



---

# EFFECT OF WORKFORCE DIVERSITY TAXONOMY ON ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

**Inass Ali**

Dar Al-Hekma University, Saudi Arabia

## ABSTRACT

*The present research was undertaken to determine the impact of workforce diversity taxonomy like diversity climate, value, organizational justice, and identity on various dimensions of organizational culture. Further, make a comparative analysis of different dichotomous groups. A sample of 117 university teachers selected from the University and higher educational institutions in Saudi Arabia. Convenient sampling techniques were used to collect the data through a Google survey, using workforce diversity taxonomy inventory and organizational culture questionnaire. Data analyzed by using a t-test to compare the mean scores of various dichotomized groups to see the effect of workforce diversity taxonomy on organizational culture with the help of the SPSS package. Results revealed that workforce diversity taxonomy like diversity climate, value, organizational justice, and identity significantly influenced organizational culture and its various dimensions. Perceived high and low groups of respondents on workforce diversity taxonomy differed significantly on organizational culture.*

**Key words:** Organizational culture, Workforce diversity, Diversity climate, Value, Organizational justice, Identity

**Cite this Article:** Inass Ali, Effect of Workforce Diversity Taxonomy on Organizational Culture: A Comparative Analysis of University Teachers, *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 12(4), 2021, pp. 440-453.

<http://iaeme.com/Home/issue/IJM?Volume=12&Issue=4>

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The present research work targeted the universities and higher educational institutions that most recurrently demonstrate a high degree of employee diversity. “Workplace diversity is increasing internationally and is increasingly important to organizational success” (Taylor, 2011), Human resource diversity, where enhances the innovation and creativity in the individuals and teams, subsequently entice great attention and challenges for the managers and organizations. Thus, managing the workforce diversity arises as an important approach in organizations, especially in the universities and higher educational institutions, where the

intensity of workforce diversity is very high. Therefore, a vital need to institutionalize the workforce diversity for improved performances and efficiency within the people acquired from a diverse group of different backgrounds. For doing so, organizational culture could be another important key factor in any organization, if it has a strongly held and widely shared set of beliefs supported by its strategies and structure. Regardless of any industry, organizational culture is an important tool for effective management practices and attaining its objectives successfully (Beytekin, et al., (2010), especially for managing diverse human resources.

Workforce diversity in the corporations improves the employees' performances along with the enhanced learning opportunities and growth. Diversity generally considers the difference in age, sex, experience, education, nationality, race, and other disabilities. Van Knippenberg and Schippers, (2007) argued that effectively managed workforce results can be visualized as the comprehensive growth of the organizational members in form of competitiveness among the people, improved work performance, and innovativeness and creativity in the workplace. Thomas (1999) defines diversity as "those individual differences that are socially and historically significant and which have resulted in differences in power and privilege inside as well as outside of organizations." Mor Barak (2011) highlighted the two different perspectives as "Workforce diversity refers to the division of the workforce into distinct categories that (a) have a perceived commonality within a given cultural or national context and that (b) impact potentially harmful or beneficial employment outcomes such as job opportunities, treatment in the workplace, and promotion prospects—irrespective of job-related skills and qualifications". Cox (1994) defined, "Cultural diversity means the representation, in one social system, for people with distinctly different group affiliations of cultural significance."

A consistent and observable pattern of behavior within the organizations, a one-line statement describing the term 'organizational culture', comprises several challenges and complexities. Organizational culture is a dynamic, contextual, and having multi-faceted term, 'it cannot be easily judged as good/bad, strong/weak, or effective/ineffective' (Schein, 2004). The academic literature revealed numerous definitions of organizational culture and classified its dimensions, with a variety of evaluation models. Organizational culture is the shared perceptions of organizational practices. It can be viewed as a collective approach to developing the norms within the organization to regulate the employees' behaviour and functions for attainment of organizational goals. A comprehensive definition beyond artifacts, and behaviours of culture is 'a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems' (Schein, 2004, p. 17). Some of the authors highlight the other faceted of the organizational culture as; Martins and Terblanche (2003) defined "organizational culture as the set of subconscious values and beliefs deeply seated in the organizational structure and shared by its members". Organizational culture is the setting to develop uniformity and efficiency in the workplace (Fralinger & Olson, 2007), and holds the organization together, and stimulates employees to think, behave and perform (Wilderom et al. 2001).

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The interrelationship between employee workforce diversity and organizational culture attracts the attention of many researchers and academicians targeting the diverse industrial sector. The internationalization of the business and human resources creates opportunities as well challenges for the organizations to utilize and manage the resources, within the set boundaries of the organizational culture. In this section of the study, an attempt has been made to explore and investigate the previous studies focused on the interrelationship of employee workforce

diversity and organizational culture in Universities and Higher education institutions around the globe.

The literature on workforce diversity highlighted the impact on various dimensions like a significant impact on organizational performance (Richard et al. 2013; Chin and Huam, 2015; Cho et al. 2017), innovation orientation; (Talke et al. 2011), productivity; (Ali, 2016), and promotion of employees (Roman, 2017). Several studies highlight the gender diversity practices of the many universities such as Vermeulen (2010) highlights the diversity management for higher education institutions of South Africa and Germany, Meric et al. (2015) discussed and analyzed higher education institution in the United States of America, and Vázquez & Elston (2006) highlighted the academic career trajectories with special reference to Spain.

Many organizations witnessed significant improvement in the workplace environment, motivating and efficient employees, and retaining key employees, with the successful implementation of diversity management (Urbancová et al. 2020). Whereas other influences in form of employees' perception of marginalization and organizational efficiency, resulted from managing diversity and teamwork (Inegbedion, et al 2020). Green, et al. (2015) highlights the benefits of diversity in form of adaptability, alternative solutions for problems, availability of various services, variety if skills and expertise. Kundu and Mor (2017) inferred the perception of gender diversity in the organization for the significant positive impact on employees' performance where Oditia and Egbule (2015) found the diversity in the workforce and institutional effectiveness statistically significant.

Universities and higher educational institutions have observed a high pressure to respond to globalization and international competition and adapt to the changing internal and external environmental factors (Beytekin et al 2010). In response to the situations, organizational culture in terms of academic process and administrative authorities of universities are acknowledged as an important factor to harmonize integrated approach in response to global expectations (Bartell, 2003). Thus, a strong organizational culture values on 'mission, leadership, information, strategy and socialization' of university influenced the individual and institutions performance (Taye, et. al. 2019).

### **3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS FORMATION**

The present research intended to explore the effect of workforce diversity taxonomy on organizational culture in a challenging educational environment among the University teachers of Saudi Arabia. It aims to compare the high and low effects of diversity climate, value, organizational justice, and identity on all factors of organizational culture. To achieving the above research objective following hypotheses are formulated.

H0<sub>1</sub>. There would not be a significant effect of diversity climate on organizational culture and its dimensions.

H0<sub>2</sub>. There would not be a significant impact of value on organizational culture and its factors.

H0<sub>3</sub>. There would not be a significant effect of organizational justice on organizational culture and its facets.

H0<sub>4</sub>. There would not be a significant effect of identity on organizational culture and its factors.

### **4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The present study sample consists of 117 faculty members, working in different government and private universities, and higher educational institutions in Saudi Arabia. The questionnaire link was distributed through electronic means among the respondents through E-mails, and

other social media platforms. The respondents were assured that the privacy of information will be treated as highly confidential and the collected information will be used only for academic purposes. A descriptive model of research design has been used to investigate the impact of workforce diversity taxonomy on organizational culture and its various factors.

Organizational Culture Questionnaire, modified by Reddy (2002), has been used to collect the data from the respondents for analyzing organizational culture. The original questionnaire consists of 12 dimensions with fifty-nine items. In current research six dimensions as autonomy, trust, communication, transparency, interpersonal relations, and decision making comprised of 30 items used and each item responded on a 5-point Likert scale on a continuum of strongly agree to strongly disagree with a weighted score of 1 to 5, and in the case of negatively phrased question scoring was reversed. The reliability and validity were pretested by the questionnaire developer (Reddy,2002). The respondent's total score on each dimension is considered as a single score and composite of all dimensions representing organizational culture.

For measuring the perception of employees towards workforce diversity in the organization, the Workforce diversity Inventory developed and standardized by Taylor (2011) has been used to collect the data. Workforce diversity factors such as diversity climate, identity value, and organizational justice were included in the set of questionnaires. Each factor consists of four items and each item rated on 5—point Likert scale with a response category of strongly disagree to strongly agree with a weighted score of 1 to 5 and in the case of negatively phrased question scoring was reversed. A higher score on each count of WDI reveals a high perception towards workforce diversity. The reliability and validity of the scale were determined.

In the present research study to analyze the data, a t-test was found as a suitable statistical method to compare different groups on relative mean scores of studied variables as organizational culture and its various dimensions. To test the effect of workforce diversity taxonomy, variables were dichotomized to form the groups based on the median of diversity climate, value, organizational justice, and identity. SPSS statistical package used to analyze data.

#### **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Table 1 is representing the perceived organizational culture in terms of autonomy, trust, communication, transparency, interpersonal relation, decision making, and overall organizational culture of university teachers as the effect of diversity climate. The obtained scores of high and low groups were compared on each factor of organizational culture. The calculated mean value of employees on autonomy found  $M=19.23$  and  $M=16.18$  for a high and low group of diversity climate with  $sd.=2.96$  and  $2.78$  respectively. Two group of employees differed significantly ( $t= .52, p< .01$ ) on autonomy. The result interpreted that the success of an organization depends to a large extent on the autonomy provided to employees (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Rynes & Rosen, 1995) for effective performance. Diversity climate refers to the perception of relationships among the members of varied groups and organizational norms, policies, practices, and procedures that directly or indirectly maintaining and eliminating discrimination that influenced the autonomy provided to employees for effective performance in the organizations (Cropanzano, Li & James, 2007). Perceived high diversity climate scored significantly greater on autonomy dimension of organizational culture as compared to low diversity climate group of employees attributed to enjoying more freedom and act freely to select their method of work and also exercising freedom in taking initiative in the organization. The diversity climate at the workplace facilitates and promotes cultural and social cohesiveness as well as the transformation of information within the groups (Douglas, 2010).

**Table 1** Showing the impact of diversity climate on organizational culture among university teachers (N=117).

Variables studied	Diversity Climate	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. levels
Autonomy	High Group	69	19.23	2.96	4.452	.000
	Low Group	48	16.81	2.78		
Trust	High Group	69	19.34	3.33	2.145	.034
	Low Group	48	18.04	3.09		
Communication	High Group	69	15.14	2.75	1.697	.092
	Low Group	48	14.31	2.38		
Transparency	High Group	69	15.05	2.79	8.114	.000
	Low Group	48	10.85	2.69		
Interpersonal Relation	High Group	69	12.73	1.88	-1.031	.305
	Low Group	48	13.06	1.29		
Decision Making	High Group	69	20.14	2.95	9.235	.000
	Low Group	48	14.45	3.69		
Overall Culture	High Group	69	101.66	11.60	6.743	.000
	Low Group	48	87.54	10.43		

df=115

Trust one of the dimensions of organizational culture linked to performance, communication, and cooperation in the organization influenced by diversity climate Trust is associated with honesty and integrity in communication and determines positive relationships (Hofhuis et al. (2016). The mean trust score of high and low diversity climate found 19.34 and 18,04 with sd. 3.33 and 3.09 respectively. The two groups high and low diversity climate compared on trust revealed significant difference ( $t = 2.145$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The positive diversity climate is important for the success of managing workforce diversity plans and affects employees' trust (Rynes and Rosen,1995). Researchers of many disciplines are interested in explaining and managing workforce diversity from a global perspective. Hofhuis et al. (2016) observed a significant positive correlation between diversity climate and trust. A high diversity climate appeared to increase trust, group identification reduces interpersonal conflict and aggression, and miscommunication within group members (Drach-Zahavy and Trogan 2013; Hofhuis et al. 2012).

The perceived high and low diversity climate groups of employees are showing mean score on communication 15.14 and 14.31 with sd. 2.75 and 2.38, respectively. The two groups compared on communication dimension of organizational culture; they did not differ significantly. The result explained that perceived high and low diversity climate did not face language barriers, as instructions issued in concerned language, although, language fluency and cultural confidence noticed in diverse work settings. Overall score on communication dimension observed high that revealed strong organizational culture increased employee's commitment at work. To increase strong culture needs open and honest communication in a diverse workplace which enhances the commitment of employees especially teachers at universities and colleges.

Two groups of university teachers classified into perceived high diversity climate and low diversity climate compared on transparency. The mean score of high diversity climate on transparency was observed 15.05 while the low group found 10.85 with sd. 2.79 and 2.69, respectively. The difference between a high and low group of diversity climate on transparency was found significant ( $t = 8.11$ ,  $p < .001$ ) beyond .01 levels. Perceived high diversity climate scored significantly greater than low diversity group on transparency. The result characterized

by high diversity group members perceives strong organizational culture filled with values and favoring organizational policies and practices positively which increases the higher degree of employee commitment, involvement, and satisfaction and consequently leading organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, the perceived low diversity group scored low on transparency refers to a weak organizational culture that gives fewer values to policies and practices leading low degree of organizational effectiveness. The employee with high diversity climate received regular feedback; know policies and rules and decisions are transparent. Hofhuis et al. (2016) suggested that employees with a perceived high diversity climate revealed job satisfaction, develop group identification and share knowledge with group members. On the other hand, perceived low diversity climate not clear about policies, rules, feedback, and decision-making leading to conflict between group members (Hofhuis et al. 2016; Williams and O'Reilly, 1998; Fiske, 1998).

An interpersonal relationship is one of the dimensions of organizational culture that measures the experiences of university teachers in Saudi Arabia as the outcome of perceived high and low diversity climate. Two groups of teachers with perceived high and low diversity compared on interpersonal relations. The obtained mean score on interpersonal relation found 12.79 and 13.06 with sd. 1.88 and 1.29 for perceived high diversity climate and low diversity climate, respectively. The difference between the two groups was not found significant ( $t=1.031$ ). The results interpreted that every member established independent relation at the workplace and perform their task and rarely cooperate with their counterparts on the other hand established dependent relationship and requires cooperating to achieve the goals. Indeed, there is a competitive relationship within the group members, and everyone is making effort to compete with their counterparts. In the university set up all faculties cooperating, hence they developed a mutually cooperative interpersonal relationship and making a joint effort to achieve the objectives of the university. Therefore, two groups of university teachers with perceived high diversity climate and low diversity climate did not differ significantly on interpersonal relationships and experiencing similar fate is grounded in interpersonal relationships (Mainela, 2007) includes task-related relation involves in exchange of resources and relationship appears mutual association (Jehn et al. 2014).

Results shown in Table1 revealed the influence of perceived high and low diversity climate on decision making. The mean score on decision making of high diversity climate found 20.14 and low diversity climate 14.45 on decision making and standard deviation calculated 2.95 and 3.69 respectively. The two groups of university teachers differ significantly ( $t=9.23$ ,  $p<.001$ ) on decision making. The perceived high diversity climate comes from different backgrounds with different skills accepted, they are treated fairly with values and dignity contributing to the organizational decision-making process (Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002) leading to effective utilization of skills (Pink-Harper et al., 2017). The group of high diversity climate perceived that they will share in decision making whereas low diversity climate group significantly scored low on decision making having a different perception towards share in decision making (Bana, 2016).

The results shown in Table1 revealed the mean, Sd. for the overall organizational culture of high diversity climate and low diversity climate groups. The mean score on overall organizational culture of perceived high and low diversity climate groups was found 101.67 and 87.5 with standard deviation 11.60 and 10.3 respectively. The two groups compared on organizational culture, the difference was found statistically significant ( $t=6.7$ ,  $p<.001$ ) beyond .001 levels of significance. Organizational culture is a vital factor of HRM function. The respondents with a perceived high diversity climate viewed that existing strong organizational culture may attract the teachers to perform their tasks effectively to achieve the set standard. The results interpreted that university culture cannot be created by an individual,

but it can be developed jointly by accepting the values in creating university culture adopting a multidimensional approach to teaching and research (Zeqiri & Alija, 2016) and put focus on realizing the specific goals. The most significant benefits of a diverse climate may form employees' retentions, highly instigate motivation, and a healthy workplace atmosphere (Urbancová et al. 2020). The proposed hypothesis (H01) was rejected.

**Table 2** Showing the impact of value on organizational culture among university teachers (N=117).

Variables studied	Value	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. levels
Autonomy	High Group	79	19.0506	2.76377	4.158	.000
	Low Group	38	16.5526	3.16823		
Trust	High Group	79	19.6076	3.05680	3.955	.000
	Low Group	38	17.1579	3.17530		
Communication	High Group	79	14.9620	2.68635	.963	.339
	Low Group	38	14.4737	2.51199		
Transparency	High Group	79	13.9620	3.44720	3.060	.003
	Low Group	38	12.0263	3.07990		
Interpersonal Relation	High Group	79	12.7595	1.82022	-1.181	.240
	Low Group	38	13.1053	1.29008		
Decision Making	High Group	79	18.8228	3.91499	3.730	.000
	Low Group	38	15.7105	4.36762		
Overall Culture	High Group	79	99.1646	12.16071	4.150	.000
	Low Group	38	89.0263	12.47806		

Table 2 is showing the influence of value on various dimensions of organizational culture. In the classification of workforce diversity, value has been identified as one of the dimensions of workforce diversity that influenced the perceptions of preferences, beliefs, and behavior in a diversified workplace (Taylor, 2011). The perceived high and low value influences organizational culture. This research tried to see the impact of high and low value on different dimensions of organizational culture. The mean score of perceived high value and low value on autonomy was calculated at 19.05 and 16.55 with sd. 2.7 and 3.16, respectively. The mean difference between the two groups on autonomy was found significant ( $t = 44.15$ ,  $p < .01$ ), respondents with high value believe that they enjoy more freedom, autonomy in the selection of their own choice of work as compared to their counterparts. Two groups compared on trust and it was observed significant difference ( $t = 3.95$ ,  $p < .01$ ) that perceived high-value respondents give significantly more weight to trust that affect organizational culture. The differences in values influence organizational outcomes. The teachers with high value believe that trust based on cooperation and good intention that the action of other teachers will be motivated leading strong organizational culture. As far as communication is concern perceived high value and low-value subjects did not differ significantly ( $t = .96$ ) suggested that communication is either formal or informal meant for sharing information within the organization members. Both the groups perceived good communication in a diversified workforce can contribute to achieving organizational goals (Nordby 2020) and develop a conducive work environment. The mean score on transparency of perceived high value found 13.96 whereas the mean score of perceived low value found 12.02. Two groups of university teachers in Saudi Arabia did not differ significantly on the transparency count of organizational culture ( $t = 3.06$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The perceived high-value section of teachers viewed a high degree of openness in decision making, appraisal system, and transparency in information sharing as compared to their counterparts leading to develop strong and healthy organizational culture. Interpersonal relation is concerned no significant difference observed between the two groups

Effect of Workforce Diversity Taxonomy on Organizational Culture: A Comparative Analysis of University Teachers

of teachers with perceived high value and low value. Respondents were sharing similar attitudes and values towards interpersonal relations. Though perceived low-value teachers put more emphasis on interpersonal relationships than high value. Hence, interpersonal relation is vital for developing healthy organizational culture.

The mean score of perceived high-value respondents on decision making a count of organizational culture found 18.82 with sd. 3.91 whereas a mean score of perceived low value respondents found 15.71 with sd. 4.36 on decision-making count. The two groups of respondents differ significantly in decision making ( $t= 3.73, p< .01$ ). The high-value subjects believe in responsibility, growth, honesty, trust, and commitment affect decision-making. They believe decisions are being made good for the organization leading healthy organizational culture. Since the perceived high value drives their goals and motivates them to set priorities in decision making make difference between perceived low-value respondents. The effect of the value observed on overall organizational culture. The mean score on overall organizational culture was observed 99.16 and 89.02 for the perceived high-value group and low group, respectively. The mean difference between a high and low group of teachers was found significant beyond .01 levels of significance. The high group of respondents significantly scored greater than a low group of respondents on organizational culture. Hence differences appeared because of value perception towards the determinants of organizational culture. The proposed null hypothesis (H02) there would not be a significant effect of value on organizational culture was not accepted.

**Table 3** Showing the effect of organizational justice on organizational culture among university teachers (N=117)

Variables studied	Organizational Justice	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. levels
Autonomy	High Group	77	19.0649	2.79726	4.114	.000
	Low Group	40	16.6500	3.11777		
Trust	High Group	77	19.3117	3.20057	2.303	.024
	Low Group	40	17.8500	3.28595		
Communication	High Group	77	15.0390	2.81182	1.456	.149
	Low Group	40	14.3500	2.20198		
Transparency	High Group	77	14.5974	3.11304	6.708	.000
	Low Group	40	10.9000	2.66795		
Interpersonal Relation	High Group	77	12.7922	1.85201	-.805	.423
	Low Group	40	13.0250	1.25038		
Decision Making	High Group	77	19.6883	3.10034	7.565	.000
	Low Group	40	14.2000	4.00768		
Overall Culture	High Group	77	100.492	11.65358	6.144	.000
	Low Group	40	86.9750	11.09513		

Table 3 is showing the effect of organizational justice on organizational culture and its factors. Perceived high organizational justice and low organizational justice compared on various autonomy. The mean score of perceived high and low organizational justice on autonomy found 19.06 and 16.65 with sd. 2.79 and 3.11, respectively. The two groups compared on autonomy and result revealed a significant mean difference ( $t = 4.11, p< .001$ ). the result interpreted that the group of perceived high organizational justice enjoy significantly



greater autonomy as compared to low organizational justice. There was a significant difference observed between high and low perceived organizational justice on trust ( $t= 2.30, p< .05$ ). The faculties perceiving high organizational justice accepting fairness in procedures and policies and believe that employees are trustworthy, create a strong organizational culture. As far as communication is concerned there was no significant difference observed between the two groups of faculties who are serving in the universities. Two groups based on high and low organizational justice differ significantly on the transparency dimension of organizational culture. The mean score of perceived high organizational justice and low organizational justice on transparency appears 14.59 and 10.90 with Sd. 3.11 and 2.66, respectively. The difference between the high and low organizational justice on transparency was found significant ( $t = 6.70, p< 001$ ). The employees experiencing high organizational justice viewed more transparency in policies and procedures as compared to their counterparts; they believe communication is clear and transparent leading strong organizational culture. The mean score of high and low groups of organizational justice on interpersonal relations was found 12.79 and 13.02 with Sd. 1.85 and 1.25, respectively. As far as interpersonal relations are concerned low group of organizational justice showed better than a high group of organizational justice but the difference between the two groups did not appear significant. Both the groups are showing favorable and conducive interpersonal relations leading strong organizational culture. Decision-making is one of the important factors of organizational culture, leading to determine strong culture. The perception of high and low groups of organizational justice towards decision making in the university setup develop strong and weak culture. The mean score of perceived high organizational justice and low organizational justice on decision making were found 19.69 and 1.20 whereas Sd. found 3.10 and 4.00, respectively. Two groups of university teachers differed significantly on decision making ( $t= 7.56, p< .001$ ). The results showed the relationship between perceived organizational justice and decision making. Perceived high organizational justice accepts the fairness of procedures in the decision-making process and they are treated with respect and dignity (Greenberg, 1990; Rastgar and Pourebrahimi, 2013) in contrary to perceived low organizational justice. Therefore, perceived organizational justice may work as regulating tool for decision-making (Cassar and Buttigieg, 2015). The mean score on overall organizational culture for high organizational justice was found 100.49 with sd. 11.65 whereas mean score on overall organizational culture for low organizational justice found 86.97 with sd. 11.09. The two groups in terms of overall organizational culture differed significantly beyond .01 levels of significance ( $t= 6.14, p<.001$ ). The faculties who perceived high organizational justice significantly believed more in values, policies, procedures, transparency, decision making, etc. than their counterparts. They are contributing to develop a strong organizational culture. Hence organizational justice significantly influenced organizational culture. The proposed null hypothesis (H03) was rejected.

Table 4 is showing the results of identity as one of the factors of workforce diversity described the perception of employees towards an organization that shapes emotions and behavior (Hogg & Terry, 2000). The perceived in-group identity and out-group identity were compared on autonomy. The mean score of in-groups on autonomy found 18.75 and sd. 3.02 while meaning score of out-group employees found 17.29 and sd. 3.10. The difference between the groups was found ( $t= 2.44$ ) statistically significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score on trust was found 19.00 with sd. 3.39 for university teachers who perceived in-group members and mean score on trust for the members who perceived out-group found 18.46 with Sd. 3.09. The two groups compared on trust; difference did not appear statistically significant. While a similar feeling was found in both groups. As far as communication is concerned perceived in-group and out-group did not differ significantly. The mean score of in-group respondents was found 14.06 and sd. 3.18 while meaning score of out-group respondents found 11.97 and sd. 3.51. The respondents of the in-group perceive more transparency as compared

to the respondents of the out-group. The difference between the two groups was found significant ( $t=3.16$ ) beyond .01 levels of significance. The faculties of in-group perceive a higher degree of openness in decision making, promotional awareness, and performance appraisal system whereas out-group members perceived less openness decision making and transparency in information sharing. The mean score on decision making of perceived in-group identity was found 19.34 with sd. 3.42 whereas the mean score of perceived out-group respondents was found 14.97 with sd. 4.36 on the same count. On the decision-making dimension of organizational culture, perceived in-group identity and out-group identity differed significantly ( $t=5.54$ ,  $p < .001$ ). It is interpreted that in-group members viewed that whatever decisions are being made good for the organization as well as employees and communicated to aware them; and they believe that decisions are important based on problems and issues either by the top-level or joint process. On overall organizational culture perceived in-group identity and out-group identity compared to see the effect of perceived identity.

The observed mean score on organizational culture was found 99.07 and 89.92 with Sd. 11.79 and 13.47 for in-group and out-group identity respectively. Two groups of respondents were found to differ statistically significant ( $t= 3.65$ ) beyond .01 levels of significance. The result attributed to perceived in-group and out-group forms the behavior and emotions of respondents at the workplace that determines intra-group and inter-group feelings and relations (Hogg & Terry, 2000). The perceived in-group respondents' develop positive self-worth accounted for strong organizational culture while out-group respondents viewed exclusion based on an individual's perceived social identity. Perceived inclusion/exclusion is associated with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational justice (Acquavita, et al, 2009; Cho & Mor Barak, 2008). Identity develops the social bond of an employee feeling towards the complete association of the organization leading strong culture. The proposed hypothesis (H04) was not accepted.

**Table 4** Showing the impact of identity on organizational culture among university teachers (N=117)

<b>Variables studied</b>	<b>Identity</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Sig. levels</b>
<b>Autonomy</b>	In- Group	76	18.7500	3.02049	2.443	.017
	Out- Group	41	17.2927	3.10841		
<b>Trust</b>	In- Group	76	19.0000	3.39804	.865	.389
	In- Group	41	18.4634	3.09110		
<b>Communication</b>	In- Group	76	15.0789	2.73136	1.618	.109
	Out- Group	41	14.2927	2.37954		
<b>Transparency</b>	In- Group	76	14.0658	3.18888	3.167	.002
	Out- Group	41	11.9756	3.51773		
<b>Interpersonal Relation</b>	In- Group	76	12.8421	1.85510	-.291	.772
	Out- Group	41	12.9268	1.27260		
<b>Decision Making</b>	In- Group	76	19.3421	3.42365	5.548	.000
	Out- Group	41	14.9756	4.36742		
<b>Overall Culture</b>	In- Group	76	99.0789	11.79804	3.658	.000
	Out- Group	41	89.9268	13.47477		

## 5. CONCLUSION

Workforce diversity in the corporations improves the employees' performances along with the enhanced learning opportunities and growth. Organizational culture is the shared perceptions of organizational practices. The present research contributes to the literature on perceived workforce diversity taxonomy and organizational culture in terms of autonomy, trust, communication, transparency, interpersonal relation, decision making, and overall organizational culture, particularly in university and higher educational institution's teachers. The effect of workforce diversity taxonomy like diversity climate, value, organizational justice, and identity has been observed as significant on organizational culture and its factors. The results have shown that a perceived higher degree of diversity climate is the outcome of supportive policies and top management support, significantly influenced the autonomy of employees in the high organizational concern. The managing workforce diversity climate is to develop a strong culture in the university intended to develop a strong culture where faculties value the cultural environment and supporting policies, showing high commitment, high job satisfaction, and low occupation-related stress leading to strong organizational culture. Further interpersonal relation is observed as vital for developing healthy organizational culture, though perceived low-value teachers put more emphasis on interpersonal relationships than high value. It is evident from the results that the faculty members who perceived high organizational justice significantly believed more in values, policies, procedures, transparency, decision making, etc. than their counterparts. The result interpreted that the employees with perceived in-group may enjoy more autonomy, freedom and select their method of work and experience responsibility in the organization as compared to perceived out-group employees. Thus, the faculties of in-group perceive a higher degree of openness in decision making, promotional awareness, and performance appraisal system whereas out-group members perceived less openness decision making and transparency in information sharing. The perceived high diversity climate, value, organizational justice, and in-group identity significantly influenced all mentioned factors of organizational culture except communication and interpersonal relations. Managing workforce diversity is vital for developing positive and strong organizational culture.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Acquavita, S. P., Pittman, J., Gibbons, M., & Castellanos-Brown, K. (2009). Personal and organizational diversity factors' impact on social workers' job satisfaction: Results from a national internet-based survey. *Administration in Social Work*, 33(2), 151-166.
- [2] Ali, Muhammad. 2016. Impact of gender-focused human resources management and performance: The mediating effects of gender diversity. *Australian Journal of Management* 41: 376–97.
- [3] Bana, W. M. (2016). Effect of organizational culture on workplace diversity in public universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4(8), 241-256.
- [4] Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher education*, 45(1), 43-70.
- [5] Beytekin, O. F., Yalçinkaya, M., Doğan, M., & Karakoç, N. (2010). The organizational culture at the university. *The International Journal of Educational Researchers*, 2(1), 1-13.
- [6] Beytekin, O. F., Yalçinkaya, M., Doğan, M., & Karakoç, N. (2010). The organizational culture at the university. *The International Journal of Educational Researchers*, 2(1), 1-13.

Effect of Workforce Diversity Taxonomy on Organizational Culture: A Comparative Analysis of University Teachers

- [7] Bunderson, J. S., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2002). Comparing alternative conceptualizations of functional diversity in management teams: Process and performance effects. *Academy of management journal*, 45(5), 875-893.
- [8] Cassar, V., & Buttigieg, S. C. (2015). Psychological contract breach, organizational justice, and emotional well-being. *Personnel Review*.
- [9] Chin, Thoo Ai, and Huam Hon Tat. 2015. Does gender diversity moderate the relationship between supply chain management practice and performance in the electronic manufacturing service industry? *International Journal of Logistic-Research and Application* 18: 35–45.
- [10] 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(4), 100-126.
- [11] Choi, Sungjoo, and Hall G. Rainey. 2010. Managing diversity in US Federal Agencies: Effects of Diversity Management on employee Perceptions of Organizational Performance. *Public Administration Review* 70: 109–21.
- [12] Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- [13] Cropanzano, R., Li, A., & James, K. (2007). Intraunit justice and interunit justice and the people who experience them. In *Multi-level issues in organizations and time*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- [14] Douglas, S. (2010). *The Different Faces of Diversity: The Professional Principles of Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Work force*.  
[http://www.workforcediversitynetwork.com/res\\_articles\\_different\\_faces\\_douglas.as px](http://www.workforcediversitynetwork.com/res_articles_different_faces_douglas.aspx)
- [15] Drach-Zahavy, A., Somech, A., & Trogan, R. (2013). Opposites Attract or Attack? Team Diversity, Diversity Climate, and Inter-Personal Aggression. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2013, No. 1, p. 13060). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- [16] Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. *The handbook of social psychology*, 2(4), 357-411.
- [17] Fralinger, B., & Olson, V. (2007). Organizational culture at the university level: A study the OCAI instrument. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 4(11), 85-97.
- [18] Green, K., López, M., Wysocki, A., Kepner, K., Farnsworth, D., Clark, J. L. (2015). Diversity in the workplace: Benefits, challenges, and the required managerial tools. UF/IAFS Extension, University of Florida
- [19] Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- [20] Hofhuis, J., Van Der Rijt, P. G., & Vlug, M. (2016). Diversity climate enhances work outcomes through trust and openness in workgroup communication. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1), 1-14.
- [21] Hofhuis, J., van Der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2012). Social Identity Patterns in Culturally Diverse Organizations: The Role of Diversity Climate 1. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 42(4), 964-989.

- [22] Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. I. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 121-140.
- [23] Inegbedion, H., Sunday, E., Asaleye, A., Lawal, A., & Adebajji, A. (2020). Managing Diversity for Organizational Efficiency. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 2158244019900173.
- [24] Jehn, K.A.; Jonsen, K.; Rispens, S. (2014). Relationships at Work: Intragroup Conflict and the Continuation of Task and Social Relationships in Workgroups. *Curr. Top. Manag.* 17, 1–22.
- [25] 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(1), 61-81.
- [26] Kundu, S. C., & Mor, A. (2017). Workforce diversity and organizational performance: a study of IT industry in India. *Employee Relations*.
- [27] Mainela, T. (2007). Types and functions of social relationships in the organizing of an international joint venture. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 36, 87–98. [CrossRef]
- [28] Martins, E. C. and Terblanche, F. (2003). Building Organizational Culture that Stimulates Creativity and Innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 6(1): 64-74.
- [29] Meric, Ismail, Mustafa Er, and Mustafa Gorun. 2015. Managing Diversity in Higher Education: USAFA Case. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 195: 72–81.
- [30] Mor Barak, M. E. (2011). *Managing Diversity: Toward a Globally Inclusive Workplace*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- [31] Nordby, H. (2020). Communication and Organizational Culture. In *A Closer Look at Organizational Culture in Action*. IntechOpen.
- [32] Oditia, A. O., & Egbule, S. (2015). Workforce diversity and organizational effectiveness in Nigerian brewery industry. Delta state university.
- [33] Pink-Harper, S. A., Davis, R. S., & Burnside, R. (2017). “Justice for all”: An examination of self-identified LGBT job satisfaction in the US federal workforce. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 34(2), 182-197.
- [34] Rastgar, A. A., & Pourebrahimi, N. (2013). Social loafing in banking industry of Iran: Investigating the role of organizational commitment. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(5), 1-11.
- [35] Reddy, D.N. M. (2002). Organisational culture and its impact on organisational effectiveness A comparative study of public and private sector enterprises. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, AP (India).
- [36] Reddy, D.N. M. (2002). Organisational culture and its impact on organisational effectiveness A comparative study of public and private sector enterprises. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, AP (India).
- [37] Richard, Orlando C., Susan L. Kirby, and Ken Chadwick. 2013. The impact of racial and gender diversity in management on financial performance: how participative strategy making features can unleash a diversity advantage. *International Journal of Human Resources Management* 24: 2571–82

Effect of Workforce Diversity Taxonomy on Organizational Culture: A Comparative Analysis of University Teachers

- [38] Roman, Michelle. 2017. Relationships between Women's Glass Ceiling Beliefs Career Advancement Satisfaction and Quit Intention. Walden Dissertation and Doctoral Studies 3830: 1-149
- [39] Rynes, S., & Rosen, B. (1995). A field survey of factors affecting the adoption and perceived success of diversity training. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(2), 247-270.
- [40] Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [41] Talke, Katrin, Søren Salomo, and Alexander Kock. 2011. Top Management Team Diversity and Strategic Innovation Orientation: The Relationship and Consequences for Innovativeness and Performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 28: 819-32.
- [42] Taye, M., Sang, G., & Muthanna, A. (2019). Organizational culture and its influence on the performance of higher education institutions: The case of a state university in Beijing. *International Journal of Research*, 8(2), 77-90.
- [43] Taylor, A. S. (2011). *Toward a Taxonomy of Diversity at Work: Developing and Validating the Workplace Diversity Inventory*. Dissertations and Theses. Paper 158.
- [44] Thomas, Roosevelt R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review* 68: 107-17.
- [45] Urbancova, H., Hudakova, M., & Fajcikova, A. (2020). Diversity management as a tool of sustainability of competitive advantage. *Sustainability*, 12(12), 5020.
- [46] Van Knippenberg, Daan, Jeremy F. Dawson, Michael A. West, and Astrid C. Homan. (2011). Diversity faultiness, shared objectives, and top management team performance. *Human Relations* 64: 307-36.
- [47] Vázquez-Cupeiro, Susana, and Mary A. Elston. 2006. Gender and academic career trajectories in Spain from gendered passion to consecration in a Sistema Endogamico? *Employee Relations* 28: 588-603.
- [48] Vermeulen, Pieter. 2010. *Diversity Management in Higher Education: A South African Perspective in Comparison to a Homogeneous and Monomorphous Society Such as Germany*. Gütersloh: Centre for Higher Education Development gGmbH, 157p
- [49] Wilderom, C. P. M., Van den Berg, P. T., Glunk, U., Maslowski, R., & Ashkanasy, N. (2001). On operationalizing organizational culture. In N. Ashkanasy (Chair), *Beyond the handbook: Organizational culture in the twenty-first century*. Showcase symposium conducted at the Academy of Management Conference, Washington, DC, August.
- [50] Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1998). Demography and. *Research in organizational behavior*, 20, 77-140.
- [51] Zeqiri, J., & Alija, S. (2016). The organizational culture dimensions-The case of an independent private University in Macedonia. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai*, 61(3), 20.