	15.17	3.21	.50**	.54**	.47**	.39**	.48**	.63**	.42**	.54**								
10. Experience discrimination	.17	.38	−.24**	−.21**	−.31**	−.42**	−.45**	−.25**	−.16*	.18*	−.12							
11. Non-minorities	.70	.46	.04	.03	−.02	−.00	−.10	−.03	−.02	.10	−.07	−.05						
12. Years in the organization	13.51	9.18	.26**	.17**	.20**	.01	.09	.12	.10	.08	.02	.05	.07					
13. Years in the government	19.03	9.48	.26**	.06	.10	.06	.06	.06	.11	.05	−.01	−.01	.04	.67**				
14. Gender (male)	.39	.49	−.04	−.04	−.03	.01	.01	−.02	.01	−.06	−.01	−.01	.15*	−.01	.03			
15. Age years	3.17	.84	.12	.06	.11	−.07	−.06	−.01	.10	−.01	−.08	.04	.09	.32**	.49**	.01		
16. Degree level	2.55	.88	.04	−.06	−.13	.12	.04	−.10	−.11	−.10	−.14*	−.08	.06	−.18*	−.14	.06	−.08	

*p < .05. **p < .01.

13

Table 4. Organizational Inclusive Behaviors and Its Impact on Organizational Performance.

	Model 1	Model 2
Constant	29.724***	8.673**
Diversity management (DM)	.601***	−.084
Organizational inclusive behaviors		
Commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion		.21**
Ability to influence work group decisions		.23***
Fairness/equitable treatment		−.051
DM × Commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion		.061*
DM × Ability to influence work group decisions		.029**
DM × Fairness/equitable treatment		−.018
Other controls		
Results-oriented organizational culture		.527***
Availability of resources		.202*
Employees' expectations for merit rewards		.038
Employees' expectations for opportunities		.046
Demographics		
Non-minorities		.42
Male		−.064
Years in the organization		.031
Years in the government		.032
Age years		.672
Degree level		.528
Experience discrimination		−.203
R^2	.276	.637
Adjusted R^2	.272	.528
F change	65.862***	9.119***

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

employees' expectations for opportunities were not associated with perceived organizational performance. Interestingly enough, none of the demographic variables was significantly associated with the criterion variable. Minority status and gender had no significant association with the perceived organizational performance. Overall, the full model explained 52.8% of the variance in perceived organizational performance.

Discussion and Conclusion

Diversity research in the past has been replete with studies that focused on discrimination, affirmative action, reverse discrimination, as well as valuing and managing diversity (Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991; Kellough & Naff, 2004; Morrison, 1992; Naff & Kellough, 2003; Pitts, 2006, 2009; Riccucci, 2002; Thomas, 1990; Wise & Tschirhart, 2000). Current research in public sector is limited in assessing the influence diversity and diversity management policies have on outcome measures such as

job performance, satisfaction, and turnover rates (Choi, 2009; Pitts, 2005, 2006, 2009; Soni, 2000; Wise & Tschirhart, 2000). Although most scholars mention the importance of inclusion, none of the public sector studies have empirically tested its impact on performance beyond diversity management.

The current study supports the rationale for moving beyond diversity management to creating an environment that is inclusive for all employees. The premise of this research is that creating inclusive environments leads to greater job performance. This study conceptualizes OIB into three broad concepts: (a) commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion, (b) ability to influence organizational decisions, and (c) fair treatment. While diversity management alone can positively impact performance when included with OIB, it has no significant impact on organizational performance.

The results show that improving organizational performance requires leadership which is dedicated to fostering inclusion and that can empower employees so they can influence work group decisions. When an agency offers only structural and policy changes to accommodate diverse groups without creating an inclusive environment, the agency still may not be fully successful in increasing productivity. The lesson here is that organizations need to have dedicated leadership that aims to foster inclusion at all levels of the organization (Miller, 1998; Pless & Maak, 2004; Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Shore et al., 2011). In addition, individual employees must be empowered to create an inclusive environment which enables them to contribute to their fullest potential (Bendick et al., 2010; Sabattini & Crosby, 2008). Individuals feel accepted and secure when they are part of the decision-making process, which forms the basis of the ODT. Further, the results show that creating a results-oriented culture and providing resources to employees improved the perceived organizational performance (Choi & Rainey, 2010; Fernandez, 2005; Lawrence, 1988; O'Toole & Meier, 1999; Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin, 1999; Pitts, 2009). The OIB framework recognizes the differences and uniqueness of group members and capitalizes on it to improve performance.

The findings have several implications. First, organizational performance is most effective when diversity management is coupled with support from leaders and when employees are empowered in making decisions. Second, recognizing differences and having policies that promote employee friendly workplaces are important, but do not necessarily translate into an organization that is inclusive and empowers members of all groups. Third, diversity management and inclusion are inherently related; they are two parts of a whole that must both be present to create a strong workforce. The findings of this study indicate that to create a productive workforce, an overreliance on policies and structural changes is in itself not sufficient; leaders must foster an environment that promotes inclusiveness and empowers individuals to achieve their fullest potential. Thus, inclusive management appears to hold greater potential for workplace harmony and improved productivity than diversity management alone.

The current study is not without limitation. Because the current data are limited to a few agencies in Texas, the study has a mono-data bias; thus, these results should be interpreted with caution. Future studies should replicate this study using larger and diverse data sets. Studies also have pointed to the challenge of using self-assessments to measure perceptions of organizational performance—the key argument being that

individuals usually overestimate their performance in organizations (Bazerman, 2005; Meier & O'Toole, 2013). Most of performance- and diversity-related questions can have elements of social desirability associated with them, adding to potential for bias. However, Meier and O'Toole (2013, p. 435) acknowledge that "in public management, data sets with both subjective and objective measures of performance are rare, and an ideal data set to compare various detection techniques and solutions is nonexistent."

Given these challenges, future studies should develop more objective measures of performance. However, perception-based measures have been used in several past studies and have been considered of great value (G. A. Brewer, 2006; Choi & Rainey, 2010). In fact, in studies related to diversity, it is argued that perception is reality (Allen, Dawson, Wheatley, & White, 2007; Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey, 2002; Harrison & Sin, 2006). Allen et al. (2007, p. 22) argue that "even if demographic diversity exists on paper within an organization, if the employees do not perceive their workplace to be diverse, the organization is unlikely to derive the attitudinally and behaviorally based benefits of diversity." In addition, the results of this study are a snapshot of experiences of diversity management in the United States; it might not apply in international settings, especially in non-Westernized countries (especially Asian cultures), wherein the concept of inclusion can be quite foreign in the public sector (Sabharwal & Berman, 2013). Future studies can break down the analyses by minority status, gender, and past discrimination to understand the processes that underlie organizational performance.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

Notes

1. A pilot was conducted from the list of employees provided by each agency. A total of 25 employees from five agencies were contacted to pilot the study. The surveys were sent in waves over a period of 3 months (June-September, 2011) with two follow-ups for each wave a month apart. These individuals were eventually deleted from the database to make sure they were not part of the final sample. None of the individuals reported any problems with the survey. The pilot helped estimate the time taken to complete a survey, which ranged between 17 to 20 min. Respondents across all waves were informed about the upcoming survey a week in advance. Such practice has been documented to increase the survey response rate (Babbie, 2012). Midway through data collection, Texas Department of Transportation and Texas Education Agency decided to discontinue the survey due to re-organization instituted in both these agencies. As a result, the majority of the respondents belong to Texas Department of State Health Services (67%).

2. While the survey had 115 questions related to various human resources practices, only 46 were questions that measured diversity management and organizational inclusive behaviors.

References

Adler, N. J., & Gundersen, A. (2008). *International dimensions of organizational behavior*. Mason, OH: South-Western Publisher.

Aghazadeh, S. M. (2004). Managing workforce diversity as an essential resource for improving organizational performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *53*, 521-531.

Allen, R. S., Dawson, G., Wheatley, K., & White, C. S. (2007). Perceived diversity and organizational performance. *Employee Relations*, *30*, 20-33.

Babbie, E. R. (2012). *The practice of social research*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bazerman, M. H. (2005). Conducting influential research: The need for prescriptive implications. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*, 25-31.

Bendick, M., Jr., Egan, M. L., & Lanier, L. (2010). The business case for diversity and the perverse practice of matching employees to customers. *Personnel Review*, *39*, 468-486.

Bozeman, B., & Feeney, M. K. (2009). Public management mentoring a three-tier model. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *29*, 134-157.

Brewer, G. A. (2006). All measures of performance are subjective: More evidence on U.S. federal agencies. In G. A. Boyne, K. J. Meier, L. J. O'Toole, & R. M. Walker (Eds.), *Public service performance: Perspectives on measurement and management* (pp. 35-54). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (1998). Whistle blowers in the federal civil service: New evidence of the public service ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *8*, 413-440.

Brewer, M. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 475-482.

Broadnax, W. D. (2010). Diversity in public organizations: A work in progress. *Public Administration Review*, *70*(Suppl. 1), s177-s179.

Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. J. (2001). The influence of demographic heterogeneity on the emergence and consequences of cooperative norms in work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*, 956-974.

Cho, S., & Mor Barak, M. E. (2008). Understanding of diversity and inclusion in a perceived homogeneous culture: A study of organizational commitment and job performance among Korean employees. *Administration in Social Work*, *32*, 100-126.

Choi, S. (2009). Diversity in the US federal government: Diversity management and employee turnover in federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *19*, 603-630.

Choi, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2010). Managing diversity in US federal agencies: Effects of diversity and diversity management on employee perceptions of organizational performance. *Public Administration Review*, *70*, 109-121.

Cox, T. H., Jr. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cox, T. H., Jr. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Cox, T. H., Jr., Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*, 827-847.

Cunningham, K. (2001). Father time: Flexible work arrangements and the law firm's failure of the family. *Stanford Law Review*, *53*, 967-1008.

Davidson, M. N., & Ferdman, B. M. (2002). Inclusion: What can I and my organization do about it? *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, *39*, 80-85.

Eaton, S. C. (2003). If you can use them: Flexibility policies, organizational commitment, and perceived performance. *Industrial Relations*, *42*, 145-167.

Ely, R. J. (2004). A field study of group diversity, participation in diversity education programs, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 755-780.

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.

Ferdman, B. M., Avigdor, A., Braun, D., Konkin, J., & Kuzmycz, D. (2010). Collective experience of inclusion, diversity, and performance in work groups. *RAM-Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, *11*, 6-26.

Fernandez, S. (2005). Developing and testing an integrative framework of public sector leadership: Evidence from the public education arena. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *15*, 197-217.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, *7*, 117-140.

Foldy, E. G. (2004). Learning from diversity: A theoretical exploration. *Public Administration Review*, *64*, 529-538.

Gasorek, D. (2000). Inclusion at Dun & Bradstreet: Building a high-performance company. *Diversity Factor*, *8*, 25-29.

Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2003). *Families that work*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Groeneveld, S., & Verbeek, S. (2012). Diversity policies in public and private sector organizations: An empirical comparison of incidence and effectiveness. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *32*, 353-381.

Guy, M. E., & Newman, M. A. (2004). Women's jobs, men's jobs: Sex segregation and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review*, *64*, 289-298.

Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavin, J. H., & Florey, A. T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 1029-1045.

Harrison, D. A., & Sin, H. (2006). What is diversity and how should it be measured? In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J. K. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace diversity* (pp. 191-216). London, England: Sage.

Holvino, E., Ferdman, B. M., & Merrill-Sands, B. (2004). Creating and sustaining diversity and inclusion in organizations: Strategies and approaches. In M. S. Stockdale & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* (pp. 245-276). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

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

Ivancevich, J. M., & Gilbert, J. A. (2000). Diversity management: Time for a new approach. *Public Personnel Management*, *29*, 75-92.

Kellough, J. E., & Naff, K. C. (2004). Responding to a wake-up call: An examination of federal agency diversity management programs. *Administration & society*, *36*, 62-90.

Kelly, R. M., & Newman, M. (2001). The gendered bureaucracy: Agency mission, equality of opportunity, and representative bureaucracies. *Women & Politics*, *22*, 1-33.

Kim, J. (2010). Strategic Human resource practices: Introducing alternatives for organizational performance improvement in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, *70*, 38-49.

Lawrence, B. S. (1988). New wrinkles in the theory of age: Demography, norms, and performance ratings. *Academy of management journal*, *31*, 309-337.

Lowi, T. J. (1985). The state in politics: The relation between policy and administration. In R. G. Noll (Ed.), *Regulatory policy and the social sciences* (pp. 67-105). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mannix, E., & Neale, M. A. (2005). What differences make a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organizations. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *6*, 31-55.

McLeod, P. L., & Lobel, S. A. (1992). The effects of ethnic diversity on idea generation in small groups. *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings*, *22*, 227-231.

Meier, K. J., & O'Toole, L. J., Jr. (2013). Subjective organizational performance and measurement error: Common source bias and spurious relationships. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *23*, 429-456.

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

Mor Barak, M. E. (1999). Beyond affirmative action: Toward a model of diversity and organizational inclusion. *Administration in Social Work*, *23*, 47-68.

Mor Barak, M. E. (2011). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

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

Mullen, B., & Goethals, G. R. (1987). *Theories of group behavior*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Naff, K. C., & Kellough, J. E. (2003). Ensuring employment equity: Are federal diversity programs making a difference? *International Journal of Public Administration*, *26*, 1307-1336.

O'Toole, L. J., & Meier, K. J. (1999). Modeling the impact of public management: Implications of structural context. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *9*, 505-526.

Pelled, L. H., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Xin, K. R. (1999). Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*, 1-28.

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

Pitts, D. W. (2005). Diversity, representation, and performance: Evidence about race and ethnicity in public organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *15*, 615-631.

Pitts, D. W. (2006). Modeling the impact of diversity management. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *26*, 245-268.

Pitts, D. W. (2009). Diversity management, job satisfaction, and performance: Evidence from US federal agencies. *Public Administration Review*, *69*, 328–338.

Pitts, D. W., Hicklin, A. K., Hawes, D. P., & Melton, E. (2010). What drives the implementation of diversity management programs? Evidence from public organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *20*, 867-886.

Pless, N., & Maak, T. (2004). Building an inclusive diversity culture: Principles, processes and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *54*, 129-147.

Rangarajan, N., & Black, T. (2007). Exploring organizational barriers to diversity: A case study of the New York state education department. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *27*, 249-263.

Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J., & Pruitt, B. (2002). *Beyond work-family balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Riccucci, N. (2002). *Managing diversity in public sector workforces*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Rice, M. F. (2004). Organizational culture, social equity, and diversity: Teaching public administration education in the postmodern era. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, *10*, 143-154.

Richard, O. C. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*, 164-177.

Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, *31*, 212-236.

Ryan, A. M., & Kossek, E. E. (2008). Work-life policy implementation: Breaking down or creating barriers to inclusiveness? *Human Resource Management*, *47*, 295-310.

Sabattini, L., & Crosby, F. (2008). Overcoming resistance: Structures and attitudes. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Diversity resistance in organizations* (pp. 273-301). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sabharwal, M. (2013). From glass ceiling to glass cliff: Women in senior executive service. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1093/jopart/mut030

Sabharwal, M., & Berman, E. M. (2013). *Public administration in South Asia: India, Bangladesh, and Pakistan*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Saidel, J. R., & Loscocco, K. (2005). Agency leaders, gendered institutions, and representative bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*, *65*, 158-170.

Saltzstein, A. L., Ting, Y., & Saltzstein, G. H. (2001). Work-family balance and job satisfaction: The impact of family-friendly policies on attitudes of federal government employees. *Public Administration Review*, *61*, 452-467.

Sheehan, K., & Grubbs-Hoy, M. (1999). Using e-mail to survey Internet users in the United States: Methodology and assessment. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, *4*,. Retrieved from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol4/issue3/sheehan.html

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, *37*, 1262-1289.

Sneed, B. G. (2007). Glass walls in state bureaucracies: Examining the difference departmental function can make. *Public Administration Review*, *67*, 880-891.

Soni, V. (2000). A twenty-first-century reception for diversity in the public sector: A case study. *Public Administration Review*, *60*, 395-408.

Steiner, I. D. (1972). *Group process and productivity*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Stewart, M. M., & Johnson, O. E. (2009). Leader—Member exchange as a moderator of the relationship between work group diversity and team performance. *Group & Organization Management*, *34*, 507-535.

Stone, P., & Lovejoy, M. (2004). Fast-track women and the "choice" to stay home. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *596*, 62-83.

Strachan, G., Burgess, J., & Sullivan, A. (2004). Affirmative action or managing diversity: What is the future of equal opportunity policies in organisations? *Women in Management Review*, *19*, 196-204.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London, England: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (2010). *Social identity and intergroup relations* (Vol. 7). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relation* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, *68*, 107-117.

Tower, L. E., & Alkadry, M. G. (2008). The social costs of career success for women. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *28*, 144-165.

United States Census Bureau. (2012). *State and country quick facts*. Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/48000.html

Wasserman, I. C., Gallegos, P. V., & Ferdman, B. M. (2008). Dancing with resistance: Leadership challenges in fostering a culture of inclusion. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Diversity resistance in organizations* (pp. 175-200). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wayne, J. H., & Cordeiro, B. L. (2003). Who is a good organizational citizen? Social perception of male and female employees who use family leave. *Sex Roles*, *49*, 233-246.

Wise, L. R. (2002). Public management reform: Competing drivers of change. *Public Administration Review*, *62*, 556-567.

Wise, L. R., & Tschirhart, M. (2000). Examining empirical evidence on diversity effects: How useful is diversity research for public-sector managers? *Public Administration Review*, *60*, 386-394.

Yun, G. W., & Trumbo, C. W. (2000). Comparative response to a survey executed by post, e-mail, and web form. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, *6*,. Retrieved from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue1/yun.html

Author Biography

Meghna Sabharwal is an assistant professor in the public affairs program at the University of Texas at Dallas. Her research interests are focused on public human resource management and high skilled immigration. Her most recent work is published in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Public Administration Quarterly, Public Management Review, Review of Public Personnel Administration, Journal of Public Affairs Education*, and *Research Policy* among others. She also has two recent book publications: *Public Personnel Administration* and *Public Administration in South Asia: India, Bangladesh, and Pakistan.*