Journal of Management & Organization (2025), **31**, 1316–1328
doi:10.1017/jmo.2023.2

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Diversity and inclusion: Multilevel recommendations

Lila L. Carden

College of Technology, Construction Management Department, University of Houston – Main Campus, 312 Technology Building, Houston, Texas 77204, USA
Author for correspondence: Lila L. Carden, E-mail: lcarden@uh.edu

(Received 3 April 2022; revised 23 November 2022; accepted 24 December 2022)

Abstract
This article contributes to the knowledge about diversity and inclusion by including a discussion of corporate social responsibility, communication strategies, social capital, and social identity. This article also includes archival data as use cases to demonstrate how two companies are implementing diversity and inclusion practices. I further discuss how the companies' current practices are aligned with human resource components including recruitment and selection; training and development; and compensation and rewards. I conclude by making recommendations to assist companies in building a culture of diversity and inclusion noting a multilevel approach including senior leaders, managers, and underrepresented groups.

Key words: Corporate social responsibility; HRM strategies; managing diversity; managing human resources for sustainability; social identity theory

Introduction

The importance of a diverse and inclusive work environment was noted in 2011 in the United States via Executive Order 13583. This executive order was established by President Barack Obama 'to promote the Federal workplace as a model of equal opportunity, diversity, and inclusion' (Executive Order 13583, 2011). The executive order was enacted to ensure the talents of all backgrounds are utilized by creating inclusive cultures that support collaboration, flexibility, and fairness. This importance has also been noted in corporate organizations as presented by PWC Global (2020) in their survey which reported that 76% of the organizations surveyed reported that diversity was a priority. However, per the same PWC Global survey, 33% of the organizations also agreed that diversity was a barrier to progression. Furthermore, Shore, Cleveland, and Sanchez (2018) noted that it is questionable whether organizations are developing cultures that are inclusive for underrepresented groups, such as women and minorities.

Organizations have access to social capital through their internal stakeholders (employees) and these individuals have access to resources including their education, experiences, positions, and social relationships (Lin, 1999). Women and minorities, as underrepresented groups, have untapped and underutilized resources that can be used to close the demand gap (Carnevale, Smith, & Melton, 2011) in STEM. When organizations implement diversity and inclusion practices, they hire and support individuals in underrepresented groups and engage in corporate social responsibility activities (Freeman, 1984). In addition, organizations are being responsible as they are supporting their internal stakeholders (employees) as well as external stakeholders as they consider the communication strategies that they signal through their messages (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). The concept of equity for underrepresented groups (women and

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press in association with the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

minorities) is important for the sustainability of organizations and includes sharing the capacity for well-being between current and future groups of people (Jabareen, 2008).

Employees in these underrepresented groups have social identities that impact their work experiences and personal decisions (Cox, 1994). Specifically, Cox (1994) interactional model of cultural diversity (IMCD) purports that human resource practices that promote equity and social integration of all employees create diverse supportive cultures. Further, Cox's model reports that diversity climates impact individual work outcomes such as job satisfaction and loyalty to the organization. Therefore, some of the benefits of creating a diverse and inclusive workforce includes reduced legal liabilities; attraction and retention of workers; increased performance; creative workforce; and increased customer base (Cox, 1994; Han, Han, & Brass, 2014; Lieber, 2012).

Diversity and inclusion issues have been reported to originate from a lack of productive interactions across diverse individuals and group settings (Bernstein, Bulger, Salipante, & Weisinger, 2020). Specifically, these diversity issues were related to the frequent, short-term nature of diversity training (Kravitz, 2007) as well as issues with diversity evaluations. Other issues related to diversity are mentoring and networking programs as well as programs to address the inequities (Leslie, Mayer, & Kravitz, 2014). To make human resource-focused practices more productive, managerial options and approaches are needed to administer organizational cultures that create diverse and inclusive environments (Bernstein et al., 2020). Specifically, diversity management is a term that covers not only policy and practices on race, disability, and gender discrimination, but also broader issues including other identity and cultural differences (Kirton & Greene 2021). In this study, we use Freeman (1984) view of employees as stakeholders, who are individuals that affect or are being affected by the organization's corporate social responsibility activities. Furthermore, this study focuses on the need for an integrated approach for dealing with stakeholders and communicating the corporate social responsibility strategies. Specifically, this article focuses on presenting an integrated, multilevel approach to creating and maintaining diverse and inclusive work environments, including senior leadership and management practices.

This study answers the research question of:

> How and in what ways do technology companies report on their diversity and inclusion practices?

In this study, I suggest that organizations use reports and other documents to communicate to stakeholders about their corporate social responsibility activities related to hiring, training, and retaining individuals in underrepresented groups. I further suggest that the individual relational factors of social identity need to be considered when creating human resource management dimensions and activities that are communicated in these reports. Specifically, senior management needs to make available resources to support programs, dialogues, and partnerships for a shared system between stakeholders and organizations that facilitate diversity and inclusion in the hiring, training, career advancement, and retention of underrepresented groups (Judge & Bretz, 1994; Lin, 1999; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). Therefore, communication strategies, such as stakeholder information strategy and stakeholder response strategy, are needed to effectively communicate that the organization is conducting diversity management and inclusionary practices ethically and socially responsible (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). The article is structured as follows: first, I define and discuss diversity and inclusion. Second, I discuss corporate social responsibility and communication strategies as an approach to diversity and inclusion management and reporting. Third, I discuss social capital and social identity to frame the discussions about two case studies using human resource-focused practices. Fourth, I explain the research design and present the case study information. Fifth, I present analysis of the two case studies and thereafter, conclude with limitations of the study and recommendations to assist companies in building a culture of diversity and inclusion.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Diversity and inclusion

Diversity and inclusion are two terms that have been linked to organizational approaches (Bernstein et al., 2020) that facilitate productive, innovative, and creative environments (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Cox, 1994; Han, Han, & Brass, 2014; Lieber, 2012). In this study, I suggest that diversity and inclusion are both needed to support a global diverse workforce as further confirmed by Han, Han, and Brass (2014), and include the equity aspect of corporate social responsibility focusing on social justice, social equity, participation, and empowerment (Jabareen, 2008). For example, Barak, Findler, and Wind (2016) noted that management practices that support inclusion were related to positive outcomes, whereas diversity was associated with positive and negative outcomes. Specifically, diversity includes the workforce that is divided into categorizes that have perceived likeness within a cultural or national sector that can include damaging or beneficial outcomes such as job opportunities and promotions, regardless of the competencies and qualifications (Barak, Findler, and Wind, 2016). Inclusion for organizations is focused on cultures in which people of all identities can express themselves freely while also participating as valued employees (Ferdman, 2017).

Diversity includes actions that can be mandated and legislated, and inclusion is based upon voluntary approaches to establish cultures that provide equal access to resources and opportunities to underrepresented groups that experience discriminatory practices (Winters, 2014), such as women and minorities. Nishii (2013) reported that diversity creates environments that promote assimilation and inclusive environments promote multiculturism. These inclusive environments ensure underrepresented groups are valued including access to career paths, valued for their contributions, and valued for their participation in strategic decisions (Ferdman, 2014; Nishii, 2013). This value includes the diversity, creativity, and innovation that underrepresented groups have contributed to organizations (Han, Han, & Brass, 2014).

While diversity management practices have focused chiefly on bringing women, minorities, and members of other marginalized groups into the workplace, inclusion practices have sought to create equal access to decision-making, resources, and upward mobility opportunities for these individuals. Likewise, many diversity and inclusion scholars and practitioners have sought to emphasize the value that people with a variety of differences bring to the organization (Ferdman, 2014), and not just the 'rightness' of supporting equal opportunity. However, diversity does not always bring beneficial results to organizations (Mannix & Neale, 2005), and can in fact increase conflict and turnover, and lower cohesion and performance. Hence, the focus on inclusionary practices can promote the potential advantages and opportunities of having a diverse workforce. Diversity and inclusion issues have been reported to originate from a lack of productive interactions across diverse individuals and group settings (Bernstein et al., 2020).

Corporate social responsibility and communications strategies

Corporate social responsibility, is based on the idea that an organization is not only responsible for creating value for shareholders, but also should engage in activities that benefit the broader community by engaging in activities that respect the various aspects that influence social, economic, and environmental balances (Freeman, 1984). Mattingly and Berman (2006) suggest that positive corporate social responsibility is based upon institutional strength such as supportive community actions and encouraging diverse stakeholders. For example, institutional strength includes activities related to charitable donations and programs that support hiring, training, and retention of underrepresented groups.

Using Freeman (1984) stakeholder approach to corporate social responsibility, the stakeholder relationship is assumed to consist of collaborative, mutually supportive, and responsive interactions that are built on transparency and accountability (Andriof, Waddock, Husted, & Rahman, 2002). This approach to stakeholders focuses on participation and dialogue rooted in

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

democratic ideals to support inclusive and equitable transactions. The core of stakeholder dialogue is the co-creation of a shared system between employees and the organization (Johnson-Cramer et al., 2003). Currently, participation and dialogue have become a strategy for organizations and communication strategies such as stakeholder information strategy and stakeholder response strategy have been used to sustain more mutual and dialogue-based relationships (Morsing & Schultz, 2006) focusing on diverse and inclusionary practices of shared systems. The stakeholder information strategy (Morsing & Schultz, 2006) is based on one-way communication provided by organizations and includes a request for more information about corporate social responsibility activities. Specifically, top management believes that the organization needs to inform its stakeholders and the general public about the success of the organization to maintain positive stakeholder endorsements. The stakeholder response strategy focuses on a two-way asymmetric communication and reveals to the stakeholders how the company responds to employee concerns and is validated by employee surveys, opinion polls and networks (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). Additionally, the stakeholders must be confident that the organization engages in ethical practices and is socially responsible.

In this study, information asymmetry and cognitive distance are important factors in executing the stakeholder information strategy and stakeholder response strategy, with an emphasis on diversity management and inclusionary practices. The focus on diversity management and inclusionary practices can promote the potential advantages and opportunities of having a diverse workforce. These inclusionary practices are sustainable and based on the ability to maintain or support a process continuously over time (Sachs, 1993). Assessing information is important for sustainability including a shared system (Caputo, 2020), where information is structured and used as a competitive advantage (Bashir & Farooq, 2019). Specifically, information asymmetry is ongoing and happens every time employees (internal stakeholders) have different amounts of information involving services (Caputo & Evangelista, 2019). As a result of the differences in information sharing, employees with more information can take actions to influence their work power (Perko & Mlinaric, 2016). Therefore, information asymmetry may contribute to power relationships or power conflicts (Caputo, 2020).

Strategies of information asymmetry include defense and influence scenarios (Caputo, 2020). A *defense scenario* of corporate social responsibility includes the belief organizations need to provide more information about their corporate social responsibility activities/interest so they are labeled as being socially responsible. An *influence strategy* is focused on educating stakeholders about practices so that they will understand why the company engages in their chosen corporate social responsibility activities and influence perceptions. This influence strategy recommends a company invest in communication approaches that support a shared system and the size of the information asymmetry is related to the communication channels to disseminate information (Kitzmueller & Shimshack, 2012).

Cognitive distance influences a shared system in that it is related to the differences in employees' social, cultural, and lived experiences (Markus & Shimshack, 2012) and because of these differences there are motivations to conduct different behaviors that may or may not align with an organization's goal to produce value (Caputo, 2020). In this study, I emphasize the importance of relational and process-oriented views of employees (Andriof, Waddock, Husted, & Rahman, 2002) to discuss cognitive distance. Caputo (2020) believed that a company should involve stakeholders in their understanding of which current corporate social responsibility activities they should implement. This participation of stakeholders in the decision-making process will ensure *alignment* and *evaluation* scenarios because stakeholders will partake in an active role (Caputo, 2020). Therefore, the company needs to involve stakeholders so they can understand the reasons for the corporate social responsibility activities including collaborations between organizations and shareholders. For example, diversity and inclusion activities can be discussed with the internal stakeholders (employees) prior to the execution of those activities that will hire, train, and retain a diverse workforce, such as recruitment and selection; training and development; and compensation and rewards.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Social capital/social identity

Social capital is defined as 'investment and use of embedded resources in social relations for expected returns' (Lin, 2000: 786). Specifically, social capital includes the resources that are associated with employees as well as their professional and personal relationships (Lin, 2000). Organizations have access to social capital through their employees and as such also have access to their employees' resources including education, experiences, prior job positions, and social relationships (Lin, 1999). Organizations that include diverse groups in their resource pool include employees that have entered the group at different times, have different skills and competencies, and have different outlooks on the organization's past (Ancona & Caldwell (1992). These additional resources have been linked to higher performances (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). Therefore, some organizations have expanded their recruitment and hiring practices to include more underrepresented groups to provide these additional resources for increased productivity and performances (Cox, 1994; Han, Han, & Brass, 2014; Lieber, 2012; Lin, 2000).

Cox (1994), in the IMCD, purports that diversity is a function of various interactional relationships including individual level, group/intergroup, and organizational level factors. In this study, these interactional relationships impact the social capital available to underrepresented groups. These relational individual factors include social identity, prejudice, and stereotyping situations. The relational group/intergroup factors include cultural differences and conflicts. The relational organization level factors include the acculturation process, integration, and organizational biasness. Specifically, at the organizational level the culture is based on the degree in which underrepresented groups are hired for managerial and leadership positions as well as the degree of institutional biasness rooted in human resource activities. In this study, I discuss recommendations for diversity and inclusion based on the relational individual factor of social identity. Social identity is the perception of likeness or belongingness to some group (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) and focuses on the decisions that are made based on in-group membership that yield more benefits than costs (Polach, 2003).

Social identity theory is one of the ways that individuals make decisions about their personal and professional experiences. Individual life experiences as well as their organizational associations create reactions such as curiosity, anxiety, and self-identification (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). Sveningsson and Alvesson (2003) suggest individuals struggle to process conflicting and uncertain situations as they also struggle with their identity. Thus, minority individuals that are in devalued groups, may manage their social identity by suppression or leaving the organization or the profession (Roberts, Settles, & Jellison, 2008; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018).

Based on Cox (1994) IMCD model, the continued access to social capital resources is important for underrepresented groups because their work outcomes may be impacted. For example, if underrepresented groups are not provided with equal access to continued resources their productivity may be impacted as well as opportunities for high-level positions. For example, Lin (2000) reported that inequality of social capital 'occurs when a certain group clusters at relatively disadvantaged socioeconomic positions, and the general tendency is for individuals to associate with those of similar group or socioeconomic characteristics' (Lin, 2000: 786). Thus, members in resource-poor social capital networks are limited in the quantity and quality of available information and the extent to which the information influences outcomes, such as career advancement and retention. Han, Han, and Brass (2014) reported that team diversity is one of the factors that stimulates team creativity. The authors conducted an empirical study of 36 MBA teams students and reported that team-bridging and team-bonding social capital had a positive and significant impact on team creativity.

One of the ways that individuals make decisions about their personal and professional experiences is the extent to which they feel a part of one or multiple groups – social identity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This self-identification into groups also impacts their in-group acceptance into social structures and professional relationships within organizations (Tajfel, 1982. If the in-group relationships are strong, then employees may be successful in increasing social resources that are instrumental in motivating individuals to achieve work related outcomes such as career success, career commitment, and retention (Judge and Bretz, 1994; Lin, 1999). However, if the in-group relationships are not strong, such as underrepresented groups' relationships, the individuals often find themselves excluded from the network of information (Cox, 1994; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Specifically, the in-group networks often provide resources that are important for job effectives, career advancement as well as emotional support and friendships (Ibarra, 1993). Likewise, the out-group networks (underrepresented groups) need to consider the stakeholder response strategy including a two-way asymmetric communication approach focusing on the guarantee that the company is engaging in ethical and socially responsive activities (Morsing & Schultz, 2006) that support resources and programs dedicated to the participation, empowerment, and inclusion of underrepresented groups.

Method

This qualitative study uses secondary data to report on corporate social responsibility activities related to diversity and inclusion. This paper uses data to answer the research question how and in what ways do technology companies report on their diversity and inclusion practices?

Study design and data collection

This study used the case study methodology and collected data from two purposeful technology companies selected from the internet. The case study methodology was considered suitable as it provided detailed descriptions of the activities of diversity and inclusion focusing on human resource dimensions and activities (Yin, 2014). Specifically, the case study approach was used to demonstrate the insights about practices of diversity and inclusion to create and support organizational and managerial knowledge (Leonard-Barton, 1990). I also used the framework of Gibbert, Ruigrok, and Wicki (2008) to support the investigation of human resource management components of companies in this study. Moreover, I used human resource management components to report on the similarities and differences of two different technology companies – Apple and Microsoft. These companies were selected because they operate in similar industries, have similar products, and employ similar employees. Technology companies were chosen because this industry focuses on human resources as part of their assets and specifically report that innovation and creativity are important to their industry. Technology companies were also chosen because they hire science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) employees more often than other types of industries. Secondary sources were used to collect data related to organizational history, products/services, number of employees, number of shareholders, revenue, net income, dividends, and earnings per share. This study used websites, diversity and inclusion reports, as well as information reported from the Mergent Online database.

Case study companies

The case study overview company information for Microsoft and Apple was obtained from the Mergent online database on June 1, 2021. The information included in Table 1 was obtained from Microsoft's website in their Diversity and Inclusion Report and Apples' information was obtained from their website in the Inclusion and Diversity section.

Microsoft corporation

Microsoft Corporation was incorporated in November 1975 and reincorporated in June 1981 in Washington, located in the United Sates. The primary industries of this technology company

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. Microsoft and Apple Diversity and Inclusion Data – 2020 information

Criteria	Microsoft	Apple
Gender %[a]	71.3% M, 28.6% F	66% M, 34% F
Culturally Diversity %[b]	34.7% A, 4.9% B, 6.6% H, .5% NA, .2% PI, 2.3% MU, 50.2% W	27% A, 9% B, 14% H, 1% NA, 3% MU, 47% W
Employee Inclusion Index %[c]	88% Positive	92% Positive
Measurement of New Diversity & Inclusion Innovation	9 Global Employee Resource Groups[d]	Increase in the % of people from underrepresented communities and women holding leadership roles

Legend.
[a]M, Male; F, Female.
[b]W, White; NW, Non-white including Asian, Black/African American, Hispanics/Latinx, Native American/Alaska Native, Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian, Multiracial and Other.
[c]Inclusion Index is a measure of employee sentiment when it comes to factors like authenticity, belonging, and a belief in Microsoft's commitment to diversity (Microsoft, n.d.).
[d]Employee resource groups (ERGs) include support, networking, and community-building for women, families, racial and ethnic minorities, military, people with disabilities, or who identify as LGBTQI + (Microsoft, n.d.).

include software, prepackaged software, and software publishers. Specifically, Microsoft provides cloud-based solutions and online advertising. The company's products include operating systems; various applications; desktop, server, and development tools; and video games. The company also designs, manufactures, and sells various devices such as computers, tablets, gaming consoles and other types of devices. The company as of June 30, 2020, employed 163,000 people and included 91,674 shareholders as of July 27, 2020. Microsoft's revenue was $159,969,000,000 and net income was $56,015,000,000 as of March 31, 2021. The dividend was $2.19 and the earnings per share (basic) was $7.42 as of March 31, 2021.

Apple

Apple was incorporated in January 1977 in California, located in the United States. The primary industries of this technology company include (a) computer hardware, (b) radio and TV communications equipment, and (c) radio and television broadcasting and wireless communications equipment manufacturing. Specifically, Apple designs, manufacturers, and markets phones, computers, tablets, accessories, and other services. The company's products include iPhone, Mac, iPad, and wearables including accessories. The company's services and support initiatives include advertising; AppleCare, cloud services; digital content, and payment services. The company as of September 26, 2020, employed 147,000 full-time employees and included 22,797 shareholders as of October 16, 2020. Apple's revenue was $325,406,000,000 and net income was $76,311,000,000 as of March 31, 2021. The dividend was $.835 and the earnings per share (basic) was $4.51 as of March 31, 2021.

Discussion

This section of the article includes a discussion of the diversity and inclusion criteria for each company as well as a summary of the human resource management activities for Microsoft and Apple. Specifically, this discussion includes how the aforementioned companies report on their diversity and inclusion practices. To develop a sustainable diversity and inclusion process, there is a need to integrate a shared system of basic values whereby employees and organizations are guided and evaluated (Johnson-Cramer et al., 2003). In this study, I suggest that the criteria and human resource management activities are reported using the stakeholder information strategy and stakeholder response strategy by Morsing and Schultz (2006) and include the following

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

information asymmetry and cognitive distance scenarios: defense, influence, alignment and evaluation (Caputo, 2020).

Diversity and inclusion criteria

In Table 1, note the 2020 data for gender; cultural diversity; employee inclusion index; and measurement of new diversity and inclusion innovation. Microsoft and Apple hired more males than females in 2020. Additionally, both companies have approximately 50% of their workforce including white individuals with the remaining percentage including people of color from the following demographics: Asian, Black/African American, Hispanics/Latinx, Native American/Alaska Native, Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian, Multiracial and Other. Also, note that both companies reported approximately 90% of their employees feel that the company is committed to diversity including authenticity and belonging. Furthermore, both companies are measuring new diversity and inclusion innovation; however, note that Microsoft is using global employee resource groups and Apple is focused on the increase in the percentage of people from underrepresented communities and women holding leadership roles.

Table 1 represents information that is aligned with the *stakeholder information strategy* and is based on one-way communication (Grunig & Hunt, 1984) reported to the public. Additionally, I suggest that information asymmetry is used to share information with stakeholders and the *influence scenario* is executed in Table 1 as the focus is on educating stakeholders about corporate social responsibility practices so that they will understand why the company engages in their chosen activities and influence perceptions. For example, the influence scenario includes dimensions such as gender percentage, cultural diversity percentage, employee inclusion index percentage, and measurement of the new diversity and inclusion innovation, as identified in Table 1.

Human resource management activities

See Table 2 for a summary of the human resource management activities for Microsoft and Apple including recruitment and selection; training and development; and compensation and rewards. The recruitment and selection practices are similar for Microsoft and Apple; however, Apple is also focused on interview panels. Both companies are investing in increasing the opportunities for more diverse pools of candidates. Microsoft and Apple are both heavily engaged in upskilling the workforce by creating opportunities for training and career preparation including educational programs. Additionally, note that Microsoft is concerned about the pipeline of employees for technology in their creation of DigiGirlz. Also note that, Microsoft and Apple are both displaying their commitment to gender pay equity.

Table 2 represents information that is aligned with the *stakeholder response strategy* and is based on two-way communication (Grunig & Hunt, 1984) in which the relationship between stakeholders and the company can evolve. In this scenario, the stakeholders are trying to obtain more information about the company as they adopt the *defense scenario* (Caputo, 2020). This includes the stakeholders trying to collect more detail information about how the company engages in participatory and shared employee activities to report diversity and inclusion activities. This type of information also provides more information to assess alignment and evaluation of the activities (Caputo, 2020) as there are specific human resource management activities that engage internal stakeholders (employees) and are related to recruitment and selection; training and development; and compensation and rewards, as identified in Table 2.

Limitations of study and recommendations

This study is limited in that it only includes data from two technology companies and the data were limited to archival information provided on the companies' websites. Therefore, some of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. Microsoft and Apple Human Resource Activities

HR Activities	Microsoft	Apple
Recruitment and Selection	Investment in the STEM ecosystem; Autism Hiring Program focuses on providing neurodiverse candidates greater opportunities in the interview process (since 2020)	More diverse interview panels and candidate slates
Recruitment and Selection	Apprenticeships, internships, reskilling, and ready now talent	More robust diversity recruiting efforts for R&D and leadership
Training and Development	Educational Programs such as Microsoft Software and Systems Academy (MSSA); training and career preparation program that helps service members and veterans to enter the workforce (graduated more than 2,300 participants); DigiGirlz (started 2020) is a free outreach program for middle and high school girls to learn careers in technology	Apple University offers original classes and seminars across a range of topics, developed, and led by experts.
Training and Development	Allyship is the approach used for self-reflection to facilitate understanding of emotional reactions, accountability, and sustainable allies.	Pathways to every kind of career at Apple/Training & Development including The Career Experience program for Retail and AppleCare team members
Compensation and Rewards	Equal pay for equal work for employees is more widely implemented. For example, as of 9/2020, women in the US, Australia, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, and United Kingdom combined earned $1.000 for every $1.000 by men in these combined geographies.	In 2020, received a top ranking for pay equity in the technology industry by Arjuna Capital's Gender Pay Scorecard.

information related to diversity and inclusion was not accessible per this study. Consequently, the recommendations are limited to data that were provided, herein. Future research needs to include other research methods to obtain more information about the diversity and inclusion activities including surveys and interview questions.

The recommendations, per this study, are based on Cox (1994) IMCD model and the stakeholder response strategy, noting the individual relational factor of social identity and the importance of supporting and communicating diverse and inclusive environments. The continued access to social capital resources is important for underrepresented groups in their workplaces as these resources impact productivity, career advancement, career commitment, and retention (Judge & Bretz, 1994; Lin 1999; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). Therefore, the recommendations in this section are structured using a multilevel participation of senior leadership, managers, and the underrepresented groups. The recommendations also include the stakeholder response strategy with a focus on a shared system to assure the stakeholders that the organization is ethical and socially responsible (Morsing & Schultz, 2006) when implementing diversity and equity support programs. Pollack and Pollack (2015) noted that the execution of the change is one of the key factors in determining the success or failure of the change. Therefore, these recommends are suggested to help with the implementation of diversity and inclusion.

Recommendations

Culture mandated by senior leadership

To sustain the gains identified by the case study companies, the author suggests that there is a need for companies to embed cultures at the organizational level to more closely work with

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the individual relationship component of identity IMCD (Cox, 1994). The identity component of the model needs to consider how to mitigate environments that foster anxiety and self-identification issues (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003) and increase opportunities for social support and commitment to the jobs and organizations (Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2016a). A culture that supports diversity and inclusion needs to begin with the initial and continued communication of the senior leadership team that diversity and inclusion is a strategic focus for the company (Pollack & Pollack, 2015). Therefore, the stakeholder response strategy is recommended as an overall communication approach that includes two-way asymmetric communication that is based on providing evidence that the company is socially responsible and integrating employees' concerns (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). The senior leadership team needs to also establish a governing body to oversee the daily operational and managerial aspects of the diversity and inclusion strategy to facilitate the alignment and evaluation of corporate social responsibility activities. Specifically, a diversity governance committee (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006) can be responsible for overseeing and holding people accountable when engaging in human resource management activities such as recruitment and selection and training and development activities that do not support diverse and inclusive environments. Specific actions that the committee can oversee include affirming social identities, responding to identity threat cases appropriately, and increasing their own and their employees' cultural humility practices (Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018).

Accountability lead by managers

Managers are the gatekeeps to ensuring underrepresented groups feel a part of the 'in group' and still maintain their personal and profession identities with an emphasis on two-way communication administered in the stakeholder response strategy. The managers have the power to hold other people accountable when they do not present inclusive actions (Mattis, 2001). For example, managers can establish rules of engagement for meetings and other work functions to ensure these environments are inclusive and support culture of identify acceptance and involvement in the work group (Shore, Cleveland, and Sanchez, 2018). Managers should also facilitate the advancement of ideas and suggestions of individuals in the underrepresented group as well as support career advancement opportunities (Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018) by seeking feedback through dialogues and partnerships to better understand how to hire, train, develop, and retain underrepresented groups (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). Microsoft (2020) indicated in their diversity and inclusion report that 'what is clear in our ability to move the work forward is that listening, learning, and responding has never been more important.' One of the ways underrepresented groups perceive that they have been listened to and responded to accordingly is by engaging managers in the multi-level diversity and inclusion process.

Social identify support for underrepresented groups

Individual life experiences as well as organizational associations create reactions such as curiosity, anxiety, and self-identification (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). Sveningsson and Alvesson (2003) suggest individuals struggle to process conflicting and uncertain situations as they also struggle with their identity. To support an appreciation of identity for underrepresented groups, Farnum, McCarthy, Beauchesne, and Lawrence (2005) reported on ways to support the primary care of underrepresented groups. Farnum et al. (2005) supported setting the stage for the use of diversity and inclusion programs, such as networking, and mentoring as identified by Microsoft and Apple. This setting the stage includes feelings of being supported, sharing experiences and stories, and being inspired or energized to demonstrate that the organization hears and responds to concerns through dialogue and organized cooperation (Caputo, 2020; Morsing & Schultz, 2006) to implement human resource activities. The feelings of being supported and inspired include visible assignments and job positions (Shore, Cleveland, and Sanchez, 2018). Additionally, one of the key components for a perceived inclusive climate, is related to employees believing that their ideas are listened to and valued, involvement in decision making, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

participation in diversity governing board decisions (Nishii, 2013; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). Thus, accessible resources that provide tools for selection and consideration for noticeable and challenging work assignments need to be implemented as well as opportunities to participate in change.

Compliance practices and policies are also instrumental in supporting and implementing tools and techniques to create and sustain diverse and inclusive environments, with an emphasis on supporting social identities. Some of these practices and policies include recruitment of diverse groups; management of non-inclusive behaviors such harassment and discrimination; and diversity training for the diverse and non-diverse populations (Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). Other policies and practices include managing social support and personal support, including families (Thomas, 2001). Some of these policies and practice to support family obligations include flexible work times, parental leave, on-site daycares, and on-the job training for returning to the workforce (Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018; Wells, 2001).

Conclusion

Diversity and inclusion issues have been reported to originate from a lack of constructive interactions across diverse individuals and group settings (Bernstein et al., 2020). Specifically, these diversity issues were related to the infrequent diversity training (Kravitz, 2007) as well as issues with diversity evaluations, mentoring programs, and networking program (Leslie, Mayer, & Kravitz, 2014). Therefore, senior management needs to make available more resources to support programs, dialogues, and partnerships for a shared system between stakeholders and organizations to increase the hiring, training, career development, and retention of underrepresented groups (Judge & Bretz, 1994; Lin, 1999; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). As a result, organizations will have more information to continue to include in reports to communicate how diversity and inclusion is implemented in a socially responsible way. In this study, I also support the need to use a multilevel approach to creating and sustaining diverse and inclusive work climates including recommendations for senior leadership, managers, and employees engaged in implementing polices, practices and technique implementations. This multilevel approach supports using more organizational and managerial options to implement organizational cultures that are diverse and inclusive (Bernstein et al., 2020).

Conflict of interest. The author declares none.

References

Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Demography and de- sign: Predictors of new product team productivity. *Organizational Science*, *3*, 321–341.

Andriof, J., Waddock, S., Husted, B., & Rahman, S. S. (Eds.) (2002). *Unfolding stakeholder thinking: Theory, responsibility and engagement*. London: Routledge.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20–39.

Barak, M. E. M., Findler, L., & Wind, L. H. (2016). Diversity, inclusion, and commitment in organizations: International empirical explorations. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, *2*(2), 813.

Bashir, M., & Farooq, R. (2019). The synergetic effect of knowledge management and business model innovation on firm competence. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, *11*(3), 362–387.

Bernstein, R. S., Bulger, M., Salipante, P., & Weisinger, J. Y. (2020). From diversity to inclusion to equity: A theory of generative interactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *167*(3), 395–341, 410.

Caputo, F. (2020). Towards a holistic view of corporate social responsibility. The antecedent role of information asymmetry and cognitive distance. *Kybernetes*, *50*, 639–655.

Caputo, F., & Evangelista, F. (2019). Information sharing and cognitive involvement for sustainable workplaces. In F. Caputo & F. Evangelista (Eds.), *Corporate social responsibility: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications* (pp. 1403–1420). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-6192-7.ch073

Carnevale, A. P., Smith, N., & Melton, M. (2011). STEM: Science Technology Engineering Mathematics. *Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce*, 1–112.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cox, Jr. T. H. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
Executive Order 13583 (2011). Establishing a Coordinated Government-wide Initiative to Promote Diversity and Inclusion in the Federal Workforce. Available at https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/08/18/executive-order-13583-establishing-coordinated-government-wide-initiativ.
Farnum, K., Mccarthy, M. L., Beauchesne, M. A., & Lawrence, P. R. (2005). The Primary Care for the Underserved Conference as a building block to social capital: impact on practice, research, and education. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, *12*(4), 126–135.
Ferdman, B. M. (2014). The practice of inclusion in diverse organizations: Toward a systemic and inclusive framework. In B. M. Ferdman & B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 3–54). Jossey-Bass/Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118764282.ch1.
Ferdman, B. M. (2017). Paradoxes of inclusion: Understanding and managing the tensions of diversity and multiculturalism. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *53*(2), 235–263.
Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman Publishing.
Gibbert, M., Ruigrok, W., & Wicki, B. (2008). What passes as a rigorous case study? *Strategic Management Journal*, *29*(13), 1465–1474.
Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
Han, J., Han, J., & Brass, D. J. (2014). Human capital diversity in the creation of social capital for team creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(1), 54–71.
Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 56–87.
Jabareen, Y. (2008). A new conceptual framework for sustainable development. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *10*(2), 179–192.
Johnson-Cramer, M. E., Berman, S. L., & Post, J. E. (2003). Re-examining the concept of "stakeholder management. In J. Andriof, S. Waddock, B. Husted, & S. S. Rahman (Eds.), *Unfolding stakeholder thinking: Relationships, communication, reporting and performance* (pp. 145–161). Sheffield: Greenleaf.
Judge, T. A., & Bretz, Jr, R. D. (1994). Political influence behavior and career success. *Journal of Management*, *20*(1), 43–65.
Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*(4), 589–617.
Kirton, G., & Greene, A. M. (2021). *The dynamics of managing diversity and inclusion: A critical approach*. London: Routledge.
Kitzmueller, M., & Shimshack, J. (2012). Economic perspectives on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *50*(1), 51–84.
Kravitz, D. A. (2007). Can we take the guesswork out of diversity practice selection? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *21*(2), 80–81.
Leonard-Barton, D. (1990). A dual methodology for case studies: Synergistic use of a longitudinal single site with replicated multiple sites. *Organization Science*, *1*(3), 248–266.
Leslie, L. M., Mayer, D. M., & Kravitz, D. A. (2014). The stigma of affirmative action: A stereotyping-based theory and meta-analytic test of the consequences for performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(4), 964–989.
Lieber, L. S. (2012). Considerations for attracting and retaining a qualified, diverse workforce. *Employment Relations Today*, *38*(4), 85–92.
Lin, N. (1999). Social networks and status attainment. *Annual Review of sociology*, *25*(1), 467–487.
Lin, N. (2000). Inequality in social capital. *Contemporary Sociology*, *29*(6), 785–795.
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*(2), 31–55.
Markus, K., & Shimshack, J. (2012). Economic perspectives on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *50*(1), 51–84.
Mattingly, J., & Berman, S. (2006). Measurement of corporate social action: Discovering taxonomy in the Kinder Lyndenberg domini ratings data. *Business & Society*, *45*(1), 20–46.
Mattis, M. (2001). Advancing women in business organizations: Key leadership roles and behaviors of senior leaders and middle managers. *Journal of Management Development*, *20*(4), 371–388.
Microsoft. (2020). Diversity and Inclusion Report. https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/diversity/inside-microsoft/default.aspx.
Morrison, A. M., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 200–208.
Morsing, M., & Schultz, M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility communication: Stakeholder information, response and involvement strategies. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, *15*(4), 323–338.
Nishii, L. H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Review*, *56*(6), 1754–1774.
Perko, I., & Mlinaric, F. (2016). Decreasing information asymmetry by sharing business data: A case of business non-payers sharing agency. *International Journal of Risk Assessment and Management*, *19*(1/2), 54–67.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Polach, J. (2003). HRD's role in work-life integration issues: Moving the workforce to a change in mindset. *Human Resource Development International*, *6*(1), 57–68.
Pollack, J., & Pollack, R. (2015). Using Kotter's eight stage process to manage an organisational change program: Presentation and practice. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, *28*(1), 51–66.
PWC Global. (2020) Global Diversity and Inclusion Survey. https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/services/people-organisation/global-diversity-and-inclusion-survey.html.
Roberts, L. M., Settles, I., & Jellison, W. A. (2008). Predicting the strategic identity management of gender and race. *Identity*, *8*, 269–306. https://doi.org/10.1080/15283480802365270.
Sachs, P. (1993). Shadows in the soup: conceptions of work and nature of evidence. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Human Cognition*, *15*(4), 125–132.
Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, *28*(2), 176–189.
Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations*, *56*(10), 1163–1193.
Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thomas, P. (2001). The truth about mentoring minorities: Race matters. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*(4), 98–107.
Wells, S. (2001). A female executive is hard to find. *HR Magazine*, *46*(6), 40–49.
Winters, M. F. (2014). From diversity to inclusion: An inclusion equation. *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 205–228). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118764282.fmatter
Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cite this article: Carden LL (2025). Diversity and inclusion: Multilevel recommendations. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 31(3),1316–1328. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2

https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press