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ABSTRACT

A TEST AND EXTENSION OF WORKPLACE INCLUSION THEORY: CLARIFYING RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ORGANIZATIONAL INCLUSION PRACTICES, EMPLOYEES’ FEELINGS OF INCLUSION, AND ASSOCIATED WELL-BEING AND WORK OUTCOMES

Robert T. Keating, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Northern Illinois University, 2023
Alecia M. Santuzzzi, Director

Despite the growth of workplace inclusion research and practice over the last 20 years, conceptual clarity and theoretically grounded research have lagged. The current study used baseline data and twice-daily measurements over a two-week period to test and extend a prominent model of workplace inclusion (i.e., Shore et al. 2011). This involved testing bivariate and indirect relationships between inclusion practices (work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate), felt inclusion, and well-being and work outcomes (affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and citizenship behavior), as proposed in the original model. I extended the model to test individual differences in the need for belonging and need for authenticity as moderators of the relationship between inclusion practices and felt inclusion. Additionally, I tested felt competence as an alternative mechanism linking inclusion practices and felt inclusion.

Results provided strong support for the original Shore et al. model whereby inclusion practices were indirectly related to outcomes through felt inclusion. Results of the moderation hypothesis were largely unsupported, and indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt competence were inconsistent and primarily isolated to the baseline data. Exploratory analyses revealed subgroup (age, gender, disability) differences in mean levels of
felt inclusion. Further, there were cross-level interaction effects of subgroups on associations between inclusion practices and felt inclusion; although, the nature of relationships differed by subgroup. The current findings provide evidence in support of workplace inclusion theory and contribute clarity around inclusion construct definitions. Additional theoretical and practical implications are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The concept of inclusion has been one of the great developments in organizational diversity research over the last 20 years. Following several reviews and meta-analyses showing inconclusive benefits of diversity in organizations (Joshi & Roh, 2009; Kochan et al., 2003; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998), workplace inclusion emerged as a promising diversity management approach with reliable links to valued work outcomes. A growing number of studies have found that employees’ perceptions of workplace inclusion are related to increased job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work motivation, citizenship behavior, self-esteem, and positive affect (for reviews see Holmes, IV, et al., 2020; Mor Barak et al., 2016; Shore et al., 2011; Shore et al., 2018). Other studies that examined organization-level outcomes found associations between perceptions of inclusion and increased productivity and decreased turnover (Shore et al., 2011; Shore et al., 2018). Collectively, this work has resulted in consensus among researchers and practitioners that workplace inclusion is generally beneficial to workers and organizations.

Despite the promise of workplace inclusion to yield these benefits, theory on workplace inclusion has seen little advancement since the late 1990s. Most studies have proceeded independent of a common theoretical framework, and conceptual and operational definitions of inclusion have varied extensively. Some relatively recent conceptual work (Jansen et al., 2014; Shore et al., 2011) has made initial progress toward an integrated framework of workplace
inclusion; however, subsequent tests of key hypotheses and assumptions of these models are nearly nonexistent. Consequently, the workplace inclusion research literature remains highly fragmented, and there is still much confusion around what inclusion is and the processes linking it to work outcomes (Mor Barak, 2015). I aimed to address this gap by conducting a theoretically grounded empirical investigation of workplace inclusion.

Toward this goal, the current study had four main objectives: (a) to conduct a rare test of a prominent model of workplace inclusion antecedents and outcomes (Shore et al., 2011; see Figure 1), which proposes that contextual features in the work environment, such as inclusion practices, are indirectly related to individual well-being and work outcomes through individuals’ internal feelings of inclusion, (b) to clarify distinctions between various inclusion practices and felt inclusion and the relationships between them, and to extend theory by (c) examining potential boundary conditions of the relationship between inclusion practices and felt inclusion due to individual differences in the need to belong and need for authenticity and by (d) testing an additional mechanism—felt competence—that might link inclusion practices to outcomes.

In the remaining sections of the introduction, I review relevant literature to further highlight the need for theory-based research on workplace inclusion and provide a rationale for the specific objectives of this study. I begin with a historical overview of the workplace inclusion concept, its origins in diversity management research, and its conceptual development over the years. Next, I describe current theory on workplace inclusion guiding this study and review relevant literature on associated constructs and empirical findings. I then provide the rationales and review supporting literature for hypotheses that extend current theory to include individual
Note. The $a$ and $b$ paths represent the Shore et al. (2011) theoretical model by which organizational inclusion practices are hypothesized to be indirectly associated with individual work outcomes through the psychological experience of inclusion. The $c$ path is not explicitly represented in the Shore et al. (2011) model, but it represents direct associations between inclusion practices and work outcomes, which have been the focus of the majority of workplace inclusion research. Arrow thickness indicates degree of representation in the research literature; thicker arrows indicate higher volume of research examining that relationship.
difference moderators and an alternative indirect pathway. I end the introduction with a summary of hypotheses and an overview of this study.

A Brief History of Workplace Inclusion Research: How We Got Here

Following passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (CRA), researchers had become increasingly interested in issues related to how individuals perceive and respond to diversity—the subjective or objective differences between members of a group with regard to a particular attribute (Harrison & Klein, 2007; van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Throughout the 1960s, 70s, and 80s, research on intergroup relations, social identity and social categorization, stigma, and discrimination, had become well-established in the social psychology and sociology literatures (e.g., Blau, 1977; Goffman, 1963; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1987). Interest in applications of this research to work organizations was also growing given coverage of the employment sector by Title VII of the CRA, as well as other external factors such as corporate globalization and demographic shifts in the general population and labor force (Cox, 1991; DeNisi, 2014; Roberson et al., 2017). As such, much organizational diversity research spanning the 1970s and 80s, and into the 90s, was aimed at understanding the effects of demographic diversity and perceived dissimilarity (e.g., on the basis of sex and race), on individuals’ job attitudes and other work and well-being outcomes (e.g., Kanter, 1977; O’Reilly et al., 1989; Pelled, 1996; Tsui et al., 1992; Wagner et al., 1984).

Although overall findings from these studies were mixed, many found negative associations between diversity and outcomes, suggesting that heterogeneous workgroups had negative consequences for employees (e.g., decreased well-being, job attitudes, and
performance), work teams (e.g., decreased cohesion and performance), and organizational productivity (for reviews, see Joshi & Roh, 2009; Kochan et al., 2003; Milliken & Martins, 1996; van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). These findings contradicted an emerging perspective of researchers and practitioners that increased diversity was beneficial for organizational performance (DeNisi, 2014; e.g., Bantel & Jackson, 1989; Cox & Blake, 1991; Miller et al., 1998; Thomas & Ely, 1996; Watson et al., 1993; also see van Knippenberg et al., 2004 for a theoretical model of how diversity can lead to positive outcomes). Consequently, research efforts in the early 1990s began to shift toward identifying how organizations could avoid negative consequences of diversity and effectively manage and leverage diversity for individual and organizational benefits.

Diversity management refers to the voluntary efforts of an organization to include all employees in formal and informal organizational and work processes (Gilbert et al., 1999; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). The concept of diversity management is built largely on the ideas of Cox (1991; 1993) who proposed that diversity-related issues in the workplace stem from individual-level (e.g., prejudice, identity), interpersonal-level (e.g., intergroup conflict), and organization-level (e.g., institutional bias) factors. Cox and other scholars (e.g., Kossick & Zonia, 1993; Thomas & Ely, 1996), argued that a prosocial, learning-oriented, and value-oriented approach toward diversity could help disengage much of the negative intergroup attitudes and stereotypes that underlie individuals’ perceived threat of social difference. Cox’s (1991; 1993) influential conceptual work on diversity management provided a framework to guide subsequent empirical research on the effectiveness of diversity management. These research efforts were generally successful in demonstrating associations between diversity management and beneficial work
outcomes for individuals (e.g., increased well-being, job satisfaction, and performance) and organizations (e.g., increased productivity and reduced turnover; for reviews Holmes, IV et al., 2020; McKay & Avery, 2015; Perry & Li, 2019). Several studies also demonstrated that employees’ perceptions of positive diversity management practices could attenuate the negative effects of diversity on outcomes (e.g., Gonzalez and DeNisi, 2009; for a review see Mor Barak, 2016).

However, as research accumulated, so did operationalizations of diversity management practices. These practices ranged from basic legal compliance, such as equitable hiring practices and procedures for handling discrimination claims, to voluntary efforts, such as diversity training, issuing an organizational diversity statement, and hiring a company diversity officer. Mor Barak et al. (1998) captured this complexity in their multidimensional model of diversity climate consisting of an organizational dimension and a personal dimension. The organizational dimension captured employees’ perceptions of organizational policies and practices related to the treatment of underrepresented groups and is further divided into an organizational fairness factor (perceived fairness in personnel decision-making procedures) and an organizational inclusion factor (perceived efforts toward diversity training and resources). The personal dimension refers to individuals’ attitudes toward diversity. This dimension is further divided into a personal diversity value factor (belief in the value of diversity in the workplace) and a personal comfort with diversity factor (level of comfort interacting with members of other social identity groups). The importance of the Mor Barak et al. (1998) model of diversity climate is that it expanded the traditional conceptualization of diversity management/climate focused on compliance and fairness practices to inclusion practices characterized by voluntary, proactive efforts toward
diversity management. Thus, it was the first to distinguish the concept of inclusion as a special case of diversity management, although, not explicitly.

In the same year, Mor Barak and Cherin (1998) also contributed what is considered the first academic research publication on the concept of workplace inclusion (Ferdman, 2014; Shore et al., 2018). In the study, they proposed a conceptual framework and developed a corresponding measure (now known as the Mor Barak Inclusion-Exclusion scale [MBIE]; Mor Barak, 2005). This work extended the concept of inclusion even further beyond the traditional components of diversity management and defined inclusion as employees’ perceptions of being included in critical work processes at various organizational levels (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). This marks a critical point of departure in the diversity management literature at which workplace inclusion diverged into an independent area of systematic research.

The distinction between inclusion and diversity management is not always clear; however, there is consensus on them being separate, yet related, constructs. Diversity management is characterized by policies and practices that demonstrate an organization’s commitment to and value in diversity and, therefore, are aimed at compliance with EEO legislation, equity and fairness, and supporting marginalized groups (McKay & Avery, 2015). Inclusion encompasses the components of diversity management at minimum, but then reaches further with efforts toward the full integration of all employees into the organizational culture and work processes (Holmes, IV et al., 2020; Mor Barak et al., 2016; Nishii, 2013; Shore et al., 2018).

Building from this general definition, research on workplace inclusion has grown steadily, particularly in the last decade. Although, the emergence of inclusion marks a key
conceptual advancement in the diversity management literature, workplace inclusion research has largely paralleled the motives and methods of diversity management research, with primary aim at demonstrating a business case for diversity and inclusion. Accordingly, the workplace inclusion literature is outcome-focused, consisting primarily of empirical studies that examine associations between inclusion and various individual outcomes (e.g., job attitudes, work behaviors) and, to some extent, organizational outcomes (e.g., productivity, turnover). Further, operationalizations of inclusion have varied considerably, lending further confusion to what workplace inclusion is and to what it is related.

What is promising is that, regardless of how inclusion has been operationalized, findings have consistently shown that workplace inclusion is associated with beneficial outcomes. This suggests that, despite the disparate nature of the literature, there is likely some conceptual continuity underlying independent definitions of workplace inclusion. Consequently, the few attempts at theory development have focused on integrating existing findings and definitions and identifying a common psychological process connecting individuals’ workplace inclusion experiences to outcomes.

Workplace Inclusion Theory: Toward an Integrated Framework

The most prominent attempt at an integrated framework of workplace inclusion comes from Shore et al. (2011). In defining inclusion, they borrowed heavily from Brewer’s (1991) Optimal Distinctiveness theory (ODT). ODT is a theory of social identity that proposes that individuals’ have fundamental needs for belongingness on one hand and uniqueness on the other hand and that an optimal balance between these needs can be achieved through one’s social
group memberships. The need for belongingness is satisfied through one’s affiliation with and perceived similarity to others in one’s ingroup (Brewer, 1991; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The need for uniqueness is satisfied through the perceived distinctiveness of one’s ingroup from outgroups or the within-group distinctiveness one experiences in relation to other ingroup members (Brewer, 1991; Pickett & Brewer, 2001; Sheldon & Bettencourt, 2002).

Shore et al. (2011) applied insights of ODT to their model of workplace inclusion and proposed that the needs for belongingness and uniqueness are at the core of workers’ inclusion experiences. Accordingly, Shore et al. defined workplace inclusion as the extent to which individuals perceive that treatment from their organization satisfies their need for belongingness and need for uniqueness. With limited available evidence directly supporting their model, they provided justification by extracting themes from existing definitions of workplace inclusion that aligned with the components of ODT. They argued that, although definitions varied extensively, most contained language reflecting belonging (e.g., “acceptance,” “insider”) and value for uniqueness (e.g., “individual talents,” “valuing contributions from all employees”). Importantly, uniqueness defined by Shore et al. represents an elaborated version of Brewer’s (1991) definition in which uniqueness refers to qualitative dissimilarity to other groups or individuals. Shore et al. defines uniqueness as the extent to which the organization conveys that they value uniqueness, such as by supporting diverse voices and identities and acknowledging individual talents.

The uniqueness component of the Shore et al. (2011) model received further revision by Jansen et al. (2014). Jansen and colleagues proposed a similar dual component, needs-based model of inclusion consisting of the need for belongingness and the need for authenticity. Like Shore et al., they built upon the central tenets of ODT but borrowed additional insights from
Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2000) in defining their authenticity component. SDT proposes that general human motivation is driven by fundamental needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competence. Jansen et al. drew specifically upon the autonomy component, which refers to the extent to which individuals’ feel they have volition in the activities they pursue and control over how they pursue them. This can include any activity in which motivation is relevant, such as how one performs a work task or how they express the self and their social identities.

Thus, Jansen et al. proposed that individuals have a fundamental need for authenticity—the desire to present oneself as they are or wish. They argued that the need for authenticity better encompasses the experiences of individuals in various group contexts than the need for uniqueness because individuals vary in their ability or desire to be different. For example, members of a majority social group at work are limited in their ability to differentiate from others in their organization relative to members of minority social groups. Thus, organizations that implement diversity and inclusion practices that emphasize value in uniqueness risk excluding prototypical work group members from those efforts. Value in authenticity is broader in scope than valuing uniqueness, as it accommodates individuals’ ability and/or motivation to be the same or different. Accordingly, they defined inclusion as the extent to which individuals perceive that their organization provides them with a sense that they belong—that they are liked and accepted—and a sense that their authenticity is valued—that they are free and encouraged to be themselves.

The Shore et al. model and the Jansen et al. model are highly similar in terms of the proposed psychological processes underlying workplace inclusion perceptions. However, Shore
et al. goes further by offering a functional model of workplace inclusion (see Figure 1) by which inclusion practices relate indirectly to individual work outcomes through the satisfaction of needs for belongingness and uniqueness (i.e., felt inclusion). This model carries two important assumptions: (1) felt inclusion is the common psychological process linking various operationalizations of inclusion practices to various outcomes and (2) inclusion practices and felt inclusion are distinct, yet related, inclusion constructs.

In the case of the former assumption, felt inclusion is the much-needed black box of the workplace inclusion literature. The majority of workplace inclusion research has examined, in one operational form or another, the link between inclusion practices and work outcomes. As mentioned, however, most of this research is conceptually independent. Thus, the identification of a universal psychological experience of inclusion integrates the literature by providing a plausible, and testable, explanation for consistent findings across varied operationalizations of inclusion and work outcomes. As such, the Shore et al. model is deliberately broad in terms of its proposed “contextual antecedents” (i.e., inclusion practices), which accounts for established policies, practices, and behaviors while leaving room for the development of future policies, practices, and behaviors that cue felt inclusion experiences. The model is similarly broad regarding outcomes given that felt inclusion—the satisfaction of needs for belonging and authenticity—should relate to a range of affective, cognitive, and behavioral outcomes. Thus, beyond providing an explanatory framework for existing relationships between inclusion antecedents and outcomes, the Shore et al. model is also adaptable to novel antecedent and outcomes with conceptual relevance to workplace inclusion. The current study exploited this versatility by examining relationships between a variety inclusion practices (work involvement,
inclusive leadership, and diversity climate) and work outcomes (affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and citizenship behaviors) that span affective/attitudinal, cognitive/motivational, and behavioral domains.

The second assumption is important for continued development of the workplace inclusion concept because it acknowledges the distinction between inclusion as an organizational practice and inclusion as an internal psychological experience. Importantly, the Shore et al. (2011) model accommodates both perspectives, thereby providing a framework by which the inclusiveness of current and future organizational practices can be validated. Despite these potential advances, insights of the Shore et al. model have rarely been adopted to guide subsequent empirical investigations. Research on workplace inclusion over the past 20 or so years has been, and remains, disproportionately focused on the inclusion practice-outcome relationship (path c in Figure 1). Although the last ten years since the publication of Shore et al. (2011) have seen a slight increase in research on felt inclusion, most of this research has similarly focused on associations with work outcomes (path b in Figure 1). A few exceptions have examined a limited subset of workplace antecedents of felt inclusion (path a in Figure 1; Jansen et al., 2015; Jansen et al., 2017; Jansen, Vos, et al., 2015). However, research on inclusion practices and research on felt inclusion have mostly proceeded in parallel streams, one focusing on the utility of inclusion practices and one focusing on the utility of felt inclusion experiences. Moreover, research in either stream has rarely acknowledged the distinction between inclusion practices and felt inclusion, nor explicitly stated whether the inclusion construct of focus in the

---

1 There is one known study prior to Shore et al. (2011) that explicitly made a conceptual distinction between the practice of inclusion and the psychological experience of inclusion and provided some statistical support for the distinction (Ferdman et al., 2009). However, the study did not provide an integrated theoretical model from which to draw hypotheses regarding relationships between inclusion practices, inclusion feelings, and work outcomes.
study was a practice or felt experience. Consequently, very little understanding has been gained regarding relationships and distinctions among inclusion practices and felt inclusion, or their potential joint influence on outcomes.

Further confusion regarding these relationships comes from inconsistency between conceptual definitions of inclusion and their corresponding operational definitions in individual research studies. For example, Mor Barak and Cherin (1998) explicitly defined inclusion as “the degree to which individuals feel part of critical organizational processes such as access to information and resources, involvement in work groups, and ability to influence the decision making process” (pp. 57-58). However, their corresponding inclusion measure (i.e., MBIE; see Table 1) does not appear to assess individuals’ feelings of being part of critical organizational processes. Rather, examination of the item content suggests that the MBIE assesses the degree to which individuals perceive the occurrence of specific actions by various sources within their organization aimed at involving them in work processes. Whether perceptions of these actions are one in the same with, or translate to, feelings of workplace inclusion is an empirical question that has not been adequately addressed in the current literature.

Overall, these discrepancies reflect a widespread pattern of imprecision in the literature regarding the usage of the term inclusion—sometimes referring to individuals’ perceptions of organizational practices, sometimes referring to individuals’ felt experiences, sometimes referring to multiple conceptualizations without explicit acknowledgement of their differences. Thus, there is risk in relying solely upon the declared conceptual or operational definitions of inclusion when reviewing existing research. Rather, investigators should be rigorous in identifying how inclusion was defined and what exactly was measured when interpreting
research findings and before building new research questions upon the claims of their predecessors.

In my subsequent review and evaluation of the workplace inclusion literature, I considered how inclusion is defined at both the conceptual level and operational level. Ultimately, however, I tended to rely on how inclusion was measured to evaluate the evidence and discern whether findings had implications for inclusion practices, felt inclusion experiences, or both. Table 1 provides a list of known measures of inclusion that I have classified as measures of inclusion practices or measures of felt inclusion. I provide this list as a contextual supplement to the reviewed research and for evidence and transparency of my interpretation of how workplace inclusion has been operationalized (practice vs. feeling) in the literature.

Workplace Inclusion as a Practice

The practice of workplace inclusion refers to the specific actions of organizations and their members that contribute to organizational inclusion goals and/or cultivate an inclusive organizational climate (Ferdman, 2014; Mor Barak, 2014; Nishii, 2013; Roberson, 2006). Inclusion practices can include any relevant policies, procedures, practices, and behaviors from various sources or levels within the organization, such as the organization or members of top management, a work group or team, or individuals (e.g., supervisor, coworker; Ferdman, 2014; Ferdman et al., 2009; Mor Barak, 2014). Further, inclusion practices may be formal efforts toward achieving an organizational standard of inclusion, such as the company posting a diversity and inclusion statement (Mor Barak, 2014), or informal interpersonal behaviors, such
Table 1
Workplace Inclusion Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Author)</th>
<th>Description &amp; Response Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mor Barak Inclusion-Exclusion scale (MBIE; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Mor Barak; 2005) | Measures degree to which workers perceive to be included in critical organizational processes—decision-making processes (items 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13), information networks (2, 5, 8, 11, and 14), and level of participation/involvement (3, 6, 9, 12, and 15)—at multiple levels of the organization—work group (items 1-3), organization (items 4-6), supervisor (items 7-9), higher management (items 10-12), and social informal (items 13-15). | 1. I have influence in decisions taken by my work group regarding our tasks.  
2. My coworkers openly share work-related information with me.  
3. I am typically involved and invited to participate in work-related activities of my work group.  
4. I am able to influence decisions that affect my organization.  
5. I am usually among the last to know about important changes in the organization. (R)  
6. I am usually invited to important meetings in my organization.  
7. My supervisor often asks for my opinion before making important decisions.  
8. My supervisor does not share information with me. (R)  
9. I am invited to actively participate in review and evaluation meetings with my supervisor.  
10. I am often invited to contribute my opinion in meetings with management higher than my immediate supervisor.  
11. I frequently receive communication from management higher than my immediate supervisor (i.e., memos, e-mails).  
12. I am often invited to participate in meetings with management higher than my immediate supervisor.  
13. I am often asked to contribute in planning social activities not directly related to my job function.  
14. I am always informed about social activities and company social events.  
15. I am rarely invited to join my coworkers when they go for lunch or drinks after work. (R) |

(Continued on following page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Author)</th>
<th>Description &amp; Response Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader Inclusiveness scale (Nembhard &amp; Edmondson, 2006)</strong></td>
<td>Measures extent to which workers perceive that words and deeds of leaders indicate an invitation and appreciation of team members’ contributions. Scale was originally developed for us in a hospital context, but has been adapted for a general leader-work context in subsequent research. Response scale from original validation study: 5-point scale from <em>not at all</em> to <em>to a large extent.</em></td>
<td>1. NICU physician leadership encourages nurses to take initiative. 2. Physicians ask for the input of team members that belong to other professional groups. 3. Physicians do not value the opinion of others equally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Author)</th>
<th>Description &amp; Response Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Leadership scale (Carmeli et al., 2010)</td>
<td>Measures extent to which workers perceive that their leader displays behaviors across three dimensions—openness (items 1-3), availability (items 4-6), and accessibility (items 7-9). Response scale from original validation study: 5-point scale from 'not at all' to 'to a large extent.'</td>
<td>1. The manager is open to hearing new ideas. 2. The manager is attentive to new opportunities to improve work processes. 3. The manager is open to discuss the desired goals and new ways to achieve them. 4. The manager is available for consultation on problems. 5. The manager is an ongoing ‘presence’ in this team—someone who is readily available. 6. The manager is available for professional questions I would like to consult with him/her. 7. The manager is ready to listen to my requests. 8. The manager encourages me to access him/her on emerging issues. 9. The manager is accessible for discussing emerging problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Inclusion scale (Nishii, 2013)</td>
<td>Measures unit-level perceptions of three dimensions of inclusion—equitable employment practices (items 1-5), interpersonal integration of differences (items 6-11), and inclusion in decision making (items 12-15). Response scale: 5-point scale. Anchors not specified in original validation study.</td>
<td>1. This [unit] has a fair promotion process. 2. The performance review process is fair in this [unit]. 3. This [unit] invests in the development of all its employees. 4. Employees in this [unit] receive ‘equal pay for equal work.’ 5. This [unit] provides safe ways for employees to voice their grievances. 6. This [unit] is characterized by a non-threatening environment in which people can reveal their “true” selves. 7. This [unit] values work-life balance. 8. This [unit] commits resources to ensuring that employees are able to resolve conflicts effectively. 9. Employees of this [unit] are valued for who they are as people, not just for the jobs that they fill. 10. In this [unit], people often share and learn about one another as people. 11. This [unit] has a culture in which employees appreciate the difference that people bring to the workplace. 12. In this [unit], employee input is actively sought. 13. In this [unit], everyone’s ideas for how to do things better are given serious consideration. 14. In this [unit], employees’ insights are used to rethink or redefine work practices. 15. Top management exercises the belief that problem-solving is improved when input from different roles, ranks, and functions is considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Cultural Intelligence scale; Inclusion subscale (Lima et al., 2015)</td>
<td>Measures degree to which the organization is capable with regard to diversity and inclusion. Response scale from original validation study: 5-point scale from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree.’</td>
<td>1. The organization is inclusive. It gives equal opportunity to employees regardless of gender, ethnicity, and so on. 2. The organization strategically makes use of the diverse voices within the organization. 3. The organization understands the dynamics of diversity and inclusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on following page)
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Author)</th>
<th>Description &amp; Response Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-based measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Perceived Insider Status (Stamper & Masterson, 2002) | Measures degree to which employees feel like organizational insiders. | 1. I feel very much a part of my work organization.  
2. My work organization makes me believe that I am included in it.  
3. I feel like I am an ‘outsider’ at this organization. (R)  
4. I don’t feel included in this organization. (R)  
5. I feel I am an ‘insider’ in my work organization.  
6. My work organization makes me frequently feel ‘left-out’. (R) |
| Workplace Social Inclusion (Pearce & Randel, 2004) | Measures degree to which employees have informal social ties with and feel socially included by others at work. | 1. I feel like an accepted part of a team.  
2. I feel included in most activities at work.  
3. Sometimes I feel like an outsider. (R) |
| Perceived Group Inclusion Scale (PGIS; Jansen et al., 2014) | Measures degree to which individuals perceive that their work group provides them with a sense of belonging (items 1-8) and authenticity (items 9-16). | This group…  
1. …gives me the feeling that I belong  
2. …gives me the feeling that I am part of this group  
3. …gives me the feeling that I fit in  
4. …treats me as an insider  
5. …likes me  
6. …appreciates me  
7. …is pleased with me  
8. …cares about me  
9. …allows me to be authentic  
10. …allows me to be who I am  
11. …allows me to express my authentic self  
12. …allows me to present myself the way I am  
13. …encourages me to be authentic  
14. …encourages me to be who I am  
15. …encourages me to express my authentic self  
16. …encourages me to present myself the way I am |

(Continued on following page)
### Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Author)</th>
<th>Description &amp; Response Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Work Group Inclusion Measure (WGIM; Chung et al., 2020)** | Measures degree to which employees perceive treatment that satisfies their need for belonging and need for uniqueness. | 1. I am treated as a valued member of my work group.  
2. I belong in my work group.  
3. I am connected to my work group.  
4. I believe that my work group is where I am meant to be.  
5. I feel that people really care about me in my work group.  
6. I can bring aspects of myself to this work group that others in the group don’t have in common with me.  
7. People in my work group listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.  
8. While at work, I am comfortable expressing opinions that diverge from my group.  
9. I can share a perspective on work issues that is different from my group members.  
10. When my group’s perspective becomes too narrow, I am able to bring up a new point of view. |

*Note.*

a The MBIE was originally developed by Mor Barak & Cherin (1998) and has been revised and expanded to its current form (i.e., Mor Barak, 2005; see also Mor Barak, 2014).

b The shortened 15-item version is shown here for brevity and is most represented in research versus the original 31-item measure. Items from the 31-item version not shown here are not qualitatively different from the 15-item version.

c This scale was developed to distinguish characteristics of organizational diversity practices and organizational inclusive practices; however, researchers have adapted the measure to assess workers’ perceptions of workplace inclusion.

d The PGIS was developed as a measure of general group inclusion that is amenable to different group contexts. It has most often been used in the work group context.

e The WGIM is conceptually defined as a measure of workers’ internal experience of inclusion through satisfaction of belonging and uniqueness needs; however, items appear to assess feelings of inclusion (e.g., items 3 and 5) and perceptions of practices (e.g., items 1 and 7).
as a coworker being a good listener in times of emotional stress (Reynolds-Kueny & Shoss, 2020), both of which have the potential to influence individuals’ inclusion perceptions. Thus, inclusion practices can essentially be any actions of the organization and/or its members which, presumably, workers can perceive and judge as inclusive to some degree (Shore et al., 2011).

As such, operationalizations of inclusion practices are typically assessed via self-report measures of employee perceptions of a given set of practices (see Table 1). Individuals who complete these measures are asked to rate the extent to which specific policies, practices, or behaviors exist or occur in their organization. These measures are typically scored such that higher (vs. lower) average scores across items indicate higher perceptions of inclusion, or more precisely, strength of agreement that, or perceived frequency at which, purported inclusion practices occur in the organization.

Examination of the measures in Table 1 and their item content reveals some overlap across measures but also some notable points of distinction between and within measures. Some of these distinctions reflect the different inclusion practice constructs that have been examined in prior research. Operationalizations of workplace inclusion practices have varied extensively in the literature, ranging anywhere from specific individual interpersonal behaviors (e.g., consoling a coworker in times of emotional distress; Reynolds-Kueny & Shoss, 2020) to written organizational policies (e.g., procedures for handling discrimination claims; Nishii, 2013). However, three practice constructs stand out as prominent in the literature in terms of the degree of research attention they have received and the strength of their theoretical basis. These constructs are (1) work involvement, (2) inclusive leadership, and (3) diversity climate.
I use the term work involvement to refer to the set of inclusion practice dimensions from Mor Barak’s inclusion-exclusion model (Mor Barak, 2005; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). Mor Barak and Cherin (1998) defined inclusion as the degree to which employees are involved in formal and informal work processes and suggest three dimensions of work processes that are most critical for influencing inclusion perceptions: (1) influence in decision-making, (2) access to information networks, and (3) level of participation/involvement. Influence in decision making refers to the extent to which employees perceive that their thoughts, ideas, and opinions are sought after and have an impact on decisions made in the organization. Access to information networks refers to the extent to which employees perceive that they regularly receive information and communications from others at work. Level of participation/involvement refers to the extent to which employees perceive that they are invited to participate in work-related activities (e.g., meetings, work tasks, lunch with coworkers). These three work processes are further proposed to occur across five organizational levels—work group, supervisor, organization, higher management, and social informal.

The Mor Barak inclusion-exclusion model provides the conceptual basis of the MBIE scale, which assesses individuals’ perceptions of involvement in the three critical work processes across the five organizational levels (see MBIE in Table 1). The MBIE scale is, by far, the most widely used measure of inclusion practices (Chung et al., 2020; Rezai et al., 2020) and has inspired the content of subsequent validated measures, such as Nishii’s (2013) climate for inclusion scale. The selection of items and/or subscales from the MBIE scale used in research has varied considerably across studies (Chung et al., 2020; Rezai et al., 2020). Studies that have
used specific subscales tend to truncate the organizational level dimensions, and most of these studies used items at the work group level at a minimum (e.g., Brimhall, 2019; Brimhall & Saastamoinen, 2020; Goswami & Goswami, 2018; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012). A small number of studies have used subsets of the work process subscales, and these studies most often include items measuring influence in decision-making (e.g., Hopkins et al., 2010; Matz-Costa et al., 2012; Travis & Mor Barak, 2010). However, most studies using the MBIE scale have measured all three dimensions of work processes. Given the ubiquity of the MBIE scale in workplace inclusion research and the influence the MBIE model has had on subsequent conceptualizations and measurement, the practice dimensions that constitute the MBIE model provide an appropriate framework of inclusion practices that convey workers’ general work involvement.

Overall, research suggests that increased perceptions of work involvement, as measured with the MBIE, have positive consequences for employee well-being, attitudes and motivation, and behaviors. Numerous studies have linked higher MBIE scores to commonly-studied attitudinal outcomes, namely increased job satisfaction (Acquavita et al., 2009; Brimhall, 2019; Findler et al., 2007; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Mor Barak et al., 2003; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002), increased organizational commitment (Findler et al., 2007; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; 2015), and decreased intentions to leave the organization (Hwang & Hopkins, 2012; 2015; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002). Associations with these outcomes offer some general indication of the positive consequences of work involvement on employees’ job attitudes.

Other studies have examined more specific indicators of employee well-being, as well as motivation and behavior that are particularly relevant to the current study. A main goal in the
development of the MBIE model was to provide a framework for understanding relationships between diversity and well-being. One hypothesis stemming from the MBIE model was that the tendency for workers from underrepresented groups (e.g., racial minorities, women) to experience lower psychological well-being than majority group members was due to their systematic exclusion from critical work processes. Mor Barak and Levin (2002) found support for this hypothesis in a study of employees from a large U.S. technology company. Overall, increased inclusion perceptions (MBIE scale scores) were associated with increased general mental health. Female (vs. male) employees and Non-Caucasian (vs. Caucasian) employees reported decreased general mental health, and some statistical evidence showed that decreased perceptions of inclusion may have played an explanatory role in this relationship.

Mor Barak and colleagues replicated this finding multiple times using similar employee surveys with the same measures among technology, child welfare, and general employee samples in the U.S. and Israel (Mor Barak et al., 2003; Mor Barak et al., 2006; Findler et al., 2007; Travis and Mor Barak, 2010). More recently, Chung et al. (2020) indirectly demonstrated evidence of the relationship between work involvement and well-being among a student sample. In testing the incremental validity of a new inclusion measure against the MBIE work group subscale, they found that the involvement in one’s work group was associated with increased general mental health.

Research has also demonstrated the impacts of inclusion via work involvement on employee motivation. Theoretically, when employees feel included, they are more likely to feel that they are part of the organization and, in turn, reciprocate via increased dedication to their work (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Travis & Mor Barak, 2010). Further, perceived involvement
in work processes frees up emotional and cognitive resources that might otherwise be spent worrying about one’s inclusion status (Travis & Mor Barak, 2010). Accordingly, several studies examined consequences of inclusion for employee engagement—the extent to which employees’ are physically, emotionally, and cognitively invested in their work (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli et al., 2002). Among a sample of employees from four telecommunications companies in India, Goswami and Goswami (2018) found that perceptions of inclusion were associated with increased work engagement. They further showed that several organizational antecedents (workforce diversity, managerial support, and trust in leadership) indirectly predicted work engagement through inclusion perceptions. Similarly, Downey et al. (2015) examined effects of diversity practices and inclusion on perceptions of trust climate and work engagement. In addition to a direct positive association between inclusion perceptions and work engagement, they found statistical evidence of a moderated indirect effect such that the positive effect of diversity practices on work engagement through trust climate was more pronounced as inclusion perceptions increased.

Travis and Mor Barak (2010) took a different approach by examining the inverse of work engagement, neglect, which reflects employees’ disengagement from work tasks and organizational activities. Using only the influence in decision-making dimension of the MBIE scale, they found that child welfare workers’ perceptions of inclusion were associated with decreased neglect. This association emerged from a test of a larger structural model (partially supported) of diversity characteristics predicting several work-related outcomes (e.g., neglect, voice, turnover, and well-being) through inclusion perceptions, organizational support, and leader support.
A relatively less studied outcome of workplace inclusion that has received increased attention in recent years is organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCBs are discretionary behaviors that are not part of employees’ formal work responsibilities (Organ, 1988) but ultimately promote organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Although OCBs are often characterized by prosocial/cooperative behaviors (e.g., helping a coworker), they can also be task-related (e.g., staying late to finish a project). OCBs have gained increased attention from researchers and practitioners as an important performance dimension (Ryan & Ployhart, 2014).

There is considerable conceptual overlap between inclusion practices, particularly individual inclusive behaviors of respectful treatment and cooperation (Ferdman et al., 2009) and OCBs given the prosocial nature of both constructs. Researchers examining associations between the two have drawn on insights from social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) to guide hypotheses. When employees perceive that their organization is inclusive, they have an increased likelihood of reciprocating behaviors that help the organization and/or its members (Chung et al., 2020; Cottrill et al., 2014; Shore et al., 2011).

Empirical findings support this hypothesis. One study focused on overall inclusion perceptions measured with the full MBIE scale. Khan and Jabeen (2019) investigated the relationship between demographic (i.e., age, gender, and education level) composition, workplace inclusion, and OCBs among a sample of 300 Pakistani information technology workers. They found a positive association between inclusion and OCBs, as well as an indirect effect of organizational diversity on OCBs through workplace inclusion. Another study that examined associations between authentic leadership, inclusion, and OCBs among a sample of employed adults found an indirect effect of perceived inclusion (full MBIE scale) on OCBs.
through employee self-esteem (Cottrill et al., 2014). Finally, in the scale validation study by Chung et al. (2020), there was a positive association between the work group subscale of the MBIE and employee helping behavior among a general employee sample.

In sum, perceived involvement in critical work processes as defined by the MBIE model has been shown to consistently predict employees’ well-being, motivation, and behavior. I expect to observe similar associations with the outcomes examined in the current study.

Hypothesis 1a: Work involvement will be positively related to positive affect and negatively related to negative affect.

Hypothesis 1b: Work involvement will be positively related to organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 1c: Work involvement will be positively related to work engagement.

Hypothesis 1d: Work involvement will be positively related to OCBs.

Inclusive Leadership

Another inclusion practice construct that has been the focus of recent research and theorizing is inclusive leadership. The concept of inclusive leadership was introduced and defined by Nembhard and Edmondson (2006) as “words and deeds by a leader or leaders that indicate an invitation and appreciation for others’ contributions” (p. 947). Their main goal in developing the leader inclusiveness construct was to capture leader behaviors that emphasized inclusion of work group members in discussions and decision-making, particularly low status group members who might otherwise not have a voice. Accordingly, their conceptual model emphasizes the role of psychological safety—the degree to which employees’ feel they can voice
concerns and express ideas without fear of negative consequences (Edmondson, 1999)—as the mechanism linking leader inclusiveness to outcomes. Empirical research has consistently supported this model (Carmeli et al., 2010; Hirak et al., 2012; Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006), therefore, offering evidence that inclusive leadership is associated with positive psychological outcomes to some degree.

Several subsequent studies have extended examinations of inclusive leadership to other important work outcomes, including additional proxies of well-being and work engagement/motivation. In a study of Chinese technology employees, Fang et al. (2019) examined relationships among inclusive leadership, innovative employee behavior, and positive psychological capital. They defined and measured innovative behaviors as innovative thinking—problem discovery and generation of ideas to solve problems—and innovative outcomes—the implementation of ideas to solve problems. Thus, it is conceptually aligned with work engagement as it involves a high degree of investment of attention and thought in discovering problems and generating novel ideas to solve problems, as well as behavior in implementing those ideas in practice. Positive psychological capital refers to a general positive orientation toward one’s work (Luthans et al., 2004) and has four components: confidence (i.e., self-efficacy), hope (i.e., “goal-oriented energy”), optimism (i.e., motivation toward positive outcomes), and resilience (i.e., ability to overcome adversity). Thus, it captures elements of both positive well-being and motivation/engagement. They found statistical evidence of an indirect effect by which leader inclusiveness influenced innovative thinking and outcomes through positive psychological capital. A related study of technology employees similarly found that
inclusive leadership was indirectly related to increased use of creativity in work tasks through psychological safety (Carmeli et al., 2010).

In another study, Randel et al. (2016) extended associations with inclusive leadership to include behavioral outcomes. Specifically, they investigated the relationships between inclusive leadership, individual perceptions of diversity climate, and group-directed helping behaviors and leader-directed helping behaviors. They found that inclusive leadership was associated with increased helping behaviors directed at both the work group and leaders and that these relationships were strengthened in positive psychological diversity climates.

So far, the reviewed studies suggest that inclusive leadership following from Nembhard and Edmondson’s (2006) conceptualization has positive consequences for employees’ psychological well-being and motivational orientation toward their organization and work tasks, as indicated by several proxies of these outcomes. Furthermore, there is some limited evidence of the positive behavioral consequences of inclusive leadership. Additional support for the link between inclusive leadership and outcomes relevant to the current study comes from research using alternative conceptualizations of inclusive leadership.

A recent multinational study conceptualized “positive leadership” as a single latent dimension consisting of authentic leadership, inclusive leadership, and respectful leadership. Adams et al. (2020) found that positive leadership was associated with increased feelings of inclusion, better well-being (increased self-efficacy and decreased burnout), and increased work engagement. They further found evidence of indirect paths linking positive leadership to increased self-efficacy, decreased burnout, and increased work engagement through increased feelings of inclusion. Cottrill et al. (2014) examined their concept of authentic leadership in
relation to inclusion perceptions (measured with the full MBIE scale) and OCBs. They found significant positive associations among all variables, and further showed that authentic leadership was indirectly associated with OCBs through perceptions of inclusion. Thus, it appears that leader behaviors that are conceptually related to inclusive leadership are associated with employee well-being, engagement, and OCBs, providing additional support for relationships between inclusive leadership and outcomes of interest in the current study.

It is also noteworthy that many of the studies that used the MBIE scale to measure work involvement included the subscales for measuring these practices at the supervisor and higher management levels. This includes previously reviewed studies that examined associations between work involvement and psychological well-being (Mor Barak et al., 2006), work engagement (Travis & Mor Barak, 2010), and OCBs (Khan & Jabeen, 2019). Although the degree of leader-specific inclusion perceptions is conflated with inclusion perceptions at other organizational levels, these studies provide some degree of indirect support for the positive consequences of inclusive leader behaviors for relevant employees’ affective, attitudinal, motivational, and behavioral outcomes.

Further, several other studies have demonstrated associations between inclusive leader behaviors and related work attitudes and behaviors, including turnover intentions (Nishii & Mayer, 2009) and team performance (Hirak et al., 2012; Mitchell et al., 2015). Taken together, the reviewed findings suggests that inclusive leadership is associated with a range of psychological and behavioral work outcomes, including outcomes relevant to the current study. Accordingly, I expect a similar pattern of relationships between inclusive leadership and employee affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCBs.
Hypothesis 2a: Inclusive leadership will be positively related to positive affect and negatively related to negative affect.

Hypothesis 2b: Inclusive leadership will be positively related to organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 2c: Inclusive leadership will be positively related to work engagement.

Hypothesis 2d: Inclusive leadership will be positively related to OCBs.

Diversity Climate

Diversity climate practices comprise a subset of inclusion practices that follow from the goals of diversity management outlined previously. Diversity management is broadly aimed at increasing and leveraging diversity for the benefit of the organization and its members (Gilbert et al., 1999; McKay & Avery, 2015). This could involve creating fair and equitable organizational systems and procedures to avoid discrimination and other types EEO violations, as well as implementing practices that convey a commitment to and value in diversity (McKay & Avery, 2015; Mor Barak et al., 1998). Accordingly, diversity practices typically take the form of organizational EEO compliance policies and procedures, practices related to the fair and respectful treatment of employees, and practices aimed at integrating underrepresented employees into the formal and informal organizational culture (Dwertmann et al., 2016; Holmes, IV, et al., 2020; McKay & Avery, 2015). Employees’ perceptions of the existence of these practices in their organization is referred to as diversity climate, and, more specifically, as psychological diversity climate when referring to perceptions at the individual level (Dwertmann
et al., 2016; McKay & Avery, 2015). As such, measures of diversity climate are often used to assess perceptions of diversity management practices in research.

As mentioned previously, there is a great deal of conceptual overlap between diversity climate and workplace inclusion. Nonetheless, there is consensus that the two have important differences (Holmes, IV, et al., 2020; Mor Barak et al., 2016). Workplace inclusion practices, at a minimum, consist of diversity practices but also consist of elevated efforts toward the integration of all employees into the organizational culture and important work processes (Ferdman, 2014; Shore et al., 2018). This distinction is probably most evident when comparing measures of inclusion practices and measures of diversity climate. For example, McKay et al. (2008) used the following four items to measure diversity climate: “I trust the organization to treat me fairly,” “The organization maintains a diversity-friendly work environment,” “The organization respects the views of people like me,” and “Top leaders demonstrate a visible commitment to diversity.” Although relatively short on items and detail, the measure appears to assess the main tenets of diversity climate—reducing bias/unfairness and supporting marginalized employees. Furthermore, this measure is a fair representation of the content of other prominent diversity climate scales, such as the Diversity Perceptions Scale (Mor Barak et al., 1998), Roberson’s (2006) diversity scale, and the Organizational Diversity Inventory (Hegarty & Dalton, 1995).

When examining the practice-based measures of inclusion in Table 1, however, items evidently extend beyond compliance, fairness, and diversity and capture efforts at integrating employees into organizational and work processes. Thus, inclusion and diversity climate appear to be differentiated by their motivational orientation. Diversity climate is typically characterized
by prevention-focused policies and practices aimed at reducing bias/discrimination and being compliant with EEO laws, and inclusion is typically characterized by promotion focused policies and practices aimed at extended efforts toward the social and work-related integration of all employees (Dwertmann et al., 2016; Nishii, 2013; Shore et al., 2018).

Similar to workplace inclusion, however, a great deal of research has examined consequences of diversity climate for employee well-being, attitudes and motivation, and behavior. The specific outcomes examined in these studies parallel those from workplace inclusion research. Several recent reviews and meta-analyses suggest that diversity climate is generally associated with benefits to employees’ work-related well-being, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work engagement, task performance, and OCBs (Holmes, IV, et al., 2020; McKay & Avery, 2015; Mor Barak et al., 2016; Perry & Li, 2019).

Sliter et al. (2014) focused specifically on the consequences of diversity climate for well-being, as indicated by burnout, and employee engagement among a sample of registered nurses. The burnout measure they used included dimensions for physical fatigue, cognitive weariness, and emotional exhaustion. They tested a structural model by which diversity climate predicted interpersonal conflict with physicians, managers, and coworker, each of which subsequently predicted engagement and burnout. Their hypotheses were generally supported. Positive diversity climate perceptions were directly associated with increased engagement and indirectly associated with increased engagement and decreased burnout through decreased conflict with physicians and managers. In a related study using a cross-cultural sample, Adams et al. (2020) examined the role of perceived discrimination at work (an inverse concept to diversity climate) in predicting well-being outcomes—burnout and self-efficacy—and engagement. Perceived
discrimination was significantly associated with decreased engagement and increased burnout. Further, statistical evidence offered some support for the hypothesis that the relationships between inclusive leadership and outcomes (burnout and engagement) occurred indirectly through perceived discrimination.

Several other studies similarly examined the impact of diversity climate on employee engagement. In a study of managerial retail employees, Volpone et al. (2012) found that employees’ positive reactions to their performance appraisals (i.e., perceived relevance and accuracy) were indirectly associated with increased engagement through positive diversity climate perceptions, lending credence to the fairness aspect of diversity climate. Goswami and Goswami (2018) examined diversity climate perceptions as measured with Roberson’s (2006) diversity practices scale among a sample of telecommunications workers from India. They found that diversity climate was indirectly associated with increased engagement through workplace inclusion as measured with the MBIE scale. In addition to supporting the diversity climate-engagement relationship, these results also lend support to diversity climate and workplace inclusion being related, yet distinct, constructs.

Another study demonstrated a relationship between diversity climate and engagement using yet another measure of diversity climate. Downey et al. (2015) developed their own measure of diversity practices which contained items capturing the organization’s commitment to recruiting and hiring diverse employees, the existence of procedures for managing discrimination and harassment claims, and organizational support for diversity. Using a sample of healthcare workers, they tested and found support for a moderated indirect effect model by which diversity practices predicted engagement through positive trust climate. The positive
indirect effect became stronger as perceptions of inclusion increased. In addition, a significant
direct effect of diversity climate on engagement remained after accounting for the indirect effect.
These studies provide consistent support for the positive psychological impacts of diversity
climate.

Several other studies have extended findings to behavioral outcomes. Singh et al. (2013)
examined the consequences of diversity climate for OCBs directed toward the organization and
individuals and in-role behaviors (formal performance requirements of the job) using a sample of
employees and supervisors from a production organization. They hypothesized that these
relationships occur indirectly via psychological safety. They found support for their hypotheses;
diversity climate was indirectly related to organizational OCBs and individual OCBs through
psychological safety based on bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals, while the indirect effect
on in-role behavior was significant at the 90% confidence level. Chung et al. (2020) similarly
found an indirect effect of diversity climate on helping behavior, as well as creativity and job
performance, through perceptions of inclusion.

In another study, Randel et al. (2016) showed that diversity climate was associated with
group-directed and leader-directed helping behaviors in the context of leader inclusiveness.
Among a general employee sample, they found that diversity climate was directly associated
with group-directed helping behavior. However, they also found that diversity climate moderated
the positive relationship between leader inclusiveness and both group-directed and leader-
directed helping behavior, such that the relationship was exacerbated with increased perceptions
of diversity climate.
Taken together, the reviewed studies provide strong support for the benefits of diversity climate for employees’ psychological well-being, commitment, engagement, and OCBs. I expect to replicate these findings in the current study.

*Hypothesis 3a:* Diversity climate will be positively related to positive affect and negatively related to negative affect.

*Hypothesis 3b:* Diversity climate will be positively related to organizational commitment.

*Hypothesis 3c:* Diversity climate will be positively related to work engagement.

*Hypothesis 3d:* Diversity climate will be positively related to OCBs.

**Incremental Value of Different Inclusion Practices**

Given the similarities among correlates of the reviewed inclusion practice constructs, two questions that naturally follow are (1) how distinct these inclusion practice constructs are from one another and (2) whether each has incremental predictive value over the others. There is considerable overlap (conceptual and operational) among the three practice constructs that are the focus of this study. However, there are also important conceptual distinctions that suggest that each might explain unique variance in outcomes.

One notable distinction is between diversity climate and the work involvement and inclusive leadership practices. As mentioned previously, diversity management practices and inclusion practices represent different motivational orientations under the overall workplace inclusion umbrella. Diversity climate practices are primarily prevention-focused and inclusion practices are primarily promotion-focused (Shore et al., 2018). On one hand, this might suggest that inclusion practices have predictive value over diversity climate practices because they
comprise efforts that go above and beyond minimal compliance, fairness, and diversity. A recent meta-analysis of the consequences of diversity climate supports this contention (Holmes, IV, et al., 2020). The authors reviewed studies that measured diversity climate and reported significant mean-corrected correlations with three attitudinal outcomes—job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work engagement, and two behavioral outcomes—job performance (a composite index comprised of task performance and citizenship behaviors) and withdrawal. Importantly, the magnitude of the correlations were stronger for studies using diversity climate measures that included items assessing inclusion practices than studies using traditional diversity climate measures based on equity/fairness.

A contrasting perspective suggests that diversity climate practices and inclusion practices might uniquely relate to employee outcomes; although, they might do so in different ways. Roberson (2006) introduced two differentiating perspectives of diversity management/inclusion efforts: identity-conscious and identity-blind. Diversity management practices tend to be identity-conscious because they are aimed at the integration and advancement of underrepresented employees, which, in practice, often target specific groups (e.g., advancement of women, minorities, etc.). Inclusion practices, on the other hand, are identity-blind, as they are typically aimed toward the integration of all employees regardless of identity. Thus, both categories of identity-orientation have important implications that might uniquely influence relationships with employee well-being, attitudes, and behavior. In sum, given the different motivational foci (prevention vs. promotion) or identity-orientations (identity blind vs. identity-conscious) of inclusion practices, it is reasonable to expect that different inclusion practices can influence employee outcomes incrementally or in parallel.
The three practice constructs examined in the current study also vary in terms of the source of the practice. Work involvement as defined from the MBIE model assesses inclusion perceptions across five organizational levels. Thus, when used in its entirety, the MBIE scale provides a general assessment of workplace inclusion perceptions. Inclusive leadership, on the other hand, is specifically focused on one level, a salient leader. Diversity practices, although not explicitly tied to one level, typically manifest at the organizational level. Most measures of diversity climate assess fairness/bias regarding organizational procedures (e.g., hiring, performance evaluations), procedures for handling discrimination and harassment claims, and organization/top management commitment to diversity. Given that such policies and practices are typically implemented at the organizational level, the organization provides an appropriate level of analysis for diversity climate perceptions (Dwertmann et al., 2016; McKay & Avery, 2015).

Which of these levels, or sources, is most likely to influence employees’ psychological and behavioral outcomes is a question that has not been directly addressed in research. Some research suggests that sources of frequent interactions at work, such as immediate supervisors or coworkers, have a stronger impact on employees’ day-to-day well-being, attitudes, and behavior than more distal sources, such as the organization or top management (Chung et al., 2020; Ellemers & Jetten, 2013; Jansen et al., 2014). Other research suggests that the effect of climate-related predictors could depend on the outcomes, with affective and attitudinal outcomes representing proximal reactions to contextual cues, and behavioral outcomes representing distal responses (Cox, 1993; Holmes, IV, et al., 2020). Overall, these practice constructs have not been examined simultaneously to determine their incremental predictive value. On one hand, their
conceptual overlap suggests that they are correlated and likely share substantial variance with outcomes. On the other hand, a case can be made for the ability of each practice to uniquely relate to outcomes. Accordingly, I propose the following research question.

*Research Question 1:* Do work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate each account for a unique proportion of variance in affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCBs when examined as simultaneous predictors?

**Workplace Inclusion as an Internal (Felt) Experience**

Inclusion as a psychological experience (i.e., felt inclusion; Jansen et al., 2014) refers to an individual’s internal sense of whether they are included by their organization, unit, or person (e.g., leader) within their organization. The key distinction between felt inclusion and inclusion practices is the evaluation target. The target when evaluating inclusion practices is the organization or level/source within the organization, such as a department, team or work group, leader/supervisor, or peer coworker. Assessments of inclusion practices address the question “What is my organization doing?” The target when evaluating felt inclusion experiences is the self, addressing the question: “How does what my organization is doing make me feel?” As mentioned, this distinction has rarely been acknowledged in research (for exceptions see Ferdman et al., 2009; Jansen et al., 2014). However, the distinction is evident in conceptual models that position these constructs at different points in the inclusion perceptual process (e.g., Shore et al., 2018; Shore et al., 2011) and in comparing item content between measures of felt inclusion and measures of inclusion practices (see Table 1).
Research on felt inclusion in work contexts did not make a notable emergence until the publication of Shore et al. (2011). Consequently, the research literature on workplace inclusion as a felt experience is substantially smaller than the literature on inclusion practices. Furthermore, most workplace felt inclusion research is conceptually rooted in the Shore et al. (2011) model and subsequent revisions by Jansen et al., (2014). Accordingly, felt inclusion most often refers to the satisfaction of needs for belonging and uniqueness/authenticity. Jansen and colleagues provide the bulk of existing empirical research on felt inclusion in the workplace following their update to the Shore et al. (2011) conceptual model and their accompanying measure, the Perceived Group Inclusion Scale (PGIS; Jansen et al., 2014; see Table 1). The PGIS was the first measure that assessed workplace inclusion from a need satisfaction perspective. In validating their scale on student and employee samples, they found that felt inclusion was associated with increased positive affect, decreased negative affect, increased self-esteem, increased job satisfaction, increased interpersonal trust, increased individual and group creativity, and increased group performance.

Subsequent research by Jansen and colleagues also found positive associations with employee well-being, attitudinal, and behavioral outcomes. Among a general employee sample, Jansen et al. (2015a) sought to test the indirect effects of colorblind versus multicultural diversity approaches on work satisfaction and perceived innovation in the organization through felt inclusion. As hypothesized, felt inclusion was directly associated with increased satisfaction and perceived innovation. Furthermore, the indirect effects were significant depending on participants’ majority/minority group status. For majority group members, the indirect effect was
significant for a colorblind diversity approach; for majority group members, the indirect effect was significant for a multicultural diversity approach.

In a related study, Jansen et al. (2015b) hypothesized an indirect relationship between perceived gender dissimilarity and absenteeism through felt inclusion. In addition to finding a direct negative relationship between felt inclusion and absenteeism, they showed statistical support for the indirect effect. Increased gender dissimilarity in one’s work group was associated with decreased felt inclusion which, in turn, was associated with increased absenteeism. In a longitudinal study, Jansen et al. (2019) examined students’ felt inclusion experiences in the context of a team project. Interestingly, they examined the interplay between individuals’ desire to be included by the team and their actual feelings of inclusion by the work team. Regardless of the degree of individuals’ desire to be included, increased feelings of being included by the team were associated with increased positive affect, increased self-confidence, increased work efficiency, and increased perceived creativity (Jansen et al., 2019). Given the limited number of studies on felt inclusion, evidence of associations with outcomes of focus in the current study is lacking. However, results of the reviewed studies collectively provide evidence to suggest that felt inclusion is a viable predictor of employee well-being, attitudes, and behavior.

With limited empirical investigations of felt inclusion, much of the support for antecedents and consequences of felt inclusion remains conceptual. Shore et al. (2011) provides the seminal theory in this regard. Interestingly, despite wide acceptance of their model, it has received very little empirical scrutiny since its publication. This may be due, in part, to the fact that their model lacked an accompanying measure of inclusion. Indeed, there is only one known
direct test of the Shore et al. model, and it came as part of a recent scale development and validation study.

Chung et al. (2020) sought to test associations between a newly developed measure of workplace inclusion based on the Shore et al. (2011) conceptual model. The authors explicitly stated that the measure was designed to assess employees’ feelings of belongingness and value in uniqueness in their immediate work group. However, analysis of the item content in Table 1 suggests that there is a mixture of items that assess individuals’ feelings of inclusion (e.g., “I feel that people really care about me in my work group.”) and perceptions of practices or behaviors of others in the work group (e.g., “People in my work group listen to me even when my views are dissimilar.”). Thus, the Chung et al. (2020) scale does not appear to be a pure measure of felt inclusion experiences, at least relative to other measures of felt inclusion (e.g., Jansen et al., 2014). Nonetheless, their inclusion measure was associated with increased general mental health, increased helping behavior, increased creative behavior, increased job performance, and decreased turnover intentions. Furthermore, their scale showed incremental predictive validity over the MBIE scale, which suggests that the measure may be tapping into a source of variance not shared with inclusion practices. Although not without some limitations, the study provides some initial direct support for the Shore et al. (2011) needs-based inclusion conceptualization and theoretical model of the antecedent-inclusion-outcome relationship.

In addition to the studies that followed Shore et al. (2011), there are two notable studies that predate Shore et al. (2011). These researchers appeared to define and measure inclusion as a felt experience, although, not from a needs satisfaction perspective (see measures from Pearce & Randel, 2004 and Stamper & Masterson, 2002 in Table 1). The earliest of these studies (Stamper
& Masterson, 2002), introduced the concept of perceived insider status (PIS) which they defined as the extent to which employees felt they were a part of the organization. They developed a self-report measure of PIS which contains items that appear to align with their conceptual definition (e.g., “My work organization makes me believe that I am included in it.”). They examined relationships between PIS, tenure and average hours worked per week (which they referred to as objective indicators of inclusion), perceived organizational support, and behavioral outcomes (i.e., OCBs and counterproductive work behaviors [CWBs]) among a sample of direct-service restaurant workers. They found direct associations between objective indicators of inclusion and PIS and, perhaps more interestingly, found support for an indirect path linking perceived organizational support to OCBs and CWBs through PIS.

In another study, Pearce and Randel (2004) introduced a similar construct, workplace social inclusion (WSI), which they defined as “the extent to which employees have informal social ties with others at work and feel as if they belong and are socially included by others in their workplace” (p. 84). Similar to Stamper and Masterson (2002), they developed a brief three-item measure of WSI that appears to be an accurate operationalization of the WSI conceptual definition (e.g., “I feel like an accepted part of a team,” “I feel included in most activities at work,” “Sometimes I feel like an outsider.”). They examined relationships between WSI, expectations of organizational mobility (EOM), defined as the extent to which employees feel that changing jobs is necessary to remain employed in their occupation, and job performance. They found evidence of an indirect association between EOM and job performance through WSI.

Although these two studies predate recent theoretical developments on felt inclusion experiences, the PIS and WSI constructs are conceptually similar to recent models in that they
define inclusion as an internal psychological experience. Further, there are similarities in the item content of the PIS, WSI, and recent measures of felt inclusion such that each contains language centered around the individual’s feeling of inclusion/belonging at work (e.g., Chung et al., 2020; Jansen et al., 2014). Given these conceptual and operational consistencies, implications of the findings from these studies may align with the goals of current theory.

In sum, the reviewed research has shown some consistency regarding associations between felt inclusion and employee well-being, attitudes, motivation, and OCBs, along with other behavioral outcomes. Although the scope of findings is somewhat limited, they do offer empirical support for relationships proposed in the Shore et al. (2011) model. Given this empirical and conceptual support, I expect to observe similar associations in the current study.

*Hypothesis 4a:* Felt inclusion will be positively related to positive affect and negatively related to negative affect.

*Hypothesis 4b:* Felt inclusion will be positively related to organizational commitment.

*Hypothesis 4c:* Felt inclusion will be positively related to work engagement.

*Hypothesis 4d:* Felt inclusion will be positively related to OCBs.

**Integration of Inclusion Practices and Felt Inclusion**

Thus far, the reviewed research has provided evidence of associations between inclusion practices and work outcomes (path $c$ in Figure 1) and felt inclusion and outcomes (path $b$ in Figure 1). These two paths have received the most attention in prior research (Figure 1). Much less research has been devoted to testing associations between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (path $a$ in Figure 1) or the indirect effects of inclusion practices on work outcomes.
through felt inclusion (paths \(a\) and \(b\) in Figure 1). However, a few studies provide some empirical support for the full Shore et al. (2011) model.

One such study providing direct support for the model was provided by Chung et al. (2020). They tested hypothesized indirect effects of three antecedent practices (organizational justice, psychological diversity climate, and leader inclusiveness) on three work outcomes (helping behavior, creativity, and job performance) via perceived “felt” inclusion. They found that psychological diversity climate (\(\beta = .28\)) and leader inclusiveness (\(\beta = .39\)) were significantly related to their measure of felt inclusion, but organizational justice (\(\beta = .09\)) was not. Furthermore, perceived “felt” inclusion was directly associated with all three outcomes (helping: \(\beta = .23\), creativity: \(\beta = .29\), job performance: \(\beta = .29\)). They also found statistical support for indirect effects of psychological diversity climate (\(\beta_s = .07-.08\)) and inclusive leadership (\(\beta_s = .09-.11\)), but not organizational justice (\(\beta_s = .02-.03\)), on all outcomes through perceived “felt” inclusion. The absence of significant effects of organizational justice likely reflects the strong conceptual overlap between diversity climate and the measure of overall organizational justice they used, which assesses general perceptions of how fair employees feel that they and their coworkers are treated (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). Barring potential measurement limitations outlined previously, Chung et al. (2020) offer some initial support for the Shore et al. (2011) model of workplace inclusion. Importantly, indirect effects through perceived “felt” inclusion were found for diversity climate and leader inclusiveness, two of the practice constructs examined in the current study.

Other research indirectly supports the Shore et al. (2011) model by testing indirect associations between various contextual antecedents that approximate inclusion practices and
work outcomes through felt inclusion (or closely related constructs). Bidee et al. (2017) conducted daily diary study of health care volunteers’ inclusion experiences. Interestingly, they used the PIS (Stamper & Masterson, 1992) as their antecedent measure and hypothesized an indirect effect on volunteers’ intrinsic motivation through the satisfaction of needs for autonomy, relatedness, competence. They found statistical support for the indirect effect through satisfaction of need for competence and need for relatedness but not need for autonomy. This suggests that satisfaction of needs similar to those defining felt inclusion in current theory can function as psychological processes linking antecedent experiences to work motivation.

In another study, Jansen and Otten (2015b) found evidence of a conditional indirect effect of gender dissimilarity on absenteeism through their measure of felt inclusion (belongingness and value in authenticity), such that increased gender dissimilarity was associated with increased absenteeism through low levels of felt inclusion when individuals experienced a negative diversity climate. The indirect effect was not significant when individuals experienced a positive diversity climate. Again, although this study does not directly test propositions of the Shore et al. (2011) model, the results do suggest that felt inclusion can be influenced by antecedent features of the work environment and, in turn, can influence work-related behavior.

Additional support for the antecedent-outcome model of felt inclusion comes from the early research on felt inclusion reviewed previously. Stamper and Masterson (2002) found support for indirect effects of perceived organizational support on OCBs and CWBs through PIS. Perceived organizational support (POS) was operationalized using the Eisenberger et al. (1986) measure (e.g., “The organization really cares about my well-being.”). Similar to measures of inclusion practices, the POS scale assesses individuals’ perception of supportive actions of others
in the organization. It can be reasonably argued, then, that POS can be operationalized as an organizational practice. Thus, Stamper and Masterson (2002) offer some evidence that perceived actions of an organization toward the individual can influence inclusion experiences and subsequent behaviors.

Overall, direct and conclusive empirical support of the Shore et al. (2011) model is lacking. However, available evidence appears to align with the proposition that inclusion practices indirectly influence individuals’ psychological and behavioral outcomes through a felt experience of inclusion. Given the emerging empirical evidence and the strength of the theoretical basis, I expect to observe direct associations between inclusion practices and felt inclusion and indirect associations of inclusion practices on employee affect, organizational support, work engagement, and OCBs through felt inclusion.

**Hypothesis 5:** Work involvement will be positively related to felt inclusion.

**Hypothesis 6:** Inclusive leadership will be positively related to felt inclusion.

**Hypothesis 7:** Diversity climate will be positively related to felt inclusion.

**Hypothesis 8:** Work involvement will be indirectly associated with (a) employee affect, (b) organizational commitment, (c) work engagement, and (d) OCBs through felt inclusion.

**Hypothesis 9:** Inclusive leadership will be indirectly associated with (a) employee affect, (b) organizational commitment, (c) work engagement, and (d) OCBs through felt inclusion.

**Hypothesis 10:** Diversity climate will be indirectly associated with (a) employee affect, (b) organizational commitment, (c) work engagement, and (d) OCBs through felt inclusion.

Just as with relationships between inclusion practices and outcomes, it is unclear which practices are more likely to predict felt inclusion experiences. Some research has suggested that
practices that characterize employees’ proximal social interactions with one’s immediate work group or supervisor are more likely influence feelings of inclusion than more distal experiences that occur at the organizational level (e.g., company policies; Chung et al., 2020; Ellemers & Jetten, 2013; Jansen et al., 2014). However, neither partial associations between inclusion practices and felt inclusion nor incremental indirect effects on outcomes through felt inclusion appear to have been directly tested. Exploration of these effects are warranted as findings have the potential to improve understanding of the relative importance of inclusion practices in associations with felt inclusion experiences and subsequent work outcomes.

*Research Question 2:* Do work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate each account for a unique proportion of variance in felt inclusion after accounting for the predictors?

*Research Question 3:* Do work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate each have a unique indirect effect on employee affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCBs after accounting for the other predictors?

**Extending the Shore et al. (2011) Model of Workplace Inclusion**

**Moderating Role of Individual Difference in the Strength of Inclusion Needs**

Further scrutiny of the distinction and relation between inclusion practices and felt inclusion is pertinent given role of needs satisfaction in inclusion experiences. A proposition of workplace inclusion theory is that contextual antecedents in the form of perceived policies, practices, and behaviors in the workplace are effective to the extent that they satisfy individuals’ need for belonging and need for uniqueness/authenticity (Shore et al., 2011). Related insights
from sociometer theory, indeed, suggest that individuals continually monitor their environment for cues that indicate their social inclusion status (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). However, research also shows that individuals differ in the extent to which they desire satisfy inclusion needs. Individuals have been shown to vary in strength of their need for belonging (Leary et al., 2001; Leary et al., 2013), need for uniqueness (Lynn & Harris, 1997b; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980), and need for authenticity (Sheldon et al., 1997; Wood et al., 2008). Furthermore, variability in the strength of these needs can have differential effects on individuals’ attention to interpretation of and ultimate response to social cues. Generally, those higher in strength of a given need (i.e., belonging, uniqueness/authenticity) tend to be more vigilant to relevant social cues and more susceptible in terms of the ability of cues to influence need satisfaction (De Cremer & Blader, 2006; Gardner et al., 2000; Lynn & Harris, 1997b; Pickett et al., 2004; Simonson & Nowlis, 2000). Thus, employees who are higher in needs for belonging and authenticity may be more likely to perceive relevant inclusion practices as felt inclusion cues and, potentially, feel included as a result.

This conditional inclusion monitoring processes should generalize to a work context with relevant organizational practices operating as inclusion cues. Indeed, some research in the social psychology literature has examined the role of individuals’ need to belong in processing social information in work contexts. In a study of employees from a large health care company, De Cremer and Blader (2006; Study 2) found that individual differences in the need to belong moderated the relationship between procedural fairness and organizational identification. The positive relationship between procedural fairness and organizational identification was stronger for those with a higher need to belong. This study has translational value for the workplace
inclusion context as procedural fairness parallels diversity and inclusion practices, such as
fairness and transparency of performance evaluation procedures. Furthermore, organizational
identification is the extent to which an individual feels they are part of the work organization and
have adopted the organization as a social identity; therefore, is conceptually similar to workplace
inclusion from an internal experience perspective.

Another study reported somewhat mixed findings across two studies. Jansen et al. (2015)
conducted an experimental study to test whether an organization’s diversity management
approach influenced prospective employees’ (Study 1) and incumbent students’ (Study 2) felt
inclusion experiences. Participants were randomly assigned to a read an organizational brochure
that conveyed either a multicultural diversity approach (emphasizing value in having
employees/students from cultural minority groups) or an all-inclusive diversity approach
(emphasizing value in having employees/students from cultural minority groups and the cultural
majority group). For the prospective employee sample, there was no main effect of diversity
approach. However, in the all-inclusive diversity approach condition, participants with a stronger
need to belong reported higher anticipated inclusion than participants with a weaker need to
belong. Among the student sample, individual differences in the need to belong did not play a
role in the effect of diversity approach on felt inclusion. Taken together, there is strong
theoretical justification and empirical support from the social psychology literature for expecting
individual differences in the strength of inclusion needs to moderate the relationship between
inclusion practices and felt inclusion. However, evidence is limited in the context of workplace
inclusion, warranting further investigation.
Further justification for testing for strength of inclusion-related needs as a moderator of the inclusion practice-felt inclusion relationship comes from the theoretical implications of such a test. By examining potential boundary conditions of this relationship based on a conceptually relevant individual difference variable, further validity evidence of the Shore et al. (2011) model might be provided. That is, the strength of inclusion needs might function as an on/off switch to the proposed inclusion practice-felt inclusion relationship. If the relationship between inclusion practices and felt inclusion is susceptible to variability in strength of inclusion needs such that the relationships is stronger for those high in relevant needs and weaker for those lower in relevant needs, more confidence can be placed on the proposition that felt inclusion defined from a need-satisfaction perspective is a unifying psychological experience at the core of inclusion practice perceptions.

**Hypothesis 11:** Individual differences in the strength of inclusion needs (i.e., need for belongingness and need for authenticity) will moderate the relationship between each of the three inclusion practices—work involvement ($a$), inclusive leadership ($b$), and diversity climate ($c$) and felt inclusion such that the relationship will be stronger for those higher in needs strength and weaker for those lower in needs strength.

**Felt Competence as an Additional Mechanism**

Given the possibility that some individuals may not be particularly susceptible to inclusion cues, it stands to reason that felt inclusion might not always provide a viable pathway by which inclusion practices influence outcomes. Nonetheless, research on workplace inclusion generally shows consistent associations between perceptions of inclusion practices and beneficial
outcomes. It is possible, then, that other processes might be explaining these associations. Felt competence stands out as a particularly promising candidate given its conceptual ties to workplace inclusion theory and its high relevance to the work context.

Individuals have a fundamental need for competence—to feel a sense of self-efficacy and ability to overcome optimally challenging tasks in one’s environment (Ryan & Deci, 2000). I use the term felt competence in the current study to refer to the degree to which one’s need for competence is satisfied. The concept of felt competence is most notably represented in SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1980; Ryan & Deci, 2000) as one of three fundamental motives—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—that drive human behavior. As previously discussed, SDT has inspired some conceptual work on inclusion (i.e., Jansen et al., 2014) and has considerable conceptual overlap in terms of the needs that make up ODT-based models of inclusion (i.e., Shore et al., 2011; see also Sheldon & Bettencourt, 2002 for a comparison of SDT and ODT). The needs for relatedness and autonomy from SDT respectively mirror the needs for belongingness and uniqueness/authenticity from the Shore et al. (2011) and Jansen et al. (2014) models of inclusion. Need for competence, however, has been left out of inclusion models despite its relevance to the work context (Van den Broeck et al., 2010). Furthermore, need for competence, in addition to relatedness and autonomy, has demonstrated utility in linking contextual features of the workplace, namely leader behaviors, to well-being and a variety of work outcomes (Deci et al., 2017).

For example, in a study of employees from a large investment firm, Baard et al. (2004) found that the degree to which employees perceived that their managers engaged in autonomy-supportive behaviors (e.g., listening to subordinate’s viewpoints, acknowledging subordinate’s
feelings) positively influenced employees intrinsic needs satisfaction (competence, autonomy, and relatedness) which, in turn, positively influence employees’ performance evaluations and psychological well-being. Deci et al. (2001) similarly found an indirect association of perceived autonomy support from managers through competence, autonomy, and relatedness needs satisfaction on well-being and work engagement.

Considerable research using a variety of designs has also linked felt competence directly to a variety of work outcomes, including decreased burnout, deviance, absenteeism and turnover intentions, and increased job satisfaction, well-being, organizational commitment, and performance (for a review see Deci et al., 2017. Thus, there is considerable empirical support suggesting that contextual features of the work environment influence individuals’ feelings of competence which, in turn, may influence a variety of well-being, attitudinal, motivational, and behavioral outcomes.

Findings from the reviewed studies suggest that inclusion practices likely also influence felt competence. Some justification for this claim comes from conceptual research on applications of SDT to the organizational context (see Deci et al., 2017) suggesting that established work-related antecedents of felt competence, such as autonomy support and transformational leadership, are conceptually related to some inclusion practices constructs, namely work involvement and leader inclusiveness. Therefore, there is at least some support that approximations of inclusion practices in the current study are related to felt competence.

Another justification is that many inclusion practices are characterized by performance-related work functions, such as having influence in decisions of the work group, having access to work-related information and communications (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). Thus, some
inclusion practices are directly instrumental to one’s ability to effectively perform their job. Bidee et al. (2017) found that health care volunteers’ feelings of workplace inclusion were indirectly associated with their work motivation through satisfaction of competence and relatedness needs. Although the authors measured inclusion as a felt experience, their finding lends preliminary support for an indirect route linking perceptions of workplace inclusion to outcomes through felt competence. Given available theory and evidence, I expect that inclusion practices will influence employees’ psychological and behavioral outcomes via felt competence in parallel to felt inclusion.

**Hypothesis 12:** Work involvement will be indirectly associated with (a) employee affect, (b) organizational commitment, (c) work engagement, and (d) OCBs through felt competence.

**Hypothesis 13:** Inclusive leadership will be indirectly associated with (a) employee affect, (b) organizational commitment, (c) work engagement, and (d) OCBs through felt competence.

**Hypothesis 14:** Diversity climate will be indirectly associated with (a) employee affect, (b) organizational commitment, (c) work engagement, and (d) OCBs through felt competence.

**Summary of Hypotheses**

Figure 2 shows the full hypothesized model of the current study. The goal of this study was to test and extend the Shore et al. (2011) model of workplace inclusion. Specific aims of this general goal were to contribute clarity around the workplace inclusion concept by disentangling various inclusion construct definitions (i.e., practices and felt experiences) and examining relationships between these constructs. Accordingly, the hypotheses in this study are primarily
Figure 2. Hypothesized Model of Workplace Inclusion.

*Note.* Solid boxes and arrows reflect relationships established in prior theory and research. Dashed arrows reflect novel hypotheses from the current study.
focused on testing direct associations and indirect associations aligned with the Shore et al. (2011) model. Additionally, I aimed to extend theory by examining individual differences in the strength of inclusion needs as a potential moderator of the relationship between inclusion practices and felt inclusion and felt competence as an additional mechanism linking inclusion practices to outcomes. Overall, these objectives were intended to improve understanding of what workplace inclusion is, how it relates to employee well-being and work outcomes, and the boundary conditions of these relationships.

Hypotheses 1a through 3d were focused on the direct relationships between inclusion practices and well-being work outcomes. This path has received the largest proportion of research attention; therefore, tests of these associations served to replicate established relationships in the current sample. Hypotheses 4a through 4d tested associations between felt inclusion and work outcomes. Examinations of these associations make up a substantially smaller proportion of the workplace inclusion research literature; however, studies in this area are increasingly emerging. These hypotheses, therefore, are aimed at replication but also have the potential to provide additional confirmatory evidence of the consequences of felt inclusion.

Hypotheses 5 through 7 tested relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion. This relationship has received the least amount of research attention; therefore, tests of these hypotheses provided much needed information regarding relationships and distinctions between inclusion practices and felt inclusion and how they ultimately relate to employee outcomes.

Hypotheses 8 through 10 involved tests of indirect effects of inclusion practices on work outcomes through felt inclusion. These hypotheses reflect the overall Shore et al. (2011) model—a process relationship linking various inclusion practices to various work outcomes.
through felt inclusion. Despite the importance of this contribution, it has received very little research attention. In addition to providing further insight into the interplay between inclusion practices and felt inclusion, tests of these hypotheses have the potential to provide crucial confirmatory evidence of the antecedents and outcomes of inclusion and, therefore, constitute a crucial contribution of this study.

Hypotheses 11a through 11c involved testing the conditional effects of inclusion practices on felt inclusion due to individual differences in the strength of inclusion needs. Boundary conditions of the inclusion practice-felt inclusion relationship have not been systematically investigated; therefore, these tests had potential to provide novel insight into this relationship as well as construct validity information. Hypotheses 12 through 14 concerned the role of felt competence as an additional mechanism linking inclusion practices to work outcomes. Given the lack of direct empirical support for the Shore et al. (2011) model, confirmatory tests of the original indirect paths through felt inclusion are still needed. However, given that inclusion practices are a key component of the model and that most inclusion practices have been developed independent of social needs-based theory, it is necessary to also understand the potential utility of inclusion practices beyond felt inclusion. Given the performance-related implications of inclusion practices, it is possible that an alternative pathway from inclusion practices to employee well-being and work outcomes occurs through felt competence.

Study Overview

Data came from a sample of working adults recruited from Prolific online research platform. Study variables were measured via surveys administered over a two-week period. This
included baseline, midpoint, and exit surveys which assessed key study variables—inclusion practices, felt inclusion, outcomes, inclusion needs (baseline only), and felt competence. Baseline, midpoint, and exit surveys assessed individuals’ general perceptions of these variables with validated measures used in prior research. This allowed for attempted replication of hypothesized relationships using methods and measures common in workplace inclusion research.

Participants also completed twice-daily measurements of events at work (i.e., interactions, communications) and main study variable (i.e., felt inclusion and work outcomes). Daily measurements of work events allowed for near momentary assessments of routine work interactions from which inclusion practice cues were coded and tested for associations with felt inclusion and outcomes. Daily measurements also allowed for the potential emergence of novel inclusion practice cues that might be related to felt inclusion and outcomes.

Data collection using repeated measurements has some potential advantages over prior research on workplace inclusion. Most existing data on workplace inclusion come from cross-sectional surveys which ask participants to recall aggregated perceptions or experiences that culminate over an extended period. Although cross-sectional surveys can be useful for understanding individuals’ psychological experiences, they are susceptible to measurement imprecision due to biased and/or inaccurate recall of measured experiences (Beal, 2015). Thus, I used repeated measurements of daily events at proximal (within three hours) recall intervals in an attempt to increase measurement precision.

I chose three-hour intervals to capture employees’ near real-time experiences while also providing a structured measurement schedule to reduce demands of completing multiple daily
surveys during work hours (Uy et al., 2010). Prior research has shown that three-hour measurement intervals are within a range of recall quality that is statistically equivalent to that of immediately recalled experiences (Beal, 2015; Kahneman et al., 2004). Alternative scheduling strategies, such as those contingent on events or signals, tend to sacrifice one goal for the other (Beal, 2015; Fisher & To, 2012). Further, interval contingent strategies have been shown to yield relatively greater compliance rates than alternative strategies, especially when accompanied by a prompt (e.g., E-mail, text) at each survey administration interval (Fisher & To, 2012).

A 10-day (two work weeks) measurement period was chosen to maximize the opportunity to record a representative sample of workplace inclusion experiences. As mentioned, there are a limited number of repeated-measures designs in the workplace inclusion literature. The few that exist have typically examined relationships between very specific variables measured over a relatively short time range (e.g., five days) and a limited number of observations (e.g., one per day; Bidee et al., 2017; Jansen et al., 2019). The current study conceptualizes workplace inclusion broadly as involving a range of potential practices that cue employees’ felt inclusion experiences and associated work outcomes. Given that no known prior research has adequately sampled the features of workplace inclusion experiences, the current study will obtain a relatively large number measurements over a longer period than in existing studies as an initial attempt to obtain a representative sample of these features.

An additional benefit of repeated inclusion experience sampling is the opportunity to clarify relationships between various inclusion practices and felt inclusion. The content of reported experiences can be examined for insight into the different features of inclusion cues (e.g., content, source) that workers might experience throughout their workdays. This can also
provide insight into some perspectives of workplace inclusion as a dynamic process that varies within individuals and sources that might contribute to this potential within-person variability (Ellemers & Jetten, 2013; Ferdman, 2014; Jansen et al., 2019). Despite calls from researchers to explore the dynamic nature of inclusion (e.g., Ferdman, 2014; Shore et al., 2018), studies of workplace inclusion using repeated measurements are rare (see Bidee et al., 2017 for an exception).

In sum, the current study took a two-pronged approach to measuring employees’ workplace inclusion experiences. Weekly measures via baseline, mid-point, and exit surveys created the opportunity to observe individuals’ general inclusion experiences (i.e., aggregated perceptions) in line with most prior research. Repeated daily surveys offered potential increased measurement precision of inclusion experiences and the possibility of improved insight into the varied features of workplace inclusion cues. Therefore, the current study allowed for testing hypothesis and research questions using established and novel (within the inclusion literature) data collection strategies, creating opportunities for comparing results on these data and providing informative insights.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Design

The current study employed a multifaceted survey design that involved between-person measurements from a baseline survey and repeated measurements from daily diary surveys and two weekly surveys. Thus, data from the current study are correlational and were analyzed using bivariate correlation analysis, standard (ordinary least squares) regression, and multilevel regression.

Data were collected over approximately two weeks. Survey responses were provided by full-time working adults employed by an organization. Daily surveys were administered twice each workday (noon and 3 p.m.) for 10 days over two consecutive work weeks (20 surveys total). Weekly surveys were administered once at the end of the first week of the daily measurement period (midpoint survey) and again at the end of the second week of the daily measurement period (exit survey). A baseline survey was administered at the start of the study prior to the daily measurement period.
Participants

Sample Size Estimation

A minimum sample size of 100 participants was targeted based on rules of thumb by Arend and Schafer (2019) for determining samples sizes in common two-level hierarchical models. They used Monte Carlo simulation to estimate minimum detectable effect sizes (MDESs) at ≥ .80 power for level 1 (L1) direct effects, level 2 (L2) direct effects, and cross-level interactions (CLIs; L2 moderator of a L1 predictor-outcome relationship). MDESs were based on sample size inputs ranging from 3 to 30 at L1 and 30 to 200 at L2 across small (.10), medium (.30), and large (.50) ICCs for direct effects and random slope variances for CLIs.

Hypothesis tests for the current study primarily concerned L1 direct effects but also include CLIs—effects of L2 individual differences in need for belonging and need for authenticity on L1 relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (L1). As such, sample sizes for the current study were based on MDESs for CLIs derived from Table 7 in Arend and Schafer (2019), as these estimates are sufficient to detect L1 direct effects in addition to CLIs. An approximate expected CLI effect size was derived from Jansen et al. (2015) who tested a CLI with conceptual relevance to the effects hypothesized in the current study. They hypothesized that individual differences in the need to belong would moderate the relationship between perceived diversity practices and anticipated inclusion. They measured all variables at the between-person level and reported a significant standardized beta of .37 representing the interaction effect. Because Jansen et al. (2015) tested a within-level interaction and this is the closest known approximation of this effect, information regarding the expected degree of random
slope variance is absent. In such a case, Arend and Schafer (2019) recommend defaulting to medium random slope variance as an input for sample size estimation.

Assuming an effect size of .37, medium random slope variance, and a targeted L1 sample size of 20 (participants measured twice per day for 10 days) to maximize the opportunity to obtain a representative sample of inclusion cues (Fisher & To, 2012), an L2 sample size of 80 is necessary to detect an effect of magnitude .37 at ≥ .80 power. To account for participant attrition and the potential for shrinkage effects, the targeted L2 sample size was increased by 25% to 100, which is sufficient to find a MDES of .34 with all other prior inputs.

A final sample of 142 participants submitted completed baseline surveys, 136 (96%) of whom submitted at least one daily survey and collectively provided 1,770 observations (i.e., daily survey responses). The average number of total daily survey responses per participant was 13.01 (SD = 6.56, Median = 15). Only participants who provided at least three daily responses were retained in multilevel analyses, yielding a final L2 sample size of 118 and 1,172 total observations (M = 14.53, SD = 5.38, median = 16). Sample sizes of 118 (L2) and 14 (L1 observations per participant), assuming medium random slope variance, are sufficient to yield a CLI effect size between 0.33 and 0.37 at 80% power (see Table 7 of Arend & Schafer, 2019). Further, L2 and L1 samples sizes in the current study exceed generally accepted rules of thumb from seminal publications on multilevel analysis (e.g., Hox et al., 2018; Snijders & Bosker, 2012).
Recruitment and Sample Characteristics

The study sample consisted of working adults who were recruited from Prolific online research recruitment platform (www.prolific.co, 2022). See Appendix A for the recruitment message. An initial sample of 281 participants were prescreened to meet eligibility criteria for the main study. These criteria were (a) 18 years of age or older, (b) work full-time hours (35+ hours per week), (c) work at least five days per week Monday through Friday, (d) employed by an organization (not self-employed), (e) have a job that requires a minimum of two daily interactions with one or more coworkers and/or a direct supervisor, (f) attend and/or carry out work in the U.S., (g) can read and write the English language. Eligibility requirements b and c were implemented so participants can meet the study’s daily measurement protocol of two surveys completed each day at work for 10 consecutive Monday through Friday workdays. Eligibility requirement d was implemented to achieve ecological correspondence between the conceptual and measurement contexts of the current study. Eligibility requirement e was implemented to ensure that participants have sufficient opportunity to experience events for recall in daily surveys.

One-hundred and ninety (68%) of the 281 prescreen participants met the eligibility criteria for the main study and were invited to complete the baseline survey. See the baseline recruitment message in Appendix A. Of those baseline invitations, 144 participants submitted responses. Two were excluded for incomplete (< 44%) data, yielding a final baseline sample of 142 participants, of which 136 (96%) submitted at least one daily survey, 114 (80%) submitted the midpoint survey, and 120 (85%) submitted the exit survey. Participants’ ages ranged from 19 to 61 years ($M = 35.6, SD = 9.5$). Eighty-two (57.7%) identified as woman, 59 (41.5%) man, and
one (0.7%) identified as transwoman. Ninety (63.4%) reported as White, Non-Hispanic, 28 (19.7%) as Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American, seven (4.9%) as Hispanic or Latinx, seven (4.9%) as East Asian, five (3.5%) as South or Southeast Asian, and six (4.2%) as multiracial. One-hundred thirteen (79.6%) reported as being straight or heterosexual, 17 (12%) as bisexual, seven (4.9%) as lesbian or gay, four (2.8%) as queer or pansexual, and one (0.7%) as asexual. Sixty-one (43%) participants reported as having a psychological (46; 32.4%), physical (20; 14.1%), and/or cognitive (7; 4.9%) disability, impairment, or health condition.

All participants worked and lived in the United States, with a majority (80; 56.3%) in the Eastern Time Zone region, 40 (28.2%) in the Central Time Zone region, 14 (9.9%) in the Pacific Time Zone region, 6 (4.2%) in the Mountain Time Zone region, and 2 (1.4%) in the Hawaii Pacific Time Zone region. Participants’ occupations varied considerably; a majority (49; 34.5%) worked in business or financial operations (e.g., quality assurance compliance manager, benefits manager, finance manager, senior accountant), 15 (10.6%) worked in education and training (e.g., elementary school teacher, course manager, librarian), 14 (9.9%) worked as health practitioner, technicians, or support specialists (e.g., speech-language pathologist, physical therapist, dental assistant, medical billing specialist), 13 (9.2%) worked in sales and related fields (e.g., sales manager, retail clerk, customer service), 10 (7%) worked in computer and mechanical services (e.g., software developer, information technology manager, power systems engineer), 9 (6.3%) worked in office and administrative support (e.g., office administrator, fraud assistant, bookkeeper), 6 (4.2%) worked in general management roles (e.g., area manager, director of management, manager of innovation), and less than 5 (3.5%) each represented the following occupation areas: arts and design; building and grounds cleaning and maintenance; construction;
Measures

**Pre-screen Survey/Demographics**

A prescreen survey was used to identify eligible participants based on age, employment status (full-time, part-time, etc.), work hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.), days of work (Monday through Friday), and frequency of interactions with coworkers and supervisor (at least twice daily). Additional demographics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, occupation) were included as fillers to mask the purpose of the prescreen survey and later merged with the main study data set. A full list of prescreen survey items is included in Appendix B.

**Baseline, Midpoint, and Exit Surveys**

Identical sets of measures were used across baseline, midpoint, and exit surveys, with the exception of measures for individual differences in the need for belonging and the need for authenticity which were included in the baseline survey only. Scale instructions were also modified to reflect the appropriate time reference. The baseline survey instructed participants to report general perceptions and experiences. The midpoint and exit surveys instructed participants to report perceptions and experiences over the past week. A full list of all scale items, response options, and original and altered instructions (where applicable) are provided in Appendix C.
Work involvement

Work involvement was measured with the MBIE scale (Mor Barak, 2005; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). The MBIE is a 15-item measure of workers’ perceptions of inclusion practices across three dimensions—decision-making, information networks, and level of participation/involvement—with each dimension assessed at five organizational levels—work group, supervisor, higher management, organization, and social informal. Items were rated on a scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 6 (Strongly agree). Item scores were averaged to create an overall index of workplace inclusion across all dimensions (α = .90). Higher scores indicate stronger perceptions of workplace inclusion.

Inclusive Leadership

Inclusive leadership was measured with the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ; Arnold et al., 2000). Three of the five original subscales that are most relevant to inclusive leadership were used in the current study. These subscales are participative decision-making (six items), informing (six items), and showing concern/interacting with the team (10 items). Participants were presented with a list of leader behaviors representing each subscale and asked to rate the frequency at which their direct supervisor engages in each behavior. Items were rated on a scale from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always). Item scores were averaged across each subscale (α = .97) with higher scores indicating stronger perceptions of inclusive leadership.
Diversity Practices

Diversity practices were measured four items developed by McKay et al. (2008). These items assess the extent to which employees perceive that their organization is fair and committed to diversity. Items were rated on a scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Item scores were averaged to create an index of diversity climate (α = .89) with higher scores indicating positive diversity climate perceptions.

Felt Inclusion

Felt inclusion was measured with the 16-item PGIS (Jansen et al., 2014). The scale consists of two eight-item subscales that measure employees’ self-reported feelings of belonging and that their authenticity is valued at work. Items were rated from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Subscales tend to be strongly correlated (Jansen et al., 2014; Jansen et al., 2019); therefore, item scores were averaged together to create an overall index of felt inclusion (α = .97). Higher scores indicate stronger feelings of being included at work.

Felt Competence

Felt competence was measured with the six-item need for competence subscale of the Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction scale (WBNS; Van den Broeck et al., 2010). These items measure employees’ self-reported degree to which their need for competence is satisfied by their work. Items were rated from 1 ( Totally disagree) to 5 ( Totally agree). Item scores were averaged to create an overall index of felt competence (α = .88) with higher score reflecting more satisfaction of the need for competence.
Affect

Affect was measured with the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule Short Form (PANAS-SF; Mackinnon et al., 1999; Watson et al. 1988). The PANAS-SF is a 10-item version of the original 60-item PANAS which measures individuals’ self-reported subjective well-being via affect. Five items assessed positive affect, and five items assessed negative affect. Items are presented as single-word descriptors of a feeling or emotion. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they have felt each affective descriptor in a given time frame on a scale from 1 (Very slightly or not at all) to 5 (Extremely). Items were averaged separately for each subscale (positive affect: \( \alpha = .89 \); negative affect: \( \alpha = .91 \). Higher scores indicate more positive affect or more negative affect for the corresponding scale.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was measured with the seven items from the affective commitment subscale of the Allen and Meyer (1990) organizational commitment scale (as revised by Jaros, 2007). This scale measures employees’ self-reported emotional attachment and identification with their organization. Items were rated on a scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). Item scores were averaged to create an overall index of organizational commitment (\( \alpha = .90 \)) higher scores indicated stronger affective organizational commitment.
Work Engagement

Work engagement was measured with the nine-item short version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006). The UWES measures employees’ perceptions of work engagement across three subdimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Participants were asked to rate the frequency with which they had feelings about their work reflecting each dimension. Items were rated on a scale from 0 (Never) to 6 (Always). Items were averaged for an overall index of work engagement ($\alpha = .94$) with higher scores indicating stronger work engagement.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

OCBs were measured with the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C) 10-item short version (Spector et al., 2010). The OCB-C measures employee self-reports of the frequency at which they engage in behaviors that are not part of their formal job description but, nonetheless, benefit the organization and/or its members. Items were rated on a scale from 1 (Never) to 6 (Always) and averaged for an overall index of OCB ($\alpha = .81$). Higher scores indicated more frequent engagement in OCBs.

Need to Belong

Need to belong was measured with the 10-item Need to Belong Scale (NTBS; Leary et al., 2013). The NTBS measures individuals’ self-reported trait-level need for social acceptance. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which a series of statements is true of the self—1
(Not at all true of me) to 5 (Extremely true of me). Scale items were averaged together for an overall need to belong index ($\alpha = .87$), with higher scores indicating a stronger need to belong.

**Need for authenticity**

Need for authenticity was measured with the 12-item Authentic Personality Scale (APS; Wood et al., 2008). The APS measures individuals’ self-reported trait-level need to express oneself authentically. Items represent three subdimensions of authentic personality: authentic living, accepting external influence, and self-alienation. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which a series of statements describes the self—1 (Does not describe me at all) to 7 (Describes me very well). Scale items were averaged for an overall need for authenticity index ($\alpha = .90$), with higher scores indicating a stronger need to be authentic.

**Daily Surveys**

Daily surveys captured employee reports of notable interpersonal interactions or communications, features of those events, psychological reactions to the events, and additional work outcomes that may have been influenced by the events. Several of the measures used in the baseline, midpoint, and exit surveys, were adapted for use in the daily survey and noted below. Item phrasing and instructions were modified where applicable to capture participants’ present experiences. Multi-item measures were also shortened to reduce the burden on participants from completing surveys during work hours. All items, instructions, response scales, and modifications where applicable are provided in Appendix C.
Work Interactions

Participants were instructed to report on their most recent or notable work-related and/or informal social interactions, communications, or other interpersonal experiences that occurred at work within the last three hours. Specifically, participants were asked if they were involved in any interactions (yes/no), if multiple interactions occurred (yes/no), and who was involved in the interactions (e.g., peer, supervisor, client). If multiple interactions occurred, participants were asked which of the interactions stood out most to them. Several additional items assessed features of the reported interaction. These included the specific interaction partners, the interaction format (e.g., in-person, virtual, E-mail), the extent to which the individual thought about the interaction since it occurred—1 (Very slightly or not at all) to 5 (Extremely), and their psychological reactions (i.e., affect, felt inclusion; see below for measure descriptions) to the interaction.

An open-ended item instructed participants to: “Briefly describe the interaction or communication. Include what happened and what about this experience has influenced the degree to which you feel you belong or are valued for your authentic self.” Open-ended responses were coded for indicators of previously established inclusion practices (i.e., work involvement, inclusive leadership, diversity climate), additional practice features noted in the literature, such as motivational focus (prevention vs. promotion) and identity-orientation (identity-blind vs. identity-conscious), and emergent features that might contribute to employees’ felt inclusion experiences. As data allowed, features of inclusion practices were coded from open-ended responses and used as predictor information in tests of hypotheses and research questions. The coding strategy is detailed below in the Data Analysis Strategy section.
Participants who reported no interaction provided no predictor information in the respective daily measurement and were advanced to measures for felt inclusion and work outcomes.

**Felt Inclusion**

Felt inclusion in the daily surveys was measured with a shortened version of the PGIS (Jansen et al., 2014). Two items were adopted—one item from the belongingness subscale (“I feel like I belong”) and one item from the authenticity subscale (“I feel that I am valued for my authentic self). These items were selected because they were the highest loading items (.92 and .88, respectively; see Jansen et al., 2014) on their respective factors while also requiring the least amount of modification to fit the daily measurement context. Participants were asked to rate their agreement from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) with the items based on how they felt in response to the reported interaction. All participants regardless of whether they reported an interaction were also asked to complete the felt inclusion items based on how they currently felt in that moment. Thus, participants who reported an interaction completed two measures of felt inclusion: one in response to the interaction and one in response to their current state.

A two-item measure of felt inclusion was justified given (1) the need to keep daily surveys time efficient, (2) redundant item wording, and (3) demonstrated strong correlations ($rs > .90$) among the PGIS items in prior research (e.g., Jansen et al., 2014, Jansen et al., 2015; Jansen et al., 2019; Keating & Santuzzi, 2018; 2019). Further, the strong correlations and redundant item wording have been noted in prior research as justification for truncated or even single-item versions of the PGIS subscales (e.g., Jansen et al., 2019).
State Affect

Participants’ affective state was measured using an adapted version of the Wong-Baker faces pain scale (Wong & Baker, 1988). Affect was measured as participants’ current mood (at the time of measurement) and again in response to the interaction for applicable participants. The current mood item asked participants “How are you feeling right now?” Participants who report having an interaction in the last three hours were asked, “How are you feeling in response to this interaction/communication?” Participants rated their response on a five-point scale with response anchors represented as faces ranging from 1 (sad, frowning face) to 5 (happy, smiling face; see Appendix C).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was measured with a modified version of the affective commitment subscale (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Jaros, 2007). Instructions were modified to account for participants’ experience over the past three hours, and the scale was shortened to two items for time constraints. The two selected items were the non-reverse coded items with the highest factor loadings from the original Allen and Meyer (1990) validation study.

Work Engagement

Work engagement was measured with a modified version of the UWES (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006). The instructions were modified to represent participants’ feelings over the last three hours. The measure was shortened to three-items, with one item representing each subscale: vigor, dedication, and absorption. The three items were chosen based on
justification provided by Schaufeli et al., (2006) that the three items are the most reflective of the scale’s underlying constructs. The response scale was also modified to 0 (Not at all) to 6 (Extremely) to align with the past three-hour time referent.

OCBs were measured with a shortened version the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C) short version (Spector et al., 2010). The original scale is intended to assess the general frequency that employees engage in OCBs. For use as a daily measure, the scale instructions had to be adapted to reflect participants’ perceptions of the last three hours. As such, the five items were chosen based on the greater likelihood of participants having the opportunity to engage in those behaviors on a daily basis (e.g., “Took time to advise, coach, or mentor a co-worker.”) relative to other behaviors on the scale (e.g., “Worked weekends or other days off to complete a project or task.”). Furthermore, rather than behaviors being rated on a frequency scale as in the original scale, participants were asked to select each, if any, behavior they engaged in over the last three hours. Responses were coded as a categorical variable (0 = did not engage in OCBs, 1 = engaged in OCBs).

Procedure

All data were collected using online surveys created in Qualtrics™ software. Following the two-stage recruitment process (prescreen survey followed by baseline survey invitation) outlined previously, participants were sent a welcome message in Prolific containing a greeting, copy of the study consent form, and detailed overview of the study procedure, including how to access and complete the surveys and a schedule detailing survey start and completion times.
across the length of the entire study. A link to a downloadable Google Drive Document containing the study information and the baseline survey link were also included in the E-mail. Participants were instructed to review all information and attachments prior to consenting to participate in the study and beginning the baseline survey.

Upon accessing the baseline survey link, participants were redirected to Qualtrics\textsuperscript{XM} where they were first presented with a consent form and the choice to actively consent to participate. Participants consented to participate by clicking “I agree to participate” at the bottom of the page and were then directed to the start of the baseline survey. Those who selected “I do not agree to participate” were redirected to the end of the survey and thanked for their time and involvement.

In the welcome E-mail, participants were instructed to complete the baseline survey by the next calendar Friday that falls no sooner than five days from the date of the welcome E-mail. For example, if the welcome E-mail was sent on Wednesday, June 1, 2022, the baseline survey was due by Friday, June 10, 2022. This was to ensure that participants had ample time (at least one full week) to review the study materials and decide whether they wanted to participate. In reality, most participants submitted the baseline survey within three days of receiving the link. The average completion time of baseline survey was 11 minutes.

Participants who submitted baseline surveys that were 80\% complete were sent invitations and links for the daily surveys via Prolific. The first daily survey links were sent on the next Monday following completion of the baseline survey. For example, if the baseline survey was submitted on Thursday, June 2, 2022, participants began receiving links to daily surveys on Monday, June 6, 2022. Daily surveys were administered twice daily—once at 12:00
pm and once at 3:00 pm—Monday through Friday, for two consecutive weeks, resulting in a total administration of 20 daily surveys (two surveys per day for 10 consecutive workdays). Participants were instructed to complete the survey within one hour (due by 1:00 pm and 4:00 pm deadlines) and that all surveys would permanently deactivate three hours after the start time.

Each daily survey was identical and took 3 minutes to complete on average.

At the end of the first week of daily surveys (Friday at 5:00 p.m.), an invitation and link for the midpoint survey was sent via Prolific. Participants were given 48 hours to complete the midpoint survey (due Sunday at 5:00 pm). A reminder E-mail was sent on Sunday morning before 12:00 pm. The midpoint survey contained the same measures as the baseline survey except for the NTB scale and the APS scale and took 7.5 minutes to complete on average.

Participants then completed the second week of daily surveys. The Week 2 daily survey administration process was identical to Week 1. At the end of Week 2, an exit survey, identical to the midpoint survey, was administered (on Friday at 5:00 pm). Participants again had 48 hours to complete the exit survey. The exit survey was the final step in the study; therefore, a debriefing form was included at the end of the survey. The debriefing form contained a message to participants thanking them for their involvement, information regarding the purpose and hypotheses of the study, references to published articles related to the current study, and contact information of the principal investigator.

Participants received cash compensation of up to $24.25 for their involvement. Only surveys that were ≥80% complete were eligible for payment. Participants received $2 for completing the baseline survey, $1.50 for completing the midpoint survey, and $1.50 for completing the exit survey. A $1 bonus payment was awarded to participants who completed
both the baseline and midpoint surveys, and an additional $1 bonus was awarded for completing the baseline, midpoint, and exit surveys. Thus, the total possible payment for completing the baseline, midpoint, and exit surveys was $7.

Participants received $0.50 for each daily survey they completed, and $2 bonuses were awarded for completing all 10 surveys in Week 1 and again for completing all 10 surveys in Week 2. An additional bonus of $3 was awarded for completing all 20 daily surveys. This resulted in a total possible payment of $17 for completing the daily surveys ($0.50 × 20 = $10.00 + $2 bonus (Week 1) + $2 bonus (Week 2) + $3 bonus for all 20 surveys = $17). The total possible compensation for the entire study was therefore $24 (main study) plus $0.25 (prescreen survey), equaling $24.25.

Coding Predictor Information from Daily Responses

Predictor information was coded from participants’ qualitative reports of daily interactions. The definitions of predictors were set a priori and based on previously outlined conceptual definitions of inclusion practices—work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate. In addition to predictor information, reports were coded for being an inclusive event and/or an exclusive event on the basis of a general social evaluation (i.e., “Would most people consider this event inclusive/exclusive?”). Raters were provided with a coding sheet created in Microsoft Excel, which contained labels and definitions of each practice construct across columns and participant reports in each row. Raters were instructed to review participants qualitative reports of daily interactions and indicate, with a “0” (No) or a “1” (Yes), whether each
practice construct feature was referenced in the reported interaction. A full list of practice construct definitions and corresponding sample statements are provided in Table 2.

Practice features were coded at the subdimension level consistent with conceptual definitions of the respective practice construct. The subdimensions coded for each construct were integrated into an omnibus indicator of the overall practice construct. For example, influence in decision making (IDM), access to information (INF), and participation/involvement (INV) were the subdimensions coded for work involvement. If a single response was coded “1” for IDM, “1” for INF, and “0” for INV, it would be secondarily coded as “1” for work involvement. Similarly, if a single response was coded “0” for IDM, “0” for INF, and “1” for INV, it too would be secondarily coded as “1” for work involvement. The omnibus practice construct codes were used to assess overall agreement and ultimately provided the predictor information used in main analyses.

Coding was conducted by a team of five raters, which included the author of this dissertation (rater 1), who served as the content matter expert, and four research assistants (raters 2-5). An initial orientation meeting was held to train research assistants on the construct definitions and coding strategy. Following the orientation session, each rater was assigned the same subset of 25 cases to code. A calibration meeting was then held to review and discuss ratings and recalibrate the coding strategy if needed. Raters were then assigned to re-review and re-code the initial 25 cases, as well as an additional 35 cases, in light of any updated information from the calibration meeting. A second calibration meeting was held to review and discuss the first 60 ratings and make any necessary refinements to the practice construct definitions and coding strategy.
Table 2
Coded Inclusion Practice Constructs, Definitions, Frequencies, and Rater Agreement (ICCs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work or Social Event</td>
<td>Event involved or referenced:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1193 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Formal work-related interactions or activities (e.g., project meeting, performance appraisal, work e-mail, task completion). “Had a meeting with subordinates over Zoom in order to talk about progress for the work week, and what was left over for various projects. Everyone was pretty attentive and provided input, making me feel competent and like I knew what I was doing.” “They asked about a work task due today which showed as still incomplete. I informed them the task had been completed by someone else. My direct supervisor had been made aware previously and should have taken care of it.”</td>
<td>935 (78%)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Informal (non-work-related) interactions or activities (e.g., personal conversation, lunch/happy hour with coworkers, office party). “We were joking around about something that happened at work. It made me feel amused and fun.” “A coworker checked with me to see how my family is doing.”</td>
<td>191 (16%)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>A combination of work-related and social activities (e.g., meeting with supervisor about work project turns into conversation about non-work activities). “My coworker sent me a message on Teams. First he asked how I was doing and then he asked me a question related to one of our projects. He has always been warm and welcoming, and that is how I felt when I spoke with him. I do feel belonging when he asks how I'm doing.”</td>
<td>67 (5.6%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on following page)
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>Event referenced or made salient:</td>
<td>“Some of my team members met to work on breakout rooms in Zoom and had some fun in the process. Because we were all laughing and making jokes, I felt like I belonged.”</td>
<td>894 (75%)</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence decision making</td>
<td>The extent to which the employee had influence on decision making through the solicitation/use of their thoughts, ideas, suggestions, etc.</td>
<td>“We were trying to come up with a good solution to an issue we are having with something at work. I appreciate her letting me bounce off ideas and letting me shoot down her ideas. It makes me feel valuable for my ideas.”</td>
<td>310 (26%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My supervisor emailed me that he wanted me to redo parts of my report. He said he was unhappy with the results that I quoted in it. I feel that he doesn't take me seriously and I can't be myself and critique him about the sources he wants me to use.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/communication</td>
<td>The extent to which information and/or communications are accessible or shared with the employee by others at work.</td>
<td>“A coworker sent me a message providing me an update on a project. He then later asked for technical advice. I feel valued for my technical expertise, which is authentic, but not sure about 'being myself.'”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I had a meeting that started at 3 that was only supposed to be an hour. It ended up being over 2 hours long. It was frustrating because it didn’t seem like we were communicating our ideas all that well. The ideas were somewhat the same but there were large gaps in goals and implementation ideas. It felt like a constant struggle. Just honestly very brutal overly long.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>253 (21%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>Event referenced or made salient:</td>
<td>“Discussed with my supervisor about an issue that needed to be resolved and what steps we needed to take. Having to relay this information makes me feel involved and valued.”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which the employee is invited to participate in work-related or social activities (e.g., tasks, meetings, social gatherings, etc.).</td>
<td>“Sometimes we go for long periods of time without talking, I feel that I am not there and not a valued member of the team. Then when we do talk I get acknowledged for a change.”</td>
<td>761 (64%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation/involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Event referenced or made salient:</td>
<td>“I am asking to be able to continue to work remotely instead of returning to the office due to personal reasons and they responded that they support me. I feel valued that they are willing to work with me so I do not have to resign.”</td>
<td>456 (38%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A formal organizational policy or procedure (e.g., paid time off, family/maternity leave, HR/personnel procedures, special permission granted by supervisor/manager, etc.).</td>
<td>“Discussing operations and procedures, felt a little frustrated by new strategies discussed.”</td>
<td>40 (3.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal policy/procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/identity</td>
<td>A demographic or social identity group (e.g., race, ethnicity, nationality, gender/sex, age, disability, sexual orientation/identity, religion, etc.) in reference to the individual, other, or in general.</td>
<td>“My coworker and I were discussing current events and the topic of racial injustice. Even though my coworker is White, she seems to get it as far as how the police treat different races when they commit a crime. For example, the guy who traveled from Buffalo and shot those shoppers at the grocery store. He was treated with dignity and respect. But on the other hand, Blacks are not treated the same if they commit similar crimes. She was able to sympathize with my feels and understand where I was coming from. It was surprising and refreshing to have someone of another race in agreement.”</td>
<td>11 (1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>The fair or differential treatment of the employee or others in the organization.</td>
<td>“I was told that we need to help out this person in another department because they made a major mistake. It always seems to happen that I'm bailing others out of tough spots. When do I get that benefit? I feel absolutely used and abused around here all the time.”</td>
<td>7 (0.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td>“My coworker vented to me about some work tasks that were given to her and she felt were unfair. It made me feel trusted.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General climate</td>
<td>An external feature of the work or social environment in the organization—in reference to the organization as a whole or an entity within the organization (e.g., department, team, coworker, environment, tools/equipment, etc.)—that was evaluated by the employee.</td>
<td>“I was told that we need to help out this person in another department because they made a major mistake. It always seems to happen that I'm bailing others out of tough spots. When do I get that benefit? I feel absolutely used and abused around here all the time.”</td>
<td>432 (36%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Had some on-site training that we needed to work on in groups to complete. It was nice working with people I usually don't have the chance to interact with much since we are on different shifts. We got along well and it wasn't awkward like I thought it would be. I was comfortable and [could] be more of myself around new people which is something I don't normally do.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>“I was told that we need to help out this person in another department because they made a major mistake. It always seems to happen that I'm bailing others out of tough spots. When do I get that benefit? I feel absolutely used and abused around here all the time.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Event referenced or made salient:</td>
<td>“I got a very quick response on a document that was pending that I needed assistance with clearing the hold. I really feel respected and that my teammate and I are really working together when they help me resolve things like that.”</td>
<td>484 (40.6%)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-related/helping</td>
<td>An act of work-related support/assistance or the opposite (i.e., a burden or hinderance on one's work activities) from other(s) at work.</td>
<td>“My manager once again was micromanaging me about the job I was doing, and it makes me feel like I'm being babysat, and that I shouldn't even bother doing the work.”</td>
<td>241 (20%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal/social</td>
<td>An act of interpersonal support/caring/respect/warmth or the opposite (i.e., interpersonal harm/hostility/disrespect) from other(s) at work.</td>
<td>“It was our bi-weekly one on one meeting where we discuss my workload. We also talked about some random things and she also compliments my work ethic! She definitely makes me feel like I belong and makes me feel good about the work that I do! I enjoy having a manager I can joke with :)”</td>
<td>186 (16%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance acknowledgement</td>
<td>An acknowledgement of a successful/valued or poor/undesirable contribution/behavior by the employee (e.g., a coworker/supervisor congratulating the individual for a job well done, a supervisor notifying the employee of low effort, a client thanking the employee for their help, a customer complaining about poor service).</td>
<td>“My manager congratulated me on a well written email to an account team. It felt like my work was being valued in that moment.” “My boss and manager said I don't take enough initiative, and it seems like I'm not really into this, which they are correct in the fact that I hate this job.” “Supervisor bought me a smoothie for appreciation of my hard work.”</td>
<td>85 (7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive-Exclusive Event</td>
<td>Event involved an act of inclusion—on average this behavior would be considered a gesture to welcome/accept/involv/value the employee with respect to formal work-related and/or informal social/interpersonal processes in the organization.</td>
<td>“Co-worker asked for my opinion on communicating with another department for our project. My co-worker really wanted to get my input, which made me feel like what I say matters.” “My coworker talked to me about buying a new house and we are friendly so she went into a lot of detail. It made me feel like a confidante.”</td>
<td>1193 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>Event involved an act of exclusion—on average this behavior would be considered an attempt to exclude/ostracize/ridicule/devalue the employee with respect to formal work-related and/or informal social/interpersonal processes in the organization.</td>
<td>“I misspoke during a presentation, and a colleague corrected me in a rude way. It made me feel very small and stupid.”</td>
<td>73 (6%)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I was asked to notify one of our clients that his nurse would be two hours late for their scheduled visit today. When I phoned the client and relayed the message to them, they became very angry and hostile. I remained positive and apologized several times for the delay, but I was not able to calm down the client. They told me that everyone at my company were liars, including myself. I found the conversation and the accusation to be hurtful because I truly did feel regretful for the client having to wait longer for their appointment. I pride myself on being honest and felt like the client did not want to believe I was genuine.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>No definition. Cases that could not be unequivocally coded as inclusive or exclusive were deemed neutral.</td>
<td>“We talked about vacations and I thought about my life a lot.”</td>
<td>491(41%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“It was a meeting about hiring policy.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“This was a quick discussion about assigning tasks to the team. I didn’t have any relevant reactions to this meeting.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ICC = Intraclass correlation coefficient.
To assess interrater agreement, intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) were calculated using the *psych* package in R (Revelle, 2022). Estimates were based on a two-way random effects, single rater measurement with absolute agreement form ($ICC_{2,1}$; McGraw & Wong, 1996). Obtained ICCs for the first 60 cases ranged from .41 to .88, prompting an additional group discussion and coding session to resolve areas of disagreement, misunderstanding of construct definitions, and to review exemplary practice features in qualitative reports. Following the final calibration meeting, raters 2-5 were assigned an individual subset of the remaining cases (~285 cases per rater; total of 1135 cases). Rater 1 separately coded all remaining 1135 cases, of which overall agreement with raters 2-5 was assessed. Overall ICCs for each practice construct dimensions are presented in Table 2. ICCs ranged from .55 to .86, all reaching acceptable to high agreement. Therefore, the Rater 1 codes were deemed sufficient for use as predictor data in hypothesis tests.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

All statistical analyses were conducted in RStudio statistical computing environment (R Core Team, 2020; RStudio Team, 2019). Analyses generally required specialized add-on packages from independent developers and are noted below where applicable. Otherwise, analyses were conducted using base R functions.

Baseline Data

Preliminary hypothesis tests were conducted on the baseline survey data. Measures in the baseline survey assessed employee’s general perceptions and experiences on key study variables (i.e., inclusion practices, felt inclusion, felt competence, and work and well-being outcomes) and are, therefore, reflective of cross-sectional survey research that is common in workplace inclusion literature.

Descriptive statistics and inter-correlations for baseline study variables were computed using the psych (Revelle, 2022) and hMisc (Harrell, Jr., 2022) R packages, respectively, and are presented in Table 3. Bivariate correlations between each of the inclusion practices, felt inclusion, and work outcomes were in the expected directions and significant (ps < .05). Results of simple regressions shown in Table 4 corroborate the correlations. Regarding Hypotheses 1, 2,
## Table 3

Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Cronbach’s Alphas for Baseline Study Variables

| Variable                        | M     | SD    | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Work involvement           | 4.87  | 1.10  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 2. Inclusive leadership       | 3.77  | 0.88  | .61   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 3. Diversity climate          | 3.68  | 0.92  | .58   | .58   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 4. Felt inclusion             | 3.68  | 0.91  | .62   | .63   | .80   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 5. Felt competence            | 4.76  | 0.83  | .44   | .25   | .28   | .31   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 6. Positive affect            | 3.10  | 0.95  | .49   | .44   | .52   | .57   | .47   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 7. Negative affect            | 1.50  | 0.74  | -.31  | -.17  | -.30  | -.40  | -.32  | -.33  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 8. Organizational commitment  | 3.24  | 0.90  | .54   | .48   | .68   | .76   | .26   | .47   | -.31  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 9. Work engagement            | 4.58  | 1.32  | .46   | .45   | .58   | .61   | .37   | .69   | -.30  | .64   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 10. OCB                       | 3.06  | 0.69  | .47   | .32   | .33   | .39   | .24   | .39   | -.17  | .49   | .57   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 11. Need to belong            | 3.00  | 0.84  | -.05  | -.05  | -.13  | -.12  | -.28  | -.18  | .24   | .11   | .00   | .13   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 12. Need for authenticity     | 5.09  | 1.10  | .19   | .09   | .14   | .22   | .39   | .39   | -.42  | .06   | .23   | .03   | -.57  |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 13. Age                       | 35.64 | 9.50  | .11   | .06   | .14   | .13   | .19   | .27   | -.25  | .10   | .30   | .13   | -.32  | .39   |       |       |       |       |       |
| 14. Sex                       |       |       | -.13  | -.14  | -.13  | -.15  | -.20  | -.17  | .19   | -.09  | -.15  | -.12  | .19   | -.19  | -.14  |       |       |       |       |
| 15. Race                      |       |       | .05   | -.01  | .08   | .04   | .17   | .20   | -.17  | .02   | .06   | .02   | -.21  | .21   | .04   | .04   |       |       |       |
| 16. Psychological disability  |       |       | -.07  | -.11  | -.17  | -.24  | -.05  | -.25  | .32   | -.16  | -.21  | -.15  | -.12  | .10   | -.25  | .24   | -.05  |       |       |
| 17. Physical disability       |       |       | -.11  | -.01  | -.11  | -.03  | .12   | -.06  | .09   | -.15  | -.04  | -.04  | .28   | -.37  | -.02  | -.11  | .00   | .10   |

Note. Correlation coefficients ≥ |.17| are significant at p < .05 except for the coefficient representing the relationship between Race and Negative Affect. Missing data were handled with pairwise deletion. N = 142 for variables 1 through 13. Sex (N_{Range} = 122-141): 0 = Man, 1 = Woman. Race (N_{Range} = 119-123): 0 = White, 1 = Black. Psychological disability (N_{Range} = 119-136): 0 = No disability, 1 = Disability. Physical disability (N_{Range} = 123-140): 0 = No disability, 1 = Disability.
Table 4

Simple Regressions of Outcomes on Inclusion Practices (Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Predictor: Work involvement</th>
<th>Predictor: Inclusive leadership</th>
<th>Predictor: Diversity climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.30; 0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.32; -0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.33; 0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work engagement</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.37; 0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20; 0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. b = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of b. 95% CI = confidence interval for b; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). Degrees of freedom = 1 and 140.
and 3, there were positive associations between each inclusion practice and positive affect (negative association with negative affect), organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB. Each relationship was statistically significant at $p < .001$ except for inclusive leadership predicting negative affect ($p = .039$).

When addressing Research Question 1, with the three inclusion practices entered as simultaneous predictors, results depended on the outcome variable. Results are displayed in Table 5. For positive affect ($R^2_{adj} = .32, F[3,138] = 22.68, p < .001$), negative affect ($R^2_{adj} = .10, F[3,138] = 6.46, p < .001$), and organizational commitment ($R^2_{adj} = .48, F[3,138] = 44.94, p < .001$), the coefficients for work involvement and diversity climate were statistically significant, but the coefficient for inclusive leadership was not. With work engagement as the outcome ($R^2_{adj} = .35, F[3,138] = 26.20, p < .001$), only the coefficient for diversity climate was significant, while the coefficients for work involvement and inclusive leadership were non-significant. Finally, with OCB as the outcome ($R^2_{adj} = .21, F[3,138] = 13.57, p < .001$), only the coefficient for work involvement was significant, while the coefficients for inclusive leadership and diversity climate were non-significant. In summary, these results provide some support for Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3; although, the relative importance of each inclusion practice appears to differ depending on the outcome variable.

Hypothesis 4a through 4d concerned relationships between felt inclusion and work outcomes. Bivariate correlations between felt inclusion and each outcome were significant and in the expected directions (see Table 3). Table 6 displays the results of the simple regressions. Felt inclusion had significant (all $ps < .001$) positive associations with positive affect ($b = 0.60$), organizational commitment ($b = 0.76$), work engagement ($b = 0.88$), and OCB ($b = 0.30$), and a
Table 5

Multiple Regressions of Outcomes on Inclusion Practices (Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Positive affect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ ($\beta$)</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$R^2_{\text{Adj}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.21 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05; 0.37</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>22.68</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.11 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.09; 0.31</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.33 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15; 0.52</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Negative affect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ ($\beta$)</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>-0.17 (-0.24)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.31; -0.02</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.09 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.09; 0.26</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>-0.08 (-0.22)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.34; -0.01</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Organizational commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ ($\beta$)</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.16 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03; 0.29</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>44.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.04 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.12; 0.21</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.53 (0.54)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.37; 0.69</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: Work engagement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ ($\beta$)</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.16 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.05; 0.38</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.17 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.10; 0.44</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.62 (0.43)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.37; 0.87</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: OCB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ ($\beta$)</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.26 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13; 0.38</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.03 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.13; 0.18</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.05 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.10; 0.19</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. $\beta$ = standardized regression coefficients. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). $R^2_{\text{Adj}}$ = adjusted for number of predictors. Degrees of freedom = 3 and 138.
negative association with negative affect ($b = -0.32$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 4.

Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7 concerned relationships between each inclusion practice and felt inclusion. All bivariate correlations were positive and significant (Table 3). Results of simple regressions are displayed in Table 7. Individually, work involvement ($b = 0.51$), inclusive leadership ($b = 0.64$), and diversity climate ($b = 0.79$) each had a positive and significant (all $ps < .001$) association with felt inclusion. In addressing Research Question #2, the three inclusion practices were entered as simultaneous predictors of felt inclusion. Results of the multiple regression analysis are displayed in the bottom half of Table 7. All three inclusion practices maintained significant and positive associations with felt inclusion and together explained 68% of the total variance, $F(3,138) = 101.60$, $p < .001$. Examination of standardized regression coefficients and the change in adjusted $R^2$ from the single predictor models to the three-predictor
Table 7

Simple Regressions and Multiple Regressions of Felt Inclusion on Inclusion Practices (Baseline Data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Simple Regressions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.40; 0.62</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>87.09</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.51; 0.78</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>90.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.69; 0.89</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>243.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b ($\beta$)</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$R^2_{Adj}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.13 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03; 0.24</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>101.60</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.18 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05; 0.31</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.59 (0.73)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.47; 0.71</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. $\beta$ = standardized regression coefficients. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). $R^2_{Adj}$ = adjusted for number of predictors. Degrees of freedom = 1 and 140 for simple regressions; 3 and 138 for multiple regression.

The model suggests that diversity climate, relative to working involvement and inclusive leadership, contributed most to variation in felt inclusion.

Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 and Research Question #3 concerned indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt inclusion. Indirect effects were tested using the mediate() function from the psych package (Revelle, 2022) for R. Significance tests of indirect effects were conducted using a bootstrapping (10,000 iterations) procedure with statistically significant effects indicated by 95% confidence intervals (CIs) excluding zero. As shown in Table 8, all individual indirect effects of work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate on each work outcome were significant except for the indirect effect of work involvement on OCB.
Table 8
Indirect Effects of Individual Inclusion Practices on Outcomes Through Felt Inclusion (Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Path estimates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Positive affect</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.69***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Positive affect</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.39***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Positive affect</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate $\rightarrow$ Felt inclusion $\rightarrow$ OCB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $a$ = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and felt inclusion. $b$ = estimate of the association between felt inclusion and outcome controlling for inclusion practice. $c$ = estimate of the uncontrolled association between inclusion practice and outcome (total effect). $c'$ = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and outcome controlling for felt inclusion (direct effect). $ab$ = estimate of the indirect association between inclusion practice and outcome through felt inclusion. S.E. = standard error of $ab$. CI = confidence interval of $ab$. ab, S.E., and 95% CI are bootstrapped estimates (10,000 iterations).

* $p < .05$ or 95% CI for $ab$ does not contain zero.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$. 
When inclusion practices were examined as simultaneous predictors (Research Question #3), a significant indirect effect of diversity climate, but not work involvement nor inclusive leadership, emerged for positive affect and for negative affect (Table 9). Significant indirect effects of work involvement and diversity climate, but not inclusive leadership, emerged for organizational commitment and for work engagement. There were no significant indirect effects on OCB. Overall, these results provide some support for indirect paths linking inclusion practices to work outcomes through felt inclusion; however, the relevance of the examined inclusion practices appears to vary by the outcome variable.

Hypothesis 11 proposed that the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion are moderated by individual differences in the strength of inclusion needs, specifically the strength of the need to belong and need for authenticity. Bivariate correlations (see Table 3) revealed a pattern of negative relationships between need to belong and inclusion practices and felt inclusion; although, these correlations were not significant. Need for authenticity, however, was significantly and positively correlated with work involvement \((r = .19, p = .015)\) and felt inclusion \((r = .22, p = .009)\). The relationship between need for authenticity and diversity climate was marginal, although, not significant \((r = .14, p = .10)\).

Formal tests for interaction effects on felt inclusion were conducted for each inclusion practice predictor and individual difference moderator combination in a series of six regression models. Results are displayed in Tables 10a and 10b. In Models 1, 2, and 3 with need to belong as a moderator, there were significant main effects of work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate, respectively. However, there were no significant main effects of need to belong nor were there significant interactions between need to belong and inclusion practices in
Table 9
Indirect Effects of Multiple Inclusion Practices on Outcomes
Through Felt Inclusion (Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Positive affect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0; 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0; 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05; 0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Negative affect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.12; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.19; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.44; -0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Organizational commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01; 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0; 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21; 0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Work engagement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01; 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0; 0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08; 0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: OCB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04; 0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and felt inclusion controlling for each other inclusion practice. b = estimate of the association between felt inclusion and outcome controlling for all inclusion practices. c = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and outcome controlling for each other inclusion practice (total effects). c' = estimate of the association between each inclusion practice and outcome controlling for all other inclusion practices and felt inclusion (direct effects). ab = estimate of the indirect association between inclusion practice and outcome through felt inclusion. S.E. = standard error of ab. CI = confidence interval of ab. ab, S.E., and 95% CI are bootstrapped estimates (10,000 iterations).

*p < .05 or 95% CI for ab does not contain zero.

**p < .01.

***p < .001.
Table 10a
Interactions Between Inclusion Practices and Need to Belong on Felt Inclusion (Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.40; 0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.24; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement $\times$ Need to belong</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.12; 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.51; 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.24; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership $\times$ Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.16; 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.68; 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.13; 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate $\times$ Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.15; 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Predictors were mean centered. $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). Degrees of freedom = 3 and 138 for each model.
Table 10b
Interactions Between Inclusion Practices and Need for Authenticity on Felt Inclusion (Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$R^2_{\text{Adjusted}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.39; 0.61</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for authenticity</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.03; 0.20</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work involvement $\times$ Need for authenticity</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11; 0.08</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI LL</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$R^2_{\text{Adjusted}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.52; 0.78</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for authenticity</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03; 0.24</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive leadership $\times$ Need for authenticity</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.19; 0.03</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI LL</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$R^2_{\text{Adjusted}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.68; 0.88</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>85.28</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for authenticity</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01; 0.17</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity climate $\times$ Need for authenticity</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.12; 0.04</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Predictors were mean centered. $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. $S.E.$ = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). Degrees of freedom = 3 and 138 for each model.*
Similarly, in Models 4, 5, and 6 with need for authenticity as the moderator, work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate, respectively, were significant predictors. There were also significant main effects of need for authenticity in Model 5 when examined simultaneously with inclusive leadership and Model 6 when examined simultaneously with diversity climate. However, interactions between need for authenticity and inclusion practices were not significant in any model. Hypothesis 11 was not supported in the baseline data.

The final set of hypothesis tests concerned indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt competence (Hypotheses 12, 13, and 14). As shown in Table 11, individual indirect effects for work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate through felt competence were significant for positive affect and work engagement as indicated by bootstrapped (10,000 iterations) 95% CIs excluding zero. No other indirect effects were significant. As an extension to Research Question #3, indirect effects were examined with all three inclusion practices as simultaneous predictors in a separate model for each outcome. As shown in Table 12, there were significant indirect effects on positive affect and work engagement only. In both cases, only the indirect effect of work involvement emerged as significant when competing with inclusive leadership and diversity climate. These results provide some, albeit limited, support for Hypotheses 12, 13, and 14.
### Table 11

Indirect Effects of Individual Inclusion Practices on Outcomes Through Felt Competence (Baseline Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Path estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → Positive affect</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → Positive affect</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate → Felt competence → Positive affect</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate → Felt competence → Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate → Felt competence → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate → Felt competence → Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate → Felt competence → OCB</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $a$ = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and felt competence, $b$ = estimate of the association between felt competence and outcome controlling for inclusion practice, $c$ = estimate of the uncontrolled association between inclusion practice and outcome (total effect), $c'$ = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and outcome controlling for felt competence (direct effect). $ab$ = estimate of the indirect association between inclusion practice and outcome through felt competence. S.E. = standard error of $ab$. CI = confidence interval of $ab$. $ab$, S.E., and 95% CI are bootstrapped estimates (10,000 iterations).

*p < .05 or 95% CI for $ab$ does not contain zero.

**p < .01.

***p < .001.
Table 12
Indirect Effects of Multiple Inclusion Practices on Outcomes
Through Felt Competence (Baseline Data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Positive affect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Negative affect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Organizational commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: Work engagement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62***</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: OCB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( a \) = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and felt competence controlling for each other inclusion practice. \( b \) = estimate of the association between felt competence and outcome controlling for all inclusion practices. \( c \) = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and outcome controlling for each other inclusion practice (total effects). \( c’ \) = estimate of the association between each inclusion practice and outcome controlling for all other inclusion practices and felt competence (direct effects). \( ab \) = estimate of the indirect association between inclusion practice and outcome through felt competence. \( S.E. \) = standard error of \( ab \). \( CI \) = confidence interval of \( ab \). \( a \) and \( ab \) are bootstrapped estimates (10,000 iterations).

\( *p < .05 \) or 95% CI for \( ab \) does not contain zero.

\( **p < .01 \)

\( ***p < .001 \).
Daily Data

Preliminary Analyses

Daily data from the current study were represented at two-levels: L2 data represent measurements at the between-person level (e.g., individual difference variables, demographics), and L1 data represent repeated measurements nested within individuals (i.e., daily or weekly survey measures). The nested data presented the possibility of non-independent errors at L1; therefore, hypotheses were tested using a multilevel approach to account for potential violations of the independence assumption (Nezlek, 2008; Snijders & Bosker, 2012).

Appropriateness of Multilevel Analysis: ICCs and DEFFs

Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) and design effects (DEFFs) were first estimated to ensure the appropriateness of multilevel analysis (Nezlek, 2008). The ICC indicates the extent to which clustering influences measurements (i.e., homogeneity of cases within clusters). For the current data, this refers to how similar repeated measurements are within individuals. ICC values range from .00 to 1.00, with .00 indicating no variance between individuals (100% of variance is within-person) and 1.00 indicating no variance within individuals (100% of variance is between-person). General recommendations suggest that MLM is appropriate with ICCs greater than .00 as this indicates that some degree of influence due to clustering is present (Snijders & Bosker, 2012). ICCs for the current study were expected to be somewhat large (approximately .40-.50) based on a range of reported ICCs (.41-.57) from multilevel study of workplace inclusion that
measured similar variables (Bidee et al., 2017). Further, the average ICC for within-individual multilevel designs reported in a recent literature review was .42 (Arend & Schafer, 2019).

A null model (no predictors) multilevel regression was conducted for each outcome variable to obtain variance components used to calculate ICCs. Results of the null model tests are presented in Tables 13 through 17. ICCs in the current study ranged from .25 to .82. The ICC for affect was .39, indicating that 39% of the total variance in employee affect was attributed to between-person variation, while 61% was attributed to within-person variation. For organizational commitment, the ICC was .82, indicating that 82% of the total variance in organizational commitment was attributed to between-person variation (18% attributed to within-person variation). For work engagement, the ICC was .72, indicating that 72% of the total variance in work engagement was attributed to between-person variation (28% attributed to within-person variation). For OCB, the ICC was .25, indicating that 25% of the total variance in work engagement was attributed to between-person variation (75% attributed to within-person variation). Lastly, the ICC for felt inclusion was .49, indicating a near event split in the total variance in felt inclusion situated at the between-person level and the within-person level.

Additionally, DEFFs were computed as an index of the degree to which standard errors are likely to increase due to clustering. A general recommendation is that DEFF values less than 2 suggest that MLM will not likely yield fixed effects results at L1 that differ from standard regression analysis models (Nezlek, 2008). However, given the generally large ICCs obtained and an average L1 sample size of 14.53 (DEFF is a function of cluster size and ICC), DEFFs well above 2 were expected for the current study. Obtained DEFFs were 4.47 for affect, 8.29 for...
Table 13

Preliminary Multilevel Regressions of Employee’s State Affect: Null Model and Time Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>59.32</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>3.42; 3.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ_u²</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ_e²</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>2821.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFF</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>48.54</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>3.31; 3.59</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>0.00; 0.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ_u²</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ_e²</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>2816.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. S.E. = standard error of coefficient. 95% CI = confidence interval for b; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). σ_u² = estimate of between-person variance. σ_e² = estimate of within-person variance. χ² = chi-squared significance test of difference from null model deviance. N_{Level 1} (total observations) = 1172. N_{Level 2} (participants) = 118.
Table 14

Preliminary Multilevel Regressions of Organizational Commitment:
Null Model and Time Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficient (S.E.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.58 (0.09)</td>
<td>41.98</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>3.41; 3.75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ_u²</td>
<td>0.83 (0.91)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.80; 1.04</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ_e²</td>
<td>0.18 (0.43)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.41; 0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>1787.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFF</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.57 (0.01)</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>3.40; 3.75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>-0.00; 0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ_u²</td>
<td>σ_e²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>1787.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *b* = unstandardized regression coefficient. *S.E.* = standard error of *b*. 95% CI = confidence interval for *b*; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). σ_u² (*SD*) = estimate of between-person variance and its standard deviation in parentheses. σ_e² (*SD*) = estimate of within-person variance and its standard deviation in parentheses. χ² = chi-squared significance test of difference from null model deviance. N_{Level 1} (total observations) = 1172. N_{Level 2} (participants) = 118.
### Table 15

Preliminary Multilevel Regressions of Work Engagement: Null Model and Time Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Outcome: Affect</th>
<th>b (S.E.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.14 (0.14)</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>3.87; 4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_u^2) (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07 (1.44)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.26; 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_e^2) (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82 (0.90)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.87; 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td>3450.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFF</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.21 (0.14)</td>
<td>29.13</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>3.92; 4.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01 (0.01)</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td>3448.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(b\) = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of \(b\). 95% CI = confidence interval for \(b\); values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). \(\sigma_u^2\) (SD) = estimate of between-person variance and its standard deviation in parentheses. \(\sigma_e^2\) (SD) = estimate of within-person variance and its standard deviation in parentheses. \(\chi^2\) = chi-squared significance test of difference from null model deviance. \(N_{\text{Level 1}}\) (total observations) = 1172. \(N_{\text{Level 2}}\) (participants) = 118.
### Table 16

Preliminary Multilevel Regressions of OCB: Null Model and Time Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Outcome: OCB</th>
<th>( b ) (S.E.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.54 (0.03)</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>0.49; 0.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_u^2 ) (SD)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.25)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.21; 0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_e^2 ) (SD)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.43)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.42; 0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>1527.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFF</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.57 (0.03)</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>0.50; 0.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>-0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>1525.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \( b \) = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of \( b \). 95% CI = confidence interval for \( b \); values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). OR = odds ratio. \( \sigma_u^2 \) (SD) = estimate of between-person variance and its standard deviation in parentheses. \( \sigma_e^2 \) (SD) = estimate of within-person variance and its standard deviation in parentheses. \( \chi^2 \) = chi-squared significance test of difference from null model deviance. \( N_{Level\,1} \) (total observations) = 1172. \( N_{Level\,2} \) (participants) = 118.
Table 17

Preliminary Multilevel Regressions of Felt Inclusion: Null Model and Time Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Outcome: Affect</th>
<th>b (S.E.)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interception</td>
<td>3.82 (0.06)</td>
<td>61.92</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>3.70; 3.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma^2 (SD) )</td>
<td>0.39 (0.62)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.54; 0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma^2 (SD) )</td>
<td>0.40 (0.64)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.61; 0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>2522.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFF</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interception</td>
<td>3.83 (0.07)</td>
<td>54.48</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>3.69; 3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>-0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>2522.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( b \) = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of \( b \). 95% CI = confidence interval for \( b \); values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). \( \sigma^2 (SD) \) = estimate of between-person variance and its standard deviation in parentheses. \( \sigma^2 (SD) \) = estimate of within-person variance and its standard deviation in parentheses. \( \chi^2 \) = chi-squared significance test of difference from null model deviance. \( N_{\text{Level 1}} \) (total observations) = 1172. \( N_{\text{Level 2}} \) (participants) = 118.
organizational commitment, 7.41 for work engagement, 3.19 for OCB, and 5.39 for felt inclusion, all indicating the possibility of fixed effects influenced by inflated standard errors if standard regressions were used. Taken together, obtained ICCs and DEFFs suggest that a multilevel approach to analyses is appropriate for the current study. Furthermore, a multilevel approach is generally recommended when data are clustered regardless of ICC and DEFF values (Nezlek, 2012; Snijder & Bosker, 2012).

Assessment of Time Covariate

Because employees’ experiences were measured at multiple time points, preliminary multilevel regressions of outcomes on time of measurement were examined to determine whether experiences vary within-individuals over time and, therefore, if time should be included as a covariate in subsequent analyses. Results for the effect of time on each outcome are presented in Tables 13 through 17. For affect, time of measurement had a small, yet, significant, effect on employee’s state affect ($b = 0.01, SE = 0.00, p = .029$) and showed slight improvement in fit over the null model ($\chi^2[1] = 4.77$). Time of measurement was not significantly associated with organizational commitment ($b = 0.00, SE = 0.00, p = .626$), work engagement ($b = -0.01, SE = 0.01, p = .134$), OCB ($b = -0.00, SE = 0.00, p = .174, OR = 1.00$), and felt inclusion ($b = -0.00, SE = 0.00, p = .785$). Given the general lack of a significant effect of time on outcomes, and the negligible effect on employee affect, it was not included as a covariate in analyses conducted for hypothesis tests.
Assessment of Subgroup Covariates

Prior research has shown that experienced inclusion levels may differ based on workers’ social category membership (e.g., race, gender; Holmes, IV, et al., 2020; Mor Barak et al., 2016). Accordingly, bivariate correlations among demographic variables, inclusion practices, and felt inclusion from the baseline data were examined to determine if demographic subgroups should be included as covariates in hypothesis tests. These associations were not able to be examined with the daily data as it would require aggregating the categorical inclusion practices. As shown in Table 3, correlations among the baseline data were generally small and non-significant, with only a few exceptions. There were significant associations between psychological disability and diversity climate ($r = -.17$) and psychological disability and felt inclusion ($r = -.24$). No correlations with inclusion practices or felt inclusion were significant for age, race, or gender. Given the lack of significant associations between subgroups and inclusion variables, subgroups were not included as covariates in analyses for main hypothesis tests.

Nonetheless, a theoretical rationale remains for potential subgroup differences in workplace inclusion experiences, and it has yet to be adequately tested with respect to the Shore et al. (2011) model. Unfortunately, the binary coding of inclusion practices in the daily data did not allow for aggregation to examine correlations with Level 2 subgroups. Therefore, potential subgroup (gender, race, disability) differences in hypothesized relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion will be examined with exploratory interaction tests and reported with the main study results.
Statistical Models for Hypothesis Tests

Hypotheses 1-7, regarding direct associations, were first tested with separate multilevel regressions for each proposed bivariate relationship. In analyses involving inclusion practices as predictors (Hypotheses 1-3 and 5-7), all three practices were then simultaneously entered as predictors in multiple multilevel regression analyses to explore for unique contributions to variance in outcomes (Research Questions 1 and 2). Results of fixed effects were examined to determine the magnitude and significance of hypothesized associations. Deviance statistics were reported as a model fit index and chi-square tests were conducted to assess improvement of predictor models from null models.

Tests of indirect effects (Hypotheses 8-10 and 12-14) were analyzed using multilevel regression in the lavaan R package (Rosseel, 2012). This allowed for model specification at L1 and L2 and obtain L1 estimates after for controlling for L2 (between-person) effects. Indirect effects were specified as the product of the $a$ and $b$ path estimates (Figure 2) in each model. The $c$ path—total effect from association between inclusion practice and outcome—was specified as the sum of the $ab$ estimate and the $c'$ (direct effect from the association between inclusion practice and outcome after controlling for the process variable) estimates. Indirect effects and their standard errors were estimated via bootstrapping. Statistical significance of indirect effects was also estimated via bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals.

Hypotheses 11a-11c involved testing a series of cross-level interactions to examine the effects of individual differences in the need to belong and the need for authenticity (L2) on relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (L1). A slopes-as-outcomes-model was conducted for each inclusion practice and individual difference combination predicting felt
inclusion. Because individual differences in need to belong and need for authenticity were L2 predictors, they were grand mean centered. This also simplified the interpretation of any main effects (Enders & Tofighi, 2007; Preacher et al. 2010). L1 predictors were categorical and, thus, were not centered. Evidence of a cross-level effect of individual differences in inclusion needs on the relationship between inclusion practices and felt inclusion was indicated by a statistically significant Inclusion Practice × Inclusion Need coefficient. Deviance statistics and chi-square tests were also reported to assess model fit and improvement from null and subsequent predictor models.

**Direct Effects of Inclusion Practices on Work and Well-being Outcomes**

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 predicted positive relationships between each inclusion practice—work involvement, inclusive leadership, and positive climate—and work and well-being outcomes—affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for daily survey variables are provided in Table 18. Correlations between each inclusion practice and outcome were significant ($ps < .05$) and in the expected direction. As with hypothesis tests on baseline survey data, simple regressions were run for each predictor-outcome pair, followed by multiple regressions to explore unique contributions to variance in outcomes by each predictor. Multilevel regressions were computed using the *lme4* (Bates et al., 2015) package in R. Results of simple multilevel regressions are presented in Table 19.
Table 18
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Daily Survey Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work and social event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inclusive leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positive climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inclusive event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exclusive event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Neutral event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Felt inclusion (state)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Felt inclusion (event)</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Event cognition</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Affect (state)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Affect (event)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Organizational</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Work engagement</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. OCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 1172. Correlation coefficients ≥ |.06| are significant at p < .05. Variables 1-9 are categorical and were coded from qualitative data (0 = feature absent, 1 = feature present). Variables 10-14 were measured on continuous scales. OCB is categorical (0 = no OCB performed in last three hours, 1 = at least one OCB performed in last three hours)
Table 19

Simple Multilevel Regressions of Outcomes on Inclusion Practices (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor: Work involvement</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>b (S.E.)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State affect</td>
<td>0.30 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.20; 0.41</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2786.40</td>
<td>34.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org. commitment</td>
<td>0.18 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.12; 0.24</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1754.70</td>
<td>33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work engagement</td>
<td>0.34 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.21; 0.46</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3424.10</td>
<td>26.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.10 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.04; 0.16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1517.00</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor: Inclusive leadership</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>b (S.E.)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State affect</td>
<td>0.16 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.02; 0.30</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>2816.00</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. commitment</td>
<td>0.18 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.10; 0.26</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1768.70</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work engagement</td>
<td>0.29 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.12; 0.46</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>3439.70</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.10 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.02; 0.18</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1522.00</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor: Positive climate</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>b (S.E.)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State affect</td>
<td>0.30 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.19; 0.42</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2795.40</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. commitment</td>
<td>0.18 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.11; 0.25</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1763.80</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work engagement</td>
<td>0.44 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.29; 0.58</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3416.50</td>
<td>34.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.05 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.11</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1525.80</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Predictors are categorical and were coded from qualitative data (0 = feature absent, 1 = feature present). b = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of b. 95% CI = confidence interval for b; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). Dev. = Deviance. χ² = chi-squared significance test of difference in deviance from null model. N_{Level 1} (total observations) = 1172. N_{Level 2} (participants) = 118.
**Hypothesis 1a: Association Between Work Involvement and Affect**

In testing Hypothesis 1a, work involvement was positively and significantly related to employee’s state affect ($b = 0.30, p < .001$), indicating that workplace interactions that involve a cue of work involvement are associated with a 0.30 unit increase in employee’s state affect compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative work involvement cue. Work involvement explained 4% of the overall variance in affect and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 34.94$). These results offer support for Hypothesis 1a.

**Hypothesis 1b: Association Between Work Involvement and Organizational Commitment**

In testing Hypothesis 1b, work involvement was positively and significantly related to organizational commitment, ($b = 0.18, p < .001$), indicating that workplace interactions that involve a cue of work involvement are associated with a 0.18 unit increase in employee’s affective attachment to their organization compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative work involvement cue. Work involvement explained 3% of the overall variance in organizational commitment and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 33.57$). These results offer support for Hypothesis 1b.

**Hypothesis 1c: Association Between Work Involvement and Work Engagement**

In testing Hypothesis 1c, work involvement was positively and significantly related to work engagement, ($b = 0.34, p < .001$), indicating that workplace interactions that involve a cue of work involvement are associated with a 0.34 unit increase in employee engagement in their
work compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative work involvement cue. Work involvement explained 2.2% of the overall variance in work engagement and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 26.76$). These results offer support for Hypothesis 1c.

**Hypothesis 1d: Association Between Work Involvement and OCB**

In testing Hypothesis 1d, work involvement was positively and significantly related to OCB ($b = 0.09$, $p = .001$, odds = 1.10). Employees who reported workplace interactions involving a cue of work involvement are 1.10 times more likely to engage in an OCB than employees whose interactions involved a neutral or negative work involvement cue. Work involvement explained 1% of the overall variance in OCB and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 10.60$). These results offer support for Hypothesis 1d.

**Hypothesis 2a: Association Between Inclusive Leadership and Affect**

In testing Hypothesis 2a, inclusive leadership was positively and significantly related to employee’s state affect, ($b = 0.16$, $p = .024$). Workplace interactions that involve a cue of inclusive leader behaviors are associated with a 0.16 unit increase in employee’s state affect compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative inclusive leadership cues. Inclusive leadership explained only a small proportion 0.4% of the overall variance in affect and showed negligible, albeit significant, improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 5.29$). These results offer some support for Hypothesis 2a.
Hypothesis 2b: Association Between Inclusive Leadership and Organizational Commitment

In testing Hypothesis 2b, inclusive leadership was positively and significantly related to organizational commitment, \((b = 0.18, p < .001)\), indicating that workplace interactions that involve a cue of inclusive leadership are associated with a 0.18 unit increase in employee’s affective attachment to their organization compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative inclusive leadership cue. Inclusive leadership explained 1% of the overall variance in organizational commitment and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model \((\chi^2(1) = 19.00)\). Hypothesis 2b was supported.

Hypothesis 2c: Association Between Inclusive Leadership and Work Engagement

In testing Hypothesis 2c, inclusive leadership was positively and significantly related to work engagement, \((b = 0.29, p < .001)\), indicating that workplace interactions that involve a cue of inclusive leadership are associated with a 0.29 unit increase in employee’s engagement in their work compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative inclusive leadership cue. Inclusive leadership explained 1% of the overall variance in work engagement which showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model \((\chi^2(1) = 11.12)\), offering support for Hypothesis 2c.

Hypothesis 2d: Association Between Inclusive Leadership and OCB

In testing Hypothesis 2d, inclusive leadership was positively and significantly related to OCB \((b = 0.10, p < .018, OR = 1.10)\). Employees who reported a workplace interaction
involving a cue of inclusive leadership were 1.10 times more likely to engage in a work-related citizenship behavior compared to interactions involving a neutral or negative inclusive leadership cue. Inclusive leadership explained < 1% of the overall variance in OCB and showed negligible, yet, significant, improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 5.56$). These results offer some support for Hypothesis 2d.

Hypothesis 3a: Association Between Positive Climate and Affect

In testing Hypothesis 3a, positive climate was positively and significantly related to employee’s state affect, ($b = 0.30$, $p < .001$). Workplace interactions that made salient to employee’s a positive feature of the work environment were associated with a 0.30 unit increase in employee’s state affect compared to interactions that referenced a neutral or negative climate feature. Positive climate explained 3% of the overall variance in affect and showed significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 25.93$). These results offer support for Hypothesis 3a.

Hypothesis 3b: Association Between Positive Climate and Organizational Commitment

In testing Hypothesis 3b, positive climate was positively and significantly related to organizational commitment, ($b = 0.18$, $p < .001$). Workplace interactions that made a positive climate feature salient to employee’s were associated with a 0.18 unit increase in employee’s affective attachment to their organization compared to interactions that involved a neutral or negative climate feature. Positive climate explained 2% of the overall variance in organizational
commitment and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 23.91$). Hypothesis 3b was supported.

Hypothesis 3c: Association Between Positive Climate and Work Engagement

In testing Hypothesis 3c, positive climate was positively and significantly related to work engagement, ($b = 0.44, p < .001$), indicating that workplace interactions that made salient a positive climate feature were associated with a 0.44 unit increase in employee’s engagement in their work compared to interactions that involved a neutral or negative climate feature. Positive climate explained 3% of the overall variance in work engagement and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 34.39$). Hypothesis 3c was supported.

Hypothesis 3d: Association Between Positive Climate and OCB

In testing Hypothesis 3d, the association between positive climate and OCB was not significant, ($b = 0.05, p = .175$). Employees who reported a positive feature of the work environment were almost equally (1.04 time more) likely to engage in a work-related citizenship behavior compared to interactions involving a neutral or negative climate feature. The addition of positive climate as a predictor did not improve model fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 1.84$). Hypothesis 3d was not supported.
Research Question 1: Does each inclusion predictor explain a unique proportion of variance in outcomes?

Four multilevel multiple regressions were conducted to test whether work involvement, inclusive leadership, and positive climate simultaneously predicted employee affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB. Results are displayed in Table 20. For affect, coefficients for work involvement \((b = 0.22, p < .001)\) and positive climate \((b = 0.17, p = .009)\) were significant, but the coefficient for inclusive leadership \((b = 0.04, p = .541)\) was not significant. Overall, the three inclusion practices together accounted for 5\% of the total variance in employee affect. The three-predictor model showed significant improvement in fit (Deviance\(_{3\text{-predictor}} = 2779.00\)) over the null model \((\chi^2(3) = 42.32, p < .001)\) and each single predictor model (work involvement: \(\chi^2(2) = 7.39, p = .025\); inclusive leadership: \(\chi^2(2) = 37.03, p < .001\); positive climate: \(\chi^2(2) = 16.40, p < .001\)).

For organizational commitment, coefficients for work involvement \((b = 0.12, p = .001)\), inclusive leadership \((b = 0.12, p = .005)\), and positive climate \((b = 0.09, p = .014)\) were significant. Each of the three inclusion practices accounted for a unique proportion of the total variance (4\%) in organizational commitment. The three-predictor model showed significant improvement in fit (Deviance\(_{3\text{-predictor}} = 1739.70\)) over the null model \((\chi^2(3) = 47.98, p < .001)\) and each single predictor model (work involvement: \(\chi^2(2) = 14.41, p < .001\); inclusive leadership: \(\chi^2(2) = 28.98, p < .001\); positive climate: \(\chi^2(2) = 24.06, p < .001\)).
Table 20

Multiple Multilevel Regressions of Outcomes on Inclusion Practices (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome: State affect</th>
<th>Outcome: Organizational commitment</th>
<th>Outcome: Work engagement</th>
<th>Outcome: OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11; 0.34</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.10; 0.19</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04; 0.30</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05; 0.19</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04; 0.20</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02; 0.18</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03; 0.32</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.34</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16; 0.48</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02; 0.16</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.15</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.09; 0.06</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Predictors are categorical and were coded from qualitative data (0 = feature absent, 1 = feature present). $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). $R^2_{Adj} = R^2$ adjusted for number of predictors. Dev. = Deviance. $\chi^2 = \chi^2$-squared significance test of difference in deviance from null model. $N_{Level\ 1}$ (total observations) = 1172. $N_{Level\ 2}$ (participants) = 118.

*p < .05 for $\chi^2$ test.
For work engagement, coefficients for work involvement \((b = 0.17, p = .021)\) and positive climate \((b = 0.32, p < .001)\) were significant, but inclusive leadership was not significant \((b = 0.17, p = .061)\). The three inclusion practices accounted for 4% of the total variance in work engagement. The three-predictor model showed significant improvement in fit (Deviance_{3-predictor} = 3405.00) over the null model \((\chi^2(3) = 45.85, p < .001)\) and each single predictor model (work involvement: \(\chi^2(2) = 19.09, p < .001\); inclusive leadership: \(\chi^2(2) = 34.74, p < .001\); positive climate: \(\chi^2(2) = 11.47, p = .003\)).

For OCB, only the coefficient for work involvement \((b = 0.09, p = .011, OR = 1.09)\) was significant. Inclusive leadership \((b = 0.07, p = .129, OR = 1.07)\) and positive climate \((b = -0.01, p = .771, OR = 0.99)\) were not significant. Work involvement accounted for nearly half of the overall (1.3%) variance explained in OCB. Employees who reported interactions consisting of a positive work involvement cue were 1.09 times more likely to engage in an OCB that employees who reported interactions containing a neutral or negative work involvement cue. The three inclusion practices accounted for 4% of the total variance in work engagement. The three-predictor model showed significant improvement in fit (Deviance_{3-predictor} = 1514.60) over the null model \((\chi^2(3) = 12.97, p < .001)\) and the single predictor models for inclusive leadership \((\chi^2(2) = 7.41, p = .025)\) and positive climate \((\chi^2(2) = 11.13, p = .004)\), but not for the model with work involvement as the sole predictor work \((\chi^2(2) = 2.37, p = .306)\). Taken together, these results showed that inclusion practices generally contributed uniquely to work and well-being outcomes when analyzed simultaneously, particularly work involvement and positive climate, but the associations that emerged and their magnitudes varied by outcome.
Association Between Felt Inclusion on Work and Well-Being Outcomes

Hypotheses 4a through 4d concern direct associations between felt inclusion and each work and well-being outcome—affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB. Results of simple regressions of each outcome on felt inclusion are displayed in Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21</th>
<th>Simple Multilevel Regressions of Outcomes on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predictor: Felt inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>$b$ (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State affect</td>
<td>0.44 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>0.36 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work engagement</td>
<td>0.61 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>0.08 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $b =$ unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). Dev. = Deviance. $\chi^2$ = chi-squared significance test of difference in deviance from null model. $N_{Level\ 1}$ (total observations) = 1172. $N_{Level\ 2}$ (participants) = 118.

Hypothesis 4a: Association Between Felt Inclusion and Affect

In testing Hypothesis 4a, the association between felt inclusion and employees’ state affect was significant, ($b = 0.44, p < .001$). Each unit increase in felt inclusion was associated with a 0.44 unit increase in self-reported state affect. Felt inclusion explained 23% of the
variance in affect and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 194.25$). Hypothesis 4a was supported.

**Hypothesis 4b: Association Between Felt Inclusion and Organizational Commitment**

In testing Hypothesis 4b, the association between felt inclusion and organizational commitment was significant, ($b = 0.36, p < .001$), indicating an average 0.36 unit increase in employees’ affective commitment to their organization for each unit increase in felt inclusion. Felt inclusion explained 32% of the variance in organizational commitment and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 338.28$). Hypothesis 4b was supported.

**Hypothesis 4c: Association Between Felt Inclusion and Work Engagement**

In testing Hypothesis 4c, the association between felt inclusion and work engagement was significant, ($b = 0.61, p = .001$), indicating an average 0.61 unit increase in employees’ engagement in their work for each unit increase in felt inclusion. Felt inclusion explained 24% of the variance in organizational commitment and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 215.94$). Hypothesis 4c was supported.

**Hypothesis 4d: Association Between Felt Inclusion and OCB**

In testing Hypothesis 4d, the association between felt inclusion and OCB was significant, ($b = 0.08, p < .001, OR = 1.07$). Each unit increase in felt inclusion was associated with a 7% increase in the odds that employees engaged in a work-related citizenship behavior. Felt
inclusion explained 2% of the variance in OCB and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model (χ²(1) = 17.00). Hypothesis 4b was supported.

Association Between Inclusion Practices on Felt Inclusion

Hypotheses 5 through 7 concerned direct associations between each inclusion practice—work involvement, inclusive leadership, and positive climate—with felt inclusion. Results of the simple regressions of felt inclusion on each inclusion practice are displayed in the top half of Table 22.

Table 22
Simple and Multiple Multilevel Regressions of Felt Inclusion on Inclusion Practices (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.43; 0.60</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2387.60</td>
<td>135.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.20; 0.43</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2496.10</td>
<td>26.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.38; 0.58</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2432.90</td>
<td>89.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R² Adj</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28; 0.48</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2359.80</td>
<td>162.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01; 0.24</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity climate</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16; 0.37</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. b = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of b. 95% CI = confidence interval for b; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). R² Adj = R² adjusted for number of predictors. Dev. = Deviance. χ² = chi-squared significance test of difference in deviance from null model. N_{Level 1} (total observations) = 1172. N_{Level 2} (participants) = 118. *p < .001 for χ² test.
Hypothesis 5: Association Between Work Involvement and Felt Inclusion

In testing Hypothesis 5, the association between work involvement and felt inclusion was significant, \((b = 0.51, p < .001)\), indicating that workplace interactions that involve a cue of work involvement are associated with a 0.51 unit increase in employee’s felt inclusion in response to the event compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative work involvement cue. Work involvement explained 13% of the variance in felt inclusion and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model \((\chi^2(1) = 135.23)\). Hypothesis 5 was supported.

Hypothesis 6: Association Between Inclusive Leadership and Felt Inclusion

In testing Hypothesis 6, the association between inclusive leadership and felt inclusion was significant, \((b = 0.31, p < .001)\), indicating that inclusive workplace interactions that involve a supervisor are associated with a 0.31 unit increase in employee’s felt inclusion in response to the event compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative inclusive leadership cue. Inclusive leadership explained 2% of the variance in felt inclusion and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model \((\chi^2(1) = 26.73)\). Hypothesis 6 was supported.

Hypothesis 7: Association Between Positive Climate and Felt Inclusion

In testing Hypothesis 7, the association between positive climate and felt inclusion was significant, \((b = 0.48, p < .001)\), indicating that inclusive workplace interactions that made salient a positive feature of the external work environment were associated with a 0.48 unit increase in employee’s felt inclusion in response to the event compared to interactions that involve a neutral or negative climate-related cue. Positive climate explained 9% of the variance in felt inclusion.
and showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the null model ($\chi^2(1) = 89.95$).

Hypothesis 7 was supported.

**Research Question 2: Does each inclusion predictor explain a unique proportion of variance in felt inclusion?**

A multilevel multiple regression was conducted to test whether work involvement, inclusive leadership, and positive climate simultaneously predicted employees’ degree of event-related felt inclusion. Results are displayed in the bottom half of Table 22. Coefficients for work involvement ($b = 0.38, p < .001$), inclusive leadership ($b = 0.12, p = .040$), and positive climate ($b = 0.26, p < .001$) were positive and significant. Each inclusion practice shared a significant proportion of the total (16%) variance in felt inclusion. Further, the three-predictor model showed significant improvement in fit ($\text{Deviance}_{3\text{-predictor}} = 2359.80$) over the null model ($\chi^2(3) = 162.99, p < .001$) and each single predictor model (work involvement: $\chi^2(2) = 7.39, p = .025$; inclusive leadership: $\chi^2(2) = 37.03, p < .001$; positive climate: $\chi^2(2) = 16.40, p < .001$).

**Indirect Effects of Inclusion Practices on Work and Well-being Outcomes Through Felt Inclusion.**

Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 concerning indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt inclusion were tested using the *lavaan* package in R (Rosseel, 2012). Indirect effects were examined for each inclusion practice predictor individually; the results are shown in Table 23. The three inclusion practices (work involvement, inclusive leadership, and positive climate) were then entered as simultaneous predictors in the indirect effects analysis to address Research
Table 23
Indirect Effects of Individual Inclusion Practices on Outcomes Through Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Path estimates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt inclusion → Affect</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt inclusion → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10; 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt inclusion → Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.54***</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.18; 0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt inclusion → OCB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.01; 1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt inclusion → Affect</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02; 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt inclusion → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06; 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt inclusion → Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10; 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt inclusion → OCB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01; 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt inclusion → Affect</td>
<td>0.49***</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.13; 0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt inclusion → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.16***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10; 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt inclusion → Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
<td>0.44***</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17; 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt inclusion → OCB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.97; 1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* a = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and felt inclusion. b = estimate of the association between felt inclusion and outcome controlling for inclusion practice. c = estimate of the uncontrolled association between inclusion practice and outcome (total effect). c' = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and outcome controlling for felt inclusion (direct effect). ab = estimate of the indirect association between inclusion practice and outcome through felt inclusion (product of paths a and b). S.E. = standard error of ab. CI = confidence interval of ab except when OCB is the outcome, then CI = confidence interval for OR. 95% CIs are bootstrapped estimates (10,000 iterations).

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

***p < .001.
Question #3. Thus, four separate tests of multiple indirect effects were conducted—one for each outcome (affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB)—and are shown in Table 24.

**Hypothesis 8a: Indirect Effect of Work Involvement on Affect**

The indirect effect of work involvement on employees’ state affect was positive and significant ($ab = 0.20, p < .001$). Employee reports of positive cues of work involvement were associated with increased state affect compared to employees who reported neutral or negative work involvement cues. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to work involvement cues, as the total association ($c$ path) between work involvement and affect ($b = 0.32, p < .001$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c’$ path; $b = 0.12, p = .031$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 8a.

**Hypothesis 8b: Indirect Effect of Work Involvement on Organizational Commitment**

The indirect effect of work involvement on employees’ affective commitment to their organization was positive and significant ($ab = 0.17, p < .001$). Employee reports of positive cues of work involvement were associated with increased organizational commitment compared to employees who reported neutral or negative work involvement cues. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to work involvement cues, as the total association ($c$ path) between work involvement and organizational commitment ($b = 0.18, p < .001$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c’$ path; $b = 0.01, p = .826$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 8b.
Table 24
Indirect Effects of Multiple Inclusion Practices on Outcomes Through Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Organizational commitment</th>
<th>Work engagement</th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.12†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $a$ = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and felt inclusion controlling for each other inclusion practice. $b$ = estimate of the association between felt competence and outcome controlling for all inclusion practices. $c$ = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and outcome controlling for each other inclusion practice (total effects). $c’$ = estimate of the association between each inclusion practice and outcome controlling for all other inclusion practices and felt inclusion (direct effects). $ab$ = estimate of the indirect association between inclusion practice and outcome through felt inclusion (product of paths $a$ and $b$). S.E. = standard error of $ab$. CI = confidence interval of $ab$ except for when OCB is the outcome, then CI = confidence interval for OR. 95% CI are bootstrapped estimates (10,000 iterations).

$†p < .10$.

$*p < .05$.

$**p < .01$.

$***p < .001$. 
Hypothesis 8c: Indirect Effect of Work Involvement on Work Engagement

The indirect effect of work involvement on employees’ work engagement was positive and significant ($ab = 0.28, p < .001$). Employee reports of positive cues of work involvement were associated with increased work engagement compared to employees who reported neutral or negative work involvement cues. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to work involvement cues, as the total association ($c$ path) between work involvement and work engagement ($b = 0.33, p < .001$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c’$ path; $b = 0.01, p = .376$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 8c.

Hypothesis 8d: Indirect Effect of Work Involvement on OCB

The indirect effect of work involvement on OCB was positive and significant ($ab = 0.04, p = .005$). Employees who reported positive cues of work involvement were 1.04 (95% CI [1.01; 1.07]) times more likely to engage in at least one OCB compared to employees who reported neutral or negative work involvement cues. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to work involvement cues, as the total association ($c$ path) between work involvement and work engagement ($b = 0.11, p = .001$, OR = 1.12) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c’$ path; $b = -0.07, p = .553$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 8d.
Hypothesis 9a: Indirect Effect of Inclusive Leadership on Affect

The indirect effect of inclusive leadership on employees’ state affect was positive and significant ($ab = 0.13, p < .001$). Employee reports of inclusive leader behaviors were associated with increased state affect compared to employees who reported neutral or exclusionary leader behaviors. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to events involving inclusive leader behaviors, as the total association ($c$ path) between inclusive leadership and affect ($b = 0.16, p = .027$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c’$ path; $b = 0.03, p = .628$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 9a.

Hypothesis 9b: Indirect Effect of Inclusive Leadership on Organizational Commitment

The indirect effect of inclusive leadership on employees’ affective attachment to their organization was positive and significant ($ab = 0.10, p < .001$). Employee reports of inclusive leader behaviors were associated with increased organizational commitment compared to employees who reported neutral or exclusionary leader behaviors. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to events involving inclusive leader behaviors, as the total association ($c$ path) between inclusive leadership and organizational commitment ($b = 0.18, p < .001$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c’$ path; $b = 0.08, p = .032$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 9b.

Hypothesis 9c: Indirect Effect of Inclusive Leadership on Work Engagement

The indirect effect of inclusive leadership on employees’ work engagement was positive and significant ($ab = 0.17, p < .001$). Employee reports of inclusive leader behaviors were
associated with increased work engagement compared to employees who reported neutral or exclusionary leader behaviors. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to events involving inclusive leader behaviors, as the total association ($c$ path) between inclusive leadership and work engagement ($b = 0.29$, $p = .001$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c' \text{ path}; b = 0.12$, $p = .142$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 9c.

**Hypothesis 9d: Indirect Effect of Inclusive Leadership on OCB**

The indirect effect of inclusive leadership on OCB was positive and significant ($ab = 0.03$, $p = .001$). Employees who reported cues of inclusive leader behaviors were 1.03 (95% CI [1.01; 1.04]) times more likely to engage in at least one OCB compared to employees who reported neutral or exclusionary leader behaviors. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to inclusive leadership, as the total association ($c$ path) between inclusive leadership and OCB ($b = 0.10$, $p = .013$, OR = 1.10) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c' \text{ path}; b = 0.07$, $p = .072$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 9d.

**Hypothesis 10a: Indirect Effect of Positive Climate on Affect**

The indirect effect of positive climate on employees’ state affect was positive and significant ($ab = 0.19$, $p < .001$). Employee reports of positive features of their work environments were associated with increased state affect compared to employees who reported neutral or negative work environment features. This association appears to be at least partially
explained by increased felt inclusion in response to events involving positive environmental cues, as the total association (c path) between positive climate and affect ($b = 0.32, p < .001$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c' \text{ path; } b = 0.13, p = .021$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 10a.

**Hypothesis 10b: Indirect Effect of Positive Climate on Organizational Commitment.**

The indirect effect of positive climate on employees’ affective attachment to their organization was positive and significant ($ab = 0.16, p < .001$). Employee reports of positive features of their work environments were associated with increased organizational commitment compared to employees who reported neutral or negative work environment features. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to events involving positive environmental cues, as the total association (c path) between positive climate and affect ($b = 0.17, p < .001$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($c' \text{ path; } b = 0.01, p = .649$). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 10b.

**Hypothesis 10c: Indirect Effect of Positive Climate on Work Engagement**

The indirect effect of positive climate on employees’ work engagement was positive and significant ($ab = 0.26, p < .001$). Employee reports of positive features of their work environments were associated with increased work engagement compared to employees who reported neutral or negative work environment features. This association appears to be at least partially explained by increased felt inclusion in response to events involving positive environmental cues, as the total association (c path) between positive climate and affect ($b =
0.44, \( p < .001 \) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion (\( c' \) path; \( b = 0.19, p = .025 \)). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 10c.

**Hypothesis 10d: Indirect Effect of Positive Climate on OCB**

The indirect effect of positive climate on OCB was positive but not significant (\( ab = 0.04, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.03; 0.07] \)). Among the sample, employees who reported positive features of their work environments were 1.04 (95\% CI [0.97; 1.07]) times as likely to engage in at least one OCB compared to employees who reported neutral or negative work environment features; however, these odds do not differ significantly from even. Further, the total association (\( c \) path) between positive climate and OCB was not significant (\( b = 0.05, p = .229 \)), as well as the association after controlling for felt inclusion (\( c' \) path; \( b = 0.10, p = .832 \)), offering no evidence that felt inclusion might explain this relationship. These results do not support Hypothesis 10d.

**Research Questions #3: Multiple Indirect Effects of Inclusion Practices on Outcomes Through Felt Inclusion**

**Felt Inclusion**

With affect as the outcome, there were significant indirect effects for work involvement (\( ab = 0.14, p < .001 \)) and positive climate (\( ab = 0.11, p < .001 \)) but not for inclusive leadership (\( ab = 0.05, p = .069 \)). Felt inclusion appeared to have at least partially explained these associations as the total associations (\( c \) path) for work involvement (\( b = 0.23, p < .001 \)) and positive climate (\( b = 0.20, p = .003 \)) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion (\( b = 0.09, p = .154 \) and \( b = 0.09, p = .154 \), respectively). Neither the total association nor the association controlling for felt inclusion were significant for inclusive leadership.
With organizational commitment as the outcome, there were again significant indirect effects for work involvement ($ab = 0.12, p < .001$) and positive climate ($ab = 0.09, p < .001$) but not for inclusive leadership ($ab = 0.04, p = .071$). Felt inclusion appeared to have at least partially explained these associations as the total associations ($c$ path) for work involvement ($b = 0.11, p = .007$) and positive climate ($b = 0.10, p = .004$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($b = -0.01, p = .693$ and $b = 0.01, p = .719$, respectively). For inclusive leadership, both the total association ($b = 0.12, p = .003$) and the association controlling for felt inclusion were significant ($b = 0.08, p = .032$), suggesting that felt inclusion does not have an explanatory role in this association.

A similar pattern was observed with work engagement as the outcome. There were significant indirect effects for work involvement ($ab = 0.20, p < .001$) and positive climate ($ab = 0.15, p < .001$) but not for inclusive leadership ($ab = 0.06, p = .072$). Felt inclusion appeared to have at least partially explained these associations as the total associations ($c$ path) for work involvement ($b = 0.16, p = .030$) and positive climate ($b = 0.34, p < .001$) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion ($b = -0.03, p = .587$ and $b = 0.19, p = .028$, respectively). For inclusive leadership, the total association with organizational commitment was significant ($b = 0.17, p = .044$) and this association decreased and became non-significant after controlling for felt inclusion ($b = 0.11, p = .203$). This pattern suggests that felt inclusion may have an explanatory role in this association; however, the formal test of the indirect effect was not significant.

With OCB as the outcome, there were once again significant indirect effects for work involvement ($ab = 0.03, p = .009$, OR = 1.03) and positive climate ($ab = 0.02, p = .014$, OR =
1.01) but not for inclusive leadership \((ab = 0.01, p = .083, OR = 1.02)\). Felt inclusion appeared to have at least partially explained the association between work involvement and OCB as the total association \((c \text{ path})\) for these variables \((b = 0.10, p = .013)\) decreased after controlling for felt inclusion \((b = 0.08, p = .074)\). Despite a significant indirect effect estimate, the explanatory role of felt inclusion in the association between positive climate and OCB was ambiguous given that the total association was negative and not significant \((b = -0.01, p = .865)\) as was the same association after controlling for felt inclusion \((b = -0.03, p = .572)\). Consequently, this indirect effect estimate may be unreliable, as indicated by the lower limit of its 95% CI near zero (95% CI \([0.004; .04]\)) corresponding to an OR 95% CI \([0.999; 1.02]\) essentially containing 1. The pattern in associations with inclusive leadership as the predictor was similar to prior analyses, with non-significant total and direct associations in alignment with a non-significant indirect effect estimate.

Cross-level Interactions of Individual Differences in Need to Belong and Need for Authenticity on the Relationship Between Inclusion Practices and Outcomes

Tests of cross-level interaction effects on felt inclusion were conducted in a series of multilevel regressions using the \textit{lme4} package (Bates et al., 2015) in R. As with the moderation analyses of baseline data, the hypothesized moderators (need to belong and need for authenticity) were tested in separate analyses with each inclusion practice. This resulted in six separate models for each inclusion practice and moderator combination. Results are presented in Tables 25a and 25b.
Table 25a
Cross-level Interaction Between Need to Belong (Level 2) and Inclusion Practices (Level 1) on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Dev.</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.43; 0.60</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>2386.90</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.20; 0.09</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement × Need to belong</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.07; 0.13</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI LL</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Dev.</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.20; 0.43</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>2495.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.17; 0.11</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership × Need to belong</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.11; 0.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI LL</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Dev.</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.39; 0.59</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>2432.2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.16; 0.13</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate × Need to belong</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.15; 0.07</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Need to belong was grand mean centered. $b =$ unstandardized regression coefficient. $S.E.$ = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). Dev. = deviance statistic. $\chi^2$ = chi-square test of change in deviance from model with inclusion practice as the single predictor.
Table 25b

Cross-level Interaction Between Need for Authenticity (Level 2) and Inclusion Practices (Level 1) on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Dev.</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.43; 0.60</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>2372.60</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for authenticity</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11; 0.34</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement × Need for authenticity</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.15; 0.01</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI LL</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Dev.</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19; 0.43</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>2485.60</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for authenticity</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07; 0.30</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership × Need for authenticity</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.11; 0.11</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>95% CI LL</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Dev.</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.36; 0.56</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>2410.4</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for authenticity</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12; 0.35</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate × Need for authenticity</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.26; -0.07</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Need to belong was grand mean centered. $b =$ unstandardized regression coefficient. $S.E.$ = standard error of $b$. $95\%$ CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). Dev. = deviance statistic. $\chi^2$ = chi-square test of change in deviance from model with inclusion practice as the single predictor.
Hypothesis 11a: Interaction Effects on the Relationship Between Work Involvement on Felt Inclusion

As shown in Model 1 of Table 25a, there was a significant main effect of work involvement \((b = 0.51, p < .001)\); however, neither the main effect of need to belong \((b = -0.05, p = .475)\) nor the interaction term was significant \((b = 0.03, p = .542)\). Individual differences in employees’ need to belong did not appear to influence the relationship between experiences of work involvement and felt inclusion. The current model did not provide a significant improvement to model fit compared to the model with work involvement as the sole predictor of felt inclusion \((\chi^2 = 0.68, p = .711)\).

With need for authenticity as the moderator (Model 1 of Table 25b), there were significant main effects for work involvement \((b = 0.51, p < .001)\) and need for authenticity \((b = 0.22, p < .001)\); however, the interaction term was not significant \((b = -0.07, p = .083)\). Despite a non-significant interaction, the current model fit showed a significant improvement compared to the model with work involvement as the sole predictor of felt inclusion \((\chi^2 = 14.96, p < .001)\). Although, need for authenticity appears to be related to felt inclusion, the relationship between work involvement and felt inclusion does not change significantly as a function of individual differences in need for authenticity. Hypothesis 11a was not supported.

Hypothesis 11b: Interaction Effects on the Relationship Between Inclusive Leadership on Felt Inclusion

As shown in Model 2 of Table 25a, there was a significant main effect of inclusive leadership \((b = 0.32, p < .001)\); however, neither the main effect of need to belong \((b = -0.03, p = \)
nor the interaction term were significant ($b = 0.03$, $p = .684$). Individual differences in employees’ need to belong did not appear to influence the relationship between inclusive leadership and felt inclusion did not change. The current model did not provide a significant improvement to model fit compared to the model with work involvement as the sole predictor of felt inclusion ($\chi^2 = 0.30$, $p = .863$).

With need for authenticity as the moderator (Model 2 of Table 25b), there were significant main effects for inclusive leadership ($b = 0.31$, $p < .001$) and need for authenticity ($b = 0.19$, $p = .001$), however, the interaction term was zero ($b = -0.00$, $p = .984$). Individual differences in need for authenticity had no influence on the relationship between inclusive leadership and felt inclusion. The current model showed a significant improvement in fit compared to the model with work involvement as the sole predictor of felt inclusion ($\chi^2 = 10.46$, $p = .005$), which was due to the main effect of need for authenticity. Hypothesis 11b was not supported.

**Hypothesis 11c: Interaction Effects on the Relationship Between Positive Climate on Felt Inclusion**

As shown in Model 3 of Table 25a, there was a significant main effect of positive climate ($b = 0.49$, $p < .001$); however, neither the main effect of need to belong ($b = -0.02$, $p = .810$) nor the interaction term were significant ($b = -0.04$, $p = .484$). Individual differences in employees’ need to belong did not appear to influence the relationship between positive climate cues and felt inclusion. The current model did not provide a significant improvement to model fit compared to the model with work involvement as the sole predictor of felt inclusion ($\chi^2 = 0.67$, $p = .714$).
With need for authenticity as the moderator (Model 3 of Table 25b), there were significant main effects for positive climate ($b = 0.46, p < .001$) and need for authenticity ($b = 0.24, p < .001$). Importantly, the interaction term was significant ($b = -0.16, p < .001$); although, the change in relationship is not in the hypothesized direction. For each unit increase in need for authenticity, there is a 0.16 decrease in the relationship between positive climate and felt inclusion. Simple slopes at 1 $SD$ below ($b = 0.63, S.E. = 0.07, p < .001$) and above the mean ($b = 0.29, S.E. = 0.08, p < .001$) of need for authenticity are plotted in Figure 3. The relationship between positive climate and felt inclusion remains positive and significant at increasing levels of need for authenticity; although, there is a marked decrease in the magnitude of the relationship. Further, as Figure 3 illustrates, mean levels of felt inclusion for individuals who reported neutral or negative climate cues differ at the different levels of need for authenticity. These differences attenuate for individuals who reported positive climate cues. Despite the significant interaction, Hypothesis 11c was not supported.

**Indirect Effects of Inclusion Practices on Work and Well-being Outcomes Through Felt Competence**

Hypotheses 12, 13, and 14 concerning indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt inclusion were tested using the *lavaan* package in R (Rosseel, 2012). An error in administering the daily surveys resulted in no data being collected on felt competence in daily reports. Consequently, these analyses were conducted using the weekly measurements obtained from the midpoint and exit surveys, in which employees reported perceptions of inclusion practices, felt inclusion, felt competence, and outcomes in reference to the prior work week.
These data therefore differ from the other results based on repeated measures data in that the perceptual frame of reference is within the past three hours for the daily data and the past week for the weekly data. Each individual ($N_{\text{Level 2}} = 104$) provided two measurements for each variable ($N_{\text{Level 1}} = 104$). Indirect effects were examined for each inclusion practice predictor individually. Results are shown in Table 26.

**Hypothesis 12a: Indirect Effect of Work Involvement on Affect**

The indirect effect of work involvement on employees’ positive affect through felt competence was not significant ($ab = 0.00, p = .851$). Increased perceptions of work involvement were associated with increased positive affect ($c$ path: $b = 0.37, p = .001$), and this association showed negligible change after controlling for felt competence ($c’$ path; $b = 0.36, p = .003$). Similarly, for negative affect, there was again no indirect effect of work involvement through felt competence ($ab = -0.00, p = .857$). Hypothesis 12a was not supported.

**Hypothesis 12b: Indirect Effect of Work Involvement on Organizational Commitment**

The indirect effect of work involvement on organizational commitment through felt competence was not significant ($ab = 0.00, p = .851$). Consistent with the baseline data and the daily data, there was a positive association between work involvement and organizational commitment ($c$ path: $b = 0.29, p = .049$), and this association held after controlling for felt competence ($c’$ path; $b = 0.29, p = .058$). Hypothesis 12b was not supported.
Table 26

Indirect Effects of Individual Inclusion Practices on Outcomes Through Felt Competence (Weekly Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Path estimates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → Positive affect</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.25†</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.04; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.04; 0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.28†</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → Work engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05; 0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement → Felt competence → OCB</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.37†</td>
<td>0.30†</td>
<td>0.30†</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.91; 1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → Positive affect</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.28†</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.37†</td>
<td>0.38†</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03; 0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → Work engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33†</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07; 0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership → Felt competence → OCB</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.33†</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.96; 1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt competence → Positive affect</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.21†</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04; 0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt competence → Negative affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07; 0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt competence → Org. commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt competence → Work engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26†</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05; 0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate → Felt competence → OCB</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.37†</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.89; 1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( a \) = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and felt competence. \( b \) = estimate of the association between felt competence and outcome controlling for inclusion practice. \( c \) = estimate of the uncontrolled association between inclusion practice and outcome (total effect). \( c' \) = estimate of the association between inclusion practice and outcome controlling for felt competence (direct effect). \( ab \) = estimate of the indirect association between inclusion practice and outcome through felt competence (product of paths \( a \) and \( b \)). S.E. = standard error of \( ab \). CI = confidence interval of \( ab \) except when OCB is the outcome, then CI = confidence interval for OR. 95% CIs are bootstrapped estimates (10,000 iterations).

†\( p < .10 \)

*\( p < .05 \)

**\( p < .01 \)

***\( p < .001 \)
Hypothesis 12c: Indirect Effect of Work Involvement on Work Engagement

There was no indirect effect of work involvement on employees’ work engagement through felt competence ($ab = 0.00, p = .854$). Again, there was little change to the total association ($c$ path) between work involvement and work engagement ($b = 0.31, p < .040$) after controlling for felt competence ($c’$ path; $b = 0.30, p = .049$). Hypothesis 12c was not supported.

Hypothesis 12d: Indirect Effect of Work Involvement on OCB

There was no indirect effect of work involvement on OCB through felt competence ($ab = -0.01, p = .848$). The total association ($c$ path) between work involvement and work engagement ($b = 0.30, p = .083$) and direct association after controlling for felt competence ($c’$ path; $b = 0.30, p = .063$) were similar; although; both were not significant. Hypothesis 12d was not supported.

Hypothesis 13a: Indirect Effect of Inclusive Leadership on Affect

The indirect effect of inclusive leadership on employees’ positive affect through felt competence was not significant ($ab = -0.02, p = .494$). The total association ($c$ path) between inclusive leadership and positive affect was also not significant ($b = 0.26, p = .118$). Similarly, for negative affect, there was again no indirect effect ($ab = 0.01, p = .553$). Hypothesis 13a was not supported.

Hypothesis 13b: Indirect Effect of Inclusive Leadership on Organizational Commitment

The indirect effect of inclusive leadership on organizational commitment through felt competence was not significant ($ab = -0.01, p = .505$). There was a positive, although non-
significant, total association between inclusive leadership and organizational commitment (c path: $b = 0.37, p = .083$), and this association held after controlling for felt competence (c’ path; $b = 0.38, p = .085$). Hypothesis 13b was not supported.

Hypothesis 13c: Indirect Effect of Inclusive Leadership on Work Engagement

There was no indirect effect of inclusive leadership on employees’ work engagement through felt competence ($ab = -0.02, p = .495$) through felt competence. Again, there was little change to the total association (c path) between inclusive leadership and work engagement ($b = 0.27, p = .233$) after controlling for felt competence (c’ path; $b = 0.29, p = .234$); although, both were not significant. Hypothesis 13c was not supported.

Hypothesis 13d: Indirect Effect of Inclusive Leadership on OCB

There was no indirect effect of inclusive leadership on OCB through felt competence ($ab = 0.02, p = .521$). The total association (c path) between work involvement and work engagement ($b = 0.40, p = .145$) and direct association after controlling for felt competence (c’ path; $b = 0.38, p = .146$) were also not significant. Hypothesis 13d was not supported.

Hypothesis 14a: Indirect Effect of Diversity Climate on Affect

The indirect effect of diversity climate on employees’ positive affect through felt competence was not significant ($ab = 0.02, p = .535$). The total association between diversity climate and positive affect was significant (c path: $b = 0.50, p < .001$) and showed negligible change after controlling for felt competence (c’ path; $b = 0.48, p < .001$). The indirect effect on
negative affect was also not significant ($ab = -0.01, p = .597$), not were the total association ($c$ path: $b = -0.20, p = .131$) and direct association ($c’$ path; $b = -0.19, p = .114$). Hypothesis 14a was not supported.

**Hypothesis 14b: Indirect Effect of Diversity Climate on Organizational Commitment**

There was no indirect effect of diversity climate on organizational commitment through felt competence ($ab = 0.01, p = .678$). There was a positive total association between diversity climate and organizational commitment ($c$ path: $b = 0.44, p = .002$), and this association held after controlling for felt competence ($c’$ path; $b = 0.44, p = .003$). Hypothesis 14b was not supported.

**Hypothesis 14c: Indirect Effect of Diversity Climate on Work Engagement**

There was no indirect effect of diversity climate on work engagement through felt competence ($ab = 0.02, p = .549$). There was a positive total association between diversity climate and work engagement ($c$ path: $b = 0.47, p = .003$), and this association remained after controlling for felt competence ($c’$ path; $b = 0.45, p = .005$). Hypothesis 14c was not supported.

**Hypothesis 14d: Indirect Effect of Diversity Climate on OCB**

There was no indirect effect of diversity climate on OCB through felt competence ($ab = -0.03, p = .422$). The total association between diversity climate and work engagement was also not significant ($c$ path: $b = 0.04, p = .845$) as was the direct association after controlling for felt competence ($c’$ path; $b = 0.07, p = .739$). Hypothesis 14d was not supported.
Exploratory Tests of Subgroup Differences

Exploratory interaction tests were conducted to examine whether the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion differed by age, gender, race, psychological disability, physical disability, and cognitive disability. A separate multilevel regression was run for each subgroup and included main effects for subgroup, the three inclusion practices (work involvement, inclusive leadership, and positive climate), and the interaction between the subgroup and each inclusion practices. Results are presented in Tables 27-32.

Table 27 shows the results of the cross-level interaction test of the effect of age (Level 2) on the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (Level 1). Age was grand mean centered given that it is a Level 2 variable and to improve interpretation of any significant main effects. There were significant main effects of each lower order predictors on felt inclusion: age \((b = 0.02, p = .001)\), work involvement \((b = 0.38, p < .001)\), inclusive leadership \((b = 0.10, p = .037)\), and positive climate \((b = 0.28, p = .001)\). Only the interaction between age and positive climate was significant \((b = -0.02, p = .001)\). The positive relationship between positive climate and felt inclusion is attenuated as age increases.

Table 28 shows the results of the cross-level interaction test of the effect of gender (Level 2) on the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (Level 1). Gender was a binary categorical variable representing men (coded as 0) and women (coded as 1). There were significant main effects for gender \((b = -0.27, p = .033)\) and work involvement \((b = 0.33, p < .001)\). No interactions were statistically significant; although, the interaction between gender and positive climate approached significance \((b = 0.21, p = .065)\). The positive relationship between differently, positive climate appears to have a buffering effect on the negative relationship
### Table 27

Exploratory Cross-level Interaction Between Age (Level 2) and Inclusion Practices (Level 1) on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01; 0.04</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28; 0.48</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01; 0.24</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17; 0.39</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement × Age</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.01</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership × Age</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.01</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate × Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.04; -0.01</td>
<td>-3.69</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Level 1 $N = 1172$; Level 2 $N = 118$. Age was grand mean centered. Work involvement, Inclusive Leadership, and Positive climate are categorical variables ($0 =$ cue not referenced in daily report, $1 =$ cue referenced in daily report). $b =$ unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). $R^2 =$ overall proportion of model variance accounted for by predictors.
Table 28
Exploratory Cross-level Interaction Between Gender (Level 2) and Inclusion Practices (Level 1) on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.52; -0.02</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19; 0.47</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.03; 0.33</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.31</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement × Gender</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.10; 0.29</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership × Gender</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.27; 0.20</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate × Gender</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.01; 0.43</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Level 1 $N = 1161$; Level 2 $N = 117$. Gender is a categorical variable (0 = Men, 1 = Women). Work involvement, Inclusive Leadership, and Positive climate are categorical variables (0 = cue not referenced in daily report, 1 = cue referenced in daily report). $b =$ unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). $R^2 =$ overall proportion of model variance accounted for by predictors.
positive climate and felt inclusion was amplified for women compared to men, or, stated between being a woman (vs. a man) and felt inclusion.

Table 29 shows the results of the cross-level interaction test of the effect of race (Level 2) on the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (Level 1). Race was a binary categorical variable representing employees who reported as White (coded as 0) and employees who reported as Black (coded as 1). There were significant main effects work involvement ($b = 0.40, p < .001$) and positive climate ($b = 0.26, p < .001$). No interactions were significant.

Table 30 shows the results of the cross-level interaction test of the effect of psychological disability (Level 2) on the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (Level 1). Psychological disability was a binary categorical variable represented by employees who reported having no disability (coded as 0) and employees who reported having a psychological disability (coded as 1). There were significant main effects of psychological disability ($b = -0.41, p = .003$), work involvement ($b = 0.35, p < .001$), and positive climate ($b = 0.19, p = .003$). No interactions were significant, but the interaction between psychological disability and positive climate approached significance ($b = 0.22, p = .070$). The positive relationship between positive climate and felt inclusion was amplified for workers with a psychological disability, or, stated differently, positive climate appears to have a buffering effect on the negative relationship between having a psychological disability (vs. not having a disability) and felt inclusion.

Table 31 shows the results of the cross-level interaction test of the effect of physical disability (Level 2) on the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (Level 1). Physical disability was a binary categorical variable represented by employees who reported not having a disability (coded as 0) and employees who reported having a physical disability (coded
Table 29

Exploratory Cross-level Interaction Between Race (Level 2) and Inclusion Practices (Level 1) on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.09; 0.53</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28; 0.52</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04; 0.25</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13; 0.39</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement × Race</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.31; 0.25</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership × Race</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.15; 0.45</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate × Race</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.37; 0.30</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Level 1 $N = 1016$; Level 2 $N = 104$. Race is a categorical variable (0 = White, 1 = Black). Work involvement, Inclusive Leadership, and Positive climate are categorical variables (0 = cue not referenced in daily report, 1 = cue referenced in daily report). $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). $R^2$ = overall proportion of model variance accounted for by predictors.
Table 30

Exploratory Cross-level Interaction Between Psychological Disability (Level 2) and Inclusion Practices (Level 1) on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological disability</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.67; -0.14</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24; 0.47</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.26</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06; 0.32</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement × Psychological disability</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.16; 0.26</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership × Psychological disability</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.26; 0.25</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate × Psychological disability</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02; 0.45</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Level 1 N = 1139; Level 2 N = 114. Psychological disability is a categorical variable (0 = No disability, 1 = Physical disability). Work involvement, Inclusive Leadership, and Positive climate are categorical variables (0 = cue not referenced in daily report, 1 = cue referenced in daily report). b = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of b. 95% CI = confidence interval for b; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). R² = overall proportion of model variance accounted for by predictors.
Table 31

Exploratory Cross-level Interaction Between Physical Disability (Level 2) and Inclusion Practices (Level 1) on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.50; 0.22</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26; 0.47</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.05; 0.21</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12; 0.36</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement × Physical disability</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.22; 0.35</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership × Physical disability</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03; 0.76</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate × Physical disability</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.19; 0.50</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Level 1 $N = 1150$; Level 2 $N = 116$. Physical disability is a categorical variable (0 = No disability, 1 = Physical disability). Work involvement, Inclusive Leadership, and Positive climate are categorical variables (0 = cue not referenced in daily report, 1 = cue referenced in daily report). $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. S.E. = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). $R^2$ = overall proportion of model variance accounted for by predictors.
as 1). There were significant main effects of physical disability \( (b = -0.14, p = .003) \), work involvement \( (b = 0.36, p < .001) \), and positive climate \( (b = 0.24, p < .001) \). There was a significant interaction between physical disability and inclusive leadership \( (b = 0.39, p = .034) \). The positive relationship between positive climate and felt inclusion was amplified for workers with a physical disability, or, stated differently, positive climate appears to have a buffering effect on the negative relationship between having a physical disability (vs. not having a disability) and felt inclusion.

Table 32 shows the results of the cross-level interaction test of the effect of cognitive disability (Level 2) on the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (Level 1). Cognitive disability was a binary categorical variable represented by employees who reported not having a disability (coded as 0) and employees who reported having a cognitive disability (coded as 1). There were significant main effects of work involvement \( (b = 0.36, p < .001) \) and positive climate \( (b = 0.26, p < .001) \). There were no significant interactions, but the interaction between cognitive disability and work involvement approached significance \( (b = 0.62, p = .077) \). The positive relationship between work involvement and felt inclusion was amplified for workers with a cognitive disability compared to workers with no disability.
Table 32
Exploratory Cross-level Interaction Between Cognitive Disability (Level 2) and Inclusion Practices (Level 1) on Felt Inclusion (Daily Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive disability</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.50; 0.22</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26; 0.47</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.05; 0.21</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12; 0.36</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement × Cognitive disability</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.22; 0.35</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership × Cognitive disability</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.03; 0.76</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate × Cognitive disability</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.19; 0.50</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Level 1 $N = 1172$; Level 2 $N = 118$. Cognitive disability is a categorical variable (0 = No disability, 1 = Cognitive disability). Work involvement, Inclusive Leadership, and Positive climate are categorical variables (0 = cue not referenced in daily report, 1 = cue referenced in daily report). $b =$ unstandardized regression coefficient. $S.E.$ = standard error of $b$. 95% CI = confidence interval for $b$; values reflect lower limit (left) and upper limit (right). $R^2 =$ overall proportion of model variance accounted for by predictors.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

The primary goal of the current study was to clarify relationships among variables commonly examined in workplace inclusion research and, in doing so, provide needed empirical support for current workplace inclusion theory. Additionally, I sought to extend current theory by testing boundary conditions and alternative explanatory pathways of previously established relationships.

Toward the primary goal, I reviewed the workplace inclusion literature and identified two broad classifications of workplace inclusion constructs: inclusion practices and felt inclusion. I further identified four specific types of inclusion constructs: work involvement, inclusive leadership, diversity climate, and felt inclusion—that were most relevant in terms of their prevalence in empirical research and the strength of their underlying theory. I used the Shore et al. (2011) model of workplace inclusion as an organizing framework and basis for hypothesis development and proposed that inclusion practices (work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity climate) are indirectly related to employee well-being and work outcomes (affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCBs) through felt inclusion.

Toward the secondary goal of extending theory, I first tested whether individual differences in the strength of needs underlying the conceptual definition of felt inclusion (i.e., need to belong and need for authenticity) moderated the relationships between inclusion
practices and felt inclusion. I also tested felt competence as an alternative pathway by which inclusion practices are associated with outcomes. Additionally, I explored subgroup differences in the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion.

I tested hypotheses and research questions by using a multiphasic data collection strategy. I first collected between-person measurements obtained from a baseline survey that assessed employees’ general perceptions of inclusion and associated experiences at work, as well as individual differences. I then used a daily diary method to collect repeated measurements that assessed inclusion and associated experiences based on interactions or communications occurring during employees’ workdays. Finally, I collected additional information based on employees’ weekly perceptions of inclusion and associated experiences at the midpoint and end of the study. This approach allowed for (a) attempted replication of associations derived from between-person, cross-sectional survey studies common in the workplace inclusion literature, (b) comparisons of results based on general perceptions versus twice-daily or weekly perceptions that might lend insight into differences in data quality or measurement precision, (c) representative sampling of day-to-day workplace inclusion cues from repeated measurements, and (d) formal tests of within-person differences in inclusion experiences across time as suggested in prior research (Ferdman, 2014; Jansen et al., 2019).

Summary of Results

Overall, there was general support for hypotheses derived from the original Shore et al. (2011) model (Hypotheses 1 through 10). This support was consistent across the baseline survey data and daily survey data with a few exceptions. Hypotheses 1-3 predicting positive bivariate
associations between inclusion practices (work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity/positive climate) and outcomes (affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB) were all supported in the baseline data and the daily data, except for the association between positive climate and OCB in the daily data.

When the three inclusion practices were examined for simultaneous associations with outcomes (Research Question #1), results varied somewhat. In the both the baseline data and daily data, work involvement and diversity/positive climate were the most consistent predictors of outcomes. Both were positively associated with three of the four outcomes (affect, organizational commitment, and work engagement) in the daily data, but only work involvement was associated with OCB in the daily data. Moreover, in the daily data, the only outcome to which inclusive leadership was significantly related was organizational commitment. Similarly, in the baseline data, work involvement and diversity climate were positively associated with positive affect, negative affect, and organizational commitment. Only diversity climate was positively associated with work engagement. Work involvement was the only significant and positive predictor of OCB.

Regarding associations between felt inclusion and outcomes, Hypothesis 4 also received support in both the baseline data and the daily data. Felt inclusion was associated with all outcomes in the hypothesized directions. Hypotheses 5-7, concerning associations between inclusion practices and felt inclusion, were also universally supported by baseline data and daily data. Individual bivariate relationships with felt inclusion were significant for each inclusion practice. Furthermore, these associations remained significant when the three inclusion practices were examined as simultaneous predictors of felt inclusion (Research Question #2).
Indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt inclusion, addressed by Hypotheses 8-10, were largely supported. As individual predictors, all inclusion practices were indirectly related to all outcomes (affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB) through felt inclusion. This was true in both the baseline data and the daily data, except for the indirect effect of work involvement on OCB through felt inclusion in the baseline data.

However, in addressing Research Question #3, simultaneous indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt inclusion varied by outcome. For both positive affect and negative affect, only diversity climate emerged as an indirect predictor through felt inclusion. For the outcomes of organizational commitment and work engagement, work involvement and diversity climate emerged as indirect predictors through felt inclusion. For OCB, there were no significant indirect effects of any of the three inclusion practices through felt inclusion. In the daily data, simultaneous indirect effects were more consistent than in the baseline data. For all outcomes (affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB), there were significant indirect effects of work involvement and positive climate, but not for inclusive leadership \((p < .10)\) through felt inclusion.

Hypotheses 11-14 concerned extensions to the original Shore et al. (2011) model. Hypothesis 11a-11c proposed that associations between inclusion practices and felt inclusion would be moderated by individual differences in the strengths of individuals’ need to belong and need for authenticity. In the baseline data, with all variables measured at the between-person level, no interactions were significant. Similar results were obtained for the cross-level interaction tests with the daily data with one exception. The association between positive climate and felt inclusion at Level 1 was moderated by individual differences in the need for authenticity.
at Level 2. However, the nature of the interaction was counter to the hypothesis. The positive relationship between positive climate and felt inclusion attenuated at increasing levels of need for authenticity.

Hypotheses 12-14 proposed an alternative pathway by which inclusion practices are associated with outcomes through felt competence. These hypotheses were largely unsupported in the repeated measures (weekly) data. In the baseline data, there were significant individual indirect effects of each inclusion practice on positive affect and work engagement through felt competence. When examined as simultaneous predictors, only the indirect effect of work involvement through felt competence emerged for positive affect and work engagement. In the weekly data, no individual indirect effects of inclusion practices on any outcome through felt competence were significant. Given that no indirect effects emerged individually for any combination of inclusion practices and outcomes, simultaneous indirect effects through felt competence were not explored in the daily data.

Finally, exploratory tests of cross-level interactions examined the effect of subgroups (Level 2) on the relationship between inclusion practices and felt inclusion (Level 1). Age, gender (men vs. women), race (White vs. Black), psychological disability, physical disability, and cognitive disability (no disability, vs. have a disability) were the subgroups examined in the current study. There were main effects of age, gender, psychological disability, and physical disability on felt inclusion, but the nature of these relationships varied by subgroup. There were no main effects of race or cognitive disability. In terms of interactions, there was a significant age × positive climate interactions and a physical disability × positive climate interaction. There were also interactions for gender, psychological disability, and cognitive disability, that
approached significance ($ps = .065, .070, \text{ and } .077$, respectively). The nature of the interactions varied. Some suggested a buffering effect of inclusion practices on the negative relationship between subgroup and felt inclusion, as with the disability subgroups. One suggested an exacerbating effect of subgroup (gender) on the positive relationship between inclusion practice and felt inclusion. One suggested an attenuating effect of subgroup (age) on the positive relationship between inclusion practice and felt inclusion.

Implications

As intended, the contributions of the current study were primarily theoretical. Results of Hypotheses 1-10 provide much needed empirical support for the Shore et al. (2011) model of inclusion antecedents and outcomes—a prominent, heavily cited, and widely accepted, yet, severely undertested, model of workplace inclusion. In a variety of analyses using both between-person and repeated-measures data, I found support for the general hypothesis that contextual antecedents in the form workplace diversity and/or inclusion-related cues are associated with employee well-being and work outcomes and these relationships are indirectly linked through employees’ feelings of inclusion. Support for the model was demonstrated in the current study through associations representing the individual paths in the model, as well as the indirect paths that reflect the full model.

First, the link between perceived inclusion practices and individual well-being and work outcomes is well substantiated in the workplace inclusion literature. These relationships, depicted generally as the $c$ path in Figure 1, are reflective of the bulk of workplace inclusion studies. Results of Hypotheses 1-3 in the current study, therefore, conceptually replicate
associations from a variety of existing studies and support the common conclusion that perceptions of inclusion is beneficial for workers. Conversely, the link between inclusion practices and felt inclusion, depicted generally as the a path in Figure 1, has received very little attention in workplace inclusion research or, for that matter, acknowledgement that these might be separate, yet related, concepts. Rather, research studies involving these inclusion concepts have largely proceeded independently of one another. As such, the results of Hypotheses 5-7 in the current study provide much needed evidence of the link between inclusion practices and inclusion feelings and, equally as important, their distinction. Third, the link between felt inclusion and well-being and work outcomes, depicted generally as the b path in Figure 1, is moderately represented across conceptual research and, to a lesser degree, empirical research. Therefore, findings from Hypotheses 4a-4c balance both confirmatory and replicative contributions.

Collectively, the results of Hypotheses 1-10 help to clarify the inclusion concept in several ways. In addition to replicating associations between inclusion practices and outcomes, the current study extended this contribution by examining multiple prominent inclusion practices—work involvement, inclusive leadership, and diversity/positive climate—and multiple well-being and work outcomes—affect, organizational commitment, work engagement, and OCB—together in one study. The specific outcomes chosen for this study have all been theoretically and/or empirically linked to inclusion in prior research. However, examining these outcomes together in the current study had additional benefits of (1) providing further construct validation of workplace inclusion by demonstrating association with a range of theoretically relevant outcomes and (2) demonstrating the robustness of workplace inclusion’s effectiveness.
through associations with affective (positive/negative affect), cognitive (organizational commitment, work engagement), and behavioral outcomes (OCB).

Regarding the benefits of examining multiple inclusion practices, one interesting finding was the consistency of work involvement and diversity/positive climate, but not inclusive leadership, to emerge as predictors of outcomes in most of the multiple regression analyses. This pattern of associations also borne out in the indirect effects analyses. These findings are consistent with the prevailing idea that the general workplace inclusion construct is a multifaceted concept comprised of diversity/social climate components and work/participation components, and each plays a unique role in facilitating a range of beneficial employee outcomes (Ferdman, 2014; Mor Barak, 2014; Shore et al., 2018). Future research can build on this finding with more detailed attempts at differentiating inclusion practice constructs, such as diversity/social climate and work involvement. Insights from such investigations can shed light on the factor structure of workplace inclusion (i.e., unidimensional versus multidimensional versus hierarchical), differential associations with felt inclusion, well-being, and work outcomes, and the mechanisms underlying associations with felt inclusion and outcomes. For example, it could be that different serial processes are linking different inclusion practices to outcomes. Perhaps, diversity/social practices elicit felt inclusion via social identification (e.g., “I am valued/included for my race, gender, disability, etc.”) while work involvement practices elicit felt inclusion via occupational identification (e.g., “I am valued/included for my work contributions.”), and, in turn, these serial processes are associated with well-being and work outcomes.
The inability of inclusive leadership to emerge as a predictor in these analyses might be due to conceptual overlap with work involvement and, perhaps, to some degree, diversity/positive climate. Similar sub-dimensions comprised the measures of inclusive leadership and work involvement used in the baseline survey. For example, the participative decision-making sub-dimension in the inclusive leadership measure was very similar to the influence in decision-making sub-dimension in the work involvement measure. There were also sub-dimensions in both measures that tapped information sharing. Further, the work involvement measure had a second set of dimensions that assessed inclusion perceptions at different levels of the organization including leadership positions of supervisor and higher management.

This construct conflation likely occurred in the daily data as well. The coding of inclusion practices from daily reports inevitably involved some overlap as experiences that involved one’s supervisor(s) often also involved features of work involvement (e.g., a supervisor soliciting a subordinate’s opinion; a supervisor sharing work-related information with a subordinate). Thus, whether conceptually similar or an artifact of the coding scheme, a common component underlying work involvement and inclusive leadership likely contributed to variance in outcomes, providing no unique variance for inclusive leadership to predict.

That said, it is fair to note that the correlations between work involvement and inclusive leadership were .58 at baseline and .29 in the daily data; the correlation between diversity climate and inclusive leadership at baseline was .58 and between positive climate and inclusive leadership in the daily data was .18. Therefore, the relatedness of these constructs may not fully explain this pattern of results. It could be that cues of work involvement and cues of diversity or social climate simply weigh more heavily than leader behavior cues in shaping employees’
inclusion experiences, whether based on general perceptions or event specific perceptions. This explanation is supported by the fact that coefficients for inclusive leadership, although not significant, were consistently associated with a $p$-value < .10 in the daily data. Thus, it appears that inclusive leadership was marginal contributor to variance in outcomes when competing with work involvement and diversity/social climate but did not fully emerge in analyses based on conventions for statistical significance. Future research might address this by more precisely distinguishing inclusive leader behaviors from other inclusion practice constructs to understand if and when inclusive leadership is an effective predictor of outcomes above and beyond other inclusion practice construct and the mechanisms that might drive these associations.

The current study also provided evidence that inclusion practices and felt inclusion are distinct, yet related inclusion constructs. This was demonstrated through direct associations between inclusion practices and felt inclusion, as well as indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt inclusion. Elsewhere in the literature, this distinction has received theoretical support (Ferdman, 2014; Shore et al., 2011), but only one known study has provided empirical support (Chung et al., 2020), albeit not explicitly and with an inclusion measure that appears to conflate perceived practices with feelings. Thus, there was a strong need for a direct investigation of the nature of this relationship using measures that more closely approximate the conceptual definitions of inclusion as a practice and inclusion as a felt experience.

In doing so, the current study is also one of only two known studies (i.e., Chung et al., 2020) that have tested and demonstrated support for the full Shore et al. model. Further, the current study demonstrated this support using independent inclusion practice constructs that are well-established in the literature but had yet to be conceptually or empirically linked. Thus, not
only does the current study provide support for a prominent model of inclusion antecedents and outcomes, it also positions existing constructs into a unifying theoretical framework. Future research should continue to distinguish inclusion practices and felt inclusion constructs in their measurement strategies to further flesh out relationships and distinctions with other inclusion practices and their effectiveness in predicting work outcomes. Further, conflating inclusion practices and felt inclusion, as past research has often done (see Table 1) could compromise construct validity and yield inconclusive results.

The current study also sought to extend the basic antecedent-outcome model of workplace inclusion (Shore et al., 2011) by investigating potential individual differences moderators of the inclusion practice-felt inclusion relationships and an alternative pathway by which indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes might occur. These attempted extensions were motivated primarily by theory development rather than practicality. Thus, decisions around which moderators or theoretical “mediators” were motivated by goals to examine the validity of the inclusion concept and theoretical model.

Individual differences in the strength of the need to belong and the strength of the need for authenticity were tested as potential moderators given their clear conceptual link to the components underlying the definition of felt inclusion (Jansen et al., 2014; Shore et al., 2011). The rationale was that if features of the work environment, such as perceived inclusion practices, cue felt inclusion experiences, defined as the satisfaction of needs for belonging and/or authenticity, then differences in the degree to which individuals have a trait desire to fulfill those needs should influence their ability to translate perceived inclusion practices into felt inclusion experiences (i.e., needs satisfaction). Those with a higher need to belong or need for authenticity
should be more likely to attend to and interpret cues of inclusion into felt experiences. Despite this rationale, the data did not support the hypothesis.

One explanation of this finding may be that the motivations underlying the need to belong (as defined by Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and workplace inclusion (as defined by Jansen et al., 2014 and Shore et al., 2011) are not in alignment. The experience of inclusion as defined in the current study is a qualitatively positive experience in which one’s inclusion in the group is based on acceptance of the individual and value in their unique identity. As such, felt inclusion is associated with a host of positive well-being indicators, such as increased self-esteem, positive affect, and psychological safety (Jansen et al., 2014). Conversely, having a strong need to belong is experientially negative and driven by fear of interpersonal rejection and social exclusion (Valcke et al., 2019). As such, individuals with higher mean levels of the need to belong, as measured with the Need to Belong Scale (Leary et al., 2012), tend to report lower self-esteem, lower subjective well-being, more relationship-specific anxiety, poorer general mental health, and lower satisfaction of the need for relatedness than individuals with lower mean levels of the need to belong (Pillow et al., 2015; Valcke et al., 2019). Thus, when confronted with potential gestures of workplace inclusion, individuals with a strong need to belong may adopt avoidance-oriented strategies for maintaining their inclusion status, such as conformity, or focus on seeking out additional cues of acceptance (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Valcke et al., 2019). Consequently, these individuals are unlikely to translate inclusion cues into satisfaction of inclusion needs.

Further supporting this explanation, a recent study demonstrated the distinction between the need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and a new construct labeled the need for
inclusion (Valcke et al., 2019). In contrast to the need to belong, the need for inclusion was conceptualized as an approach-oriented motivation toward relational (interpersonal) inclusion and collective (group) inclusion and, therefore, is theorized to be a qualitatively positive experience. In support of this hypothesis, Valcke and colleagues found positive associations between need for inclusion and multiple indicators of individual well-being and social well-being, and negative associations between the need to belong and these indicators. Need for inclusion, therefore, might be more conceptually aligned with workplace inclusion than need to belong and better serve as an individual difference variable to investigate in relation to workplace inclusion experiences. Future research can directly address this by assessing employees’ need for inclusion using the scale validated by Valcke et al. (2019).

Another explanation is that individuals’ strength of their need to belong or their need for authenticity are simply not effective at influencing the extent to which inclusion practices are attended to and translated into felt inclusion experiences. This explanation is supported in the current study by follow-up correlation analysis showing that need to belong and need for authenticity were uncorrelated with the frequency of reported inclusion practices ($r$ ranged from -.01 to .06). To the extent that frequency of reported inclusion practices is a proxy for attention to inclusion practices, this offers some evidence that this attention does not covary with need to belong or need for authenticity. Further, despite significant, positive relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion, and a significant, positive relationship between the need for authenticity and felt inclusion, no interactions between felt inclusion and inclusion practices emerged. This suggests that, although trait level need for authenticity may have a bivariate
association with employees’ degree of felt inclusion, need for authenticity does not appear to influence the degree to which inclusion practices are translated to felt inclusion.

The second attempted extension of workplace inclusion theory involved testing indirect effects of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt competence. Support for this hypothesis was limited to the baseline data. All inclusion practices were indirectly related to all outcomes through felt competence when analyzed as individual predictors, providing some support for felt competence as a viable mechanism linking inclusion practices to outcomes. However, in indirect effects analysis that included all inclusion practices predictors simultaneously, only work involvement was indirectly related to positive affect and work engagement through felt competence. This finding aligns with the rationale that inclusion practices comprised of task-related cues may influence work outcomes by providing employees with a sense that they can be productive and complete work tasks effectively (i.e., felt competence).

It makes sense, then, that work involvement emerged as the primary predictor in tests of multiple indirect effects through felt competence as it involves cues such as information sharing, influence in decision-making, participation in meetings that have utility in promoting task performance. Diversity/positive climate may be more likely to evoke felt inclusion compared to felt competence as a pathway to outcomes given that it comprises components of individual identity, interpersonal interactions, and fairness/equity. Thus, relative to work involvement, diversity/positive climate might be relatively more in tune with the social identity components that drive the felt inclusion mechanism, whereas, relative to diversity/positive climate, work involvement might be relatively more in tune with the occupational/performance components that drive the felt competence mechanism.
However, it is worth noting that none of the indirect effects of inclusion practices through felt competence emerged in the weekly data, so the baseline results should be interpreted cautiously. The lack of replication across baseline and weekly data might suggest that the results are unreliable. Alternatively, if taken at face value, the results might suggest that indirect effects through felt competence are more susceptible to general perceptions than perceptions based on specific events within shorter time intervals. Either way, more research is needed to strengthen conclusions regarding the role that felt competence plays in employees’ workplace inclusion experiences.

The current study also has implications for subgroup differences in workplace inclusion experiences; although, these should be interpreted cautiously given that these analyses were exploratory. Nonetheless, there were several notable findings that provide insight and raise additional questions. One interesting pattern of results were the differences in the direct associations between subgroups and felt inclusion. Increased age was associated with higher mean levels of felt inclusion, whereas women (vs. men) and having a psychological disability or physical (vs. not having a disability) were associated with lower mean levels of felt inclusion. This has implications for the formation of hypotheses about associations between subgroups and diversity and inclusion experiences.

Decisions to include subgroups in diversity and inclusion studies typically center around comparisons of subgroups who have been targets of stigma (e.g., prejudice, discrimination, negative reactions form others, marginalization) and those who have not been targets of stigma. Hypotheses in these studies are often guided by stigma theory (e.g., Goffman, 1963; Crocker et al., 1998) which generally adopts a one-size-fits-all perspective on the experiences of members
of stigmatized groups. This approach suggests that people who are stigmatized generally have negative experiences with regard to social inclusion and psychological well-being. Alternative perspectives suggest that there may be differences in stigma experiences based on the stigmatized attribute or subgroup (Jones et al., 1984; Pachankis et al., 2017) and interactions with situational stimuli might further affect these experiences (Keating & Santuzzi, 2016). The direct associations in the current study generally align with the former perspective as relationships between subgroups and felt inclusion were negative (except for age).

The different associations for age (positive) compared to gender, psychological disability, and physical disability (negative) might be explained by the relative stigma or inclusion experiences of these groups. With regard to disability, research suggests that, although stigma exists on the basis of age, gender, and disability, individuals may be stigmatized more heavily on the basis of disability than on the basis of more prominent subgroups such as age, gender, and race (Pachankis et al., 2017), and this may be particularly so for psychological disabilities (Corrigan & Watson, 2002). The increased stigma toward people with disabilities may be driven by higher levels of discomfort with disability (vs. age, gender, or race) in the general population. It may also be driven by the fact that most disabilities are invisible to some degree, which presents difficulties with disclosure and the ability to develop support networks relative to those with visible stigmatized identities.

The different associations with felt inclusion for age versus gender, psychological disability, physical disability might also be a reflection of targeting by organizational inclusion efforts. These efforts tend to focus disproportionately on prominent subgroup categories, and relatively visible features, such as age, gender, and race, and less so on disability and visible
features (Casey, 2020). This is reflected broadly in lower workplace representation rates for persons with disabilities compared to gender or racial minorities (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023). However, women in the current study reported lower levels of inclusion than men, suggesting that, despite the possibility of increased inclusion efforts for prominent, visible subgroups, like gender, perceptions of inclusion might still lag relative to men.

Taken together, women and workers with disabilities in the current study might experience lower levels of felt inclusion than their counterparts due to increased stigma and or a lack of inclusion cues during work interactions. Follow-up analysis of the baseline data (general perceptions) provides some support for this explanation. While, age \( (r = .13, p = .117) \) and gender \( (t[140] = -1.06, p = .292) \) were unrelated to general perceptions of felt inclusion at work, having a psychological disability was significantly associated with lower felt inclusion, \( t(134) = 2.38, p = .005 \). Further, these differences could also be partially driven by differences in individual inclusion needs. Particularly regarding age, it could be that as individuals get older, concerns about social acceptance fade. This explanation is supported in the current study as age was negatively associated with the need to belong \( (r = -.32, p < .001) \) and positively associated with the need for authenticity \( (r = .39, p < .001) \).

Perhaps more importantly, subgroup differences in felt inclusion were also evident in interactions with inclusion practices, and the nature of these interactions differed by subgroup. The interaction between age and positive climate was negative, suggesting that the positive relationship between positive climate and felt inclusion attenuates at increasing levels of age. In other words, positive climate cues are less likely to be translated into felt inclusion as age increases. This aligns with the proposition that inclusion needs might fade as individuals get
older. For physical disability, the interaction with positive climate was positive, suggesting a buffering of the negative relationship between physical disability and felt inclusion when inclusive leadership cues were present. This aligns with past research showing that diversity and inclusion climate facilitate positive outcomes for historically stigmatized groups (e.g., Gonzalez & DeNisi, 2009; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998).

There were other cross-level subgroup effects on the relationships between inclusion practices and felt inclusion that approached significance. The interaction between gender and positive climate ($p = 0.065$) was positive, suggesting a similar buffering effect of climate found with physical disability. The mean difference in felt inclusion favoring men over women appears to attenuate at increasing levels of positive climate. A similar pattern emerged for psychological disability, as the interaction with positive climate was positive ($p = 0.070$). The mean difference in felt inclusion favoring employees without a disability over employees with a psychological disability appears to attenuate at increasing levels of positive climate. An opposite pattern of results emerged with regard cognitive disability and work involvement. The main effect of cognitive disability was positive, yet not significant. The interaction between cognitive disability and work involvement ($p = 0.077$) was positive. This suggests having a cognitive disability might be related to increased levels of felt inclusion and cues of work involvement exacerbate this association.

Overall, this pattern of results suggests that subgroup membership interacts with inclusion cues to influence felt inclusion experiences. However, the relevant cues in these interactions differ by subgroup. Positive climate was the primary cue in interactions with age, gender, and psychological disability suggesting that external indicators of the work climate
might weigh more heavily in experienced felt inclusion for these individuals. Inclusive leadership cues appeared to be most important for felt inclusion among employees with a physical disability suggested that, perhaps, gestures of inclusion from one’s supervisors are particularly important for generating feelings of acceptance and value for these individuals. Finally, work involvement cues appeared to be most effective in increasing felt inclusion for employees with a cognitive disability. This suggests that gestures such as sharing work-related information, soliciting ideas and opinions, and being invited to participate in work tasks are particularly important for these individuals.

In sum, the results of these exploratory analysis provided varied, yet convincing, evidence that workplace inclusion experiences might differ based on workers’ subgroup memberships. Importantly, although some subgroup categories were generally associated with lower levels of felt inclusion than their counterparts, the presence of inclusion cues always had a buffering effect on these experiences, or at minimum, an exacerbating effect on already positive associations. Future research should build these findings and continue to build relevant subgroups into their theoretical model in order to develop a more detailed and established understanding how subgroup membership relates to inclusion experience. Confirmatory studies might be the next step as there is ample theory to guide hypotheses; although, results from studies do vary. The current results suggest that some of this variation may be due to the type of diversity and inclusion practice construct. Future research should use these insights to develop theory and hypotheses around which practices might be more aligned with the experiences of specific subgroups.
Although the main purpose of the study was theory development, there are noteworthy practical implications of this research. First, evidence of the relation/distinction between inclusion practices and felt inclusion, as well as the indirect link to broader work outcomes can be informative for the design and measurement of inclusion initiatives in organizations. The results of the current study imply that inclusion practices operate as environmental stimuli (i.e., perceived actions/events) that cue feelings of inclusion (i.e., perceived belonging and value in authenticity). Thus, inclusion practices and felt inclusion might be different parts of the inclusion perceptual process. As such, the general content of inclusion initiatives should focus on activities—policies, procedures, practices, behaviors—that are within the control of organizations and their members to implement behaviorally. The primary goal of the initiative should reflect this content (e.g., increased diversity, equitable performance appraisal and promotion procedures, increased involvement in work processes and decision making). However, practitioners should also consider the impact of initiatives on felt inclusion experiences as an individual indicator of effectiveness, as well as a measure of criterion validity. After all, if the practice is purportedly inclusive, it should make people feel included.

An additional practical implication of the current results is that different practices might yield different results depending on the practice and/or depending on the outcome. Therefore, care should be put into the types of inclusion practices that organizations implement and the outcomes measured to evaluate their effectiveness. This is particularly important in the likely event that organizations implement multiple types of inclusion practices simultaneously. The current study demonstrated that not all inclusion practices are uniquely associated with outcomes. This suggests that any efforts by an organization to assess the effectiveness of
multiple inclusion initiatives might yield seemingly insignificant effects for some practices and not for others. Decisions around what inclusion initiatives implement are organization-specific and should be based on a thorough needs analysis and identification of intended goals of the initiatives (Ferdman, 2014; Mattingly et al., 2022). However, results of the current study suggest that practitioners should also consider any conceptual overlap between the initiatives and the resulting impact on associations with evaluation criteria (e.g., felt inclusion, work outcomes, well-being, organizational outcomes).

In sum, the current study provided robust evidence in support of the Shore et al. (2011) model of workplace inclusion. In doing so, it contributed some clarity to the inclusion concept by disentangling inclusion as a practice and inclusion as a feeling, and empirically demonstrating associations and, therefore, important distinctions between inclusion practices and felt inclusion. The current study also demonstrated the utility of inclusion practices to associate with outcomes directly or by way of a social inclusion mechanism (felt inclusion) and, although, to a substantially lesser degree, a performance-related mechanism (felt competence). Thus, results from the current study strengthen existing theory and findings and provides novel insights upon which future theory and research can build. The theoretical contributions of the current study also strengthen the grounding from which practical applications can be developed. Overall, workplace inclusion appears to be an important concept that is both salient, as evidenced in daily reports, and beneficial, as evidenced by associations with outcomes, to workers and organizations and, therefore, worthy of continued research and development.
Additional Insights

In addition to providing information related to the main hypothesis, the data yielded several secondary insights that are informative of workplace inclusion experiences. First, daily reports showed that interactions with coworkers and supervisors were the most common source of inclusion-related information reported by participants on a semi-daily basis. This is interesting given that formal organizational policies and procedures (e.g., family leave policies, performance appraisal procedures, diversity statement and policies) are often cited as a main feature of organizations that influence employees’ inclusion perceptions and are explicitly included in several prominent models of workplace inclusion (Ferdman, 2014; Shore et al., 2018). Only 40 (3.4%) of all events referenced formal policies and procedures. Nonetheless, it is unclear from the current data the extent to which formal policies and procedures weigh into employees’ inclusion experiences. However, the current data do suggest that, when given the opportunity to report any type of workplace interaction or communication, whether interpersonal in nature or a one-way communication, as with a formal policy document sent from human resources, for example, participants overwhelmingly reported interpersonal interactions as the events that were most prominent in their recent (three-hour) memory.

This finding aligns with sociometer theory, which suggests that individuals scan their environment for cues of social inclusion (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). The most frequently occurring cues will receive the most attention and weight in evaluations on one’s inclusion status. In the workplace, this translates to routine interactions with coworkers and supervisors as opposed to the relatively infrequent interactions workers have with organizational policies. As such, policies might play a larger role in shaping employees’ general inclusion perceptions than
their inclusion perceptions throughout the workday. Future research should investigate this idea by testing for differences in inclusion perceptions between policy-based and interpersonal-based, among other, inclusion cues.

Another interesting insight was that reported interactions were overwhelmingly work-related, with 935 (78%) of 1193 total events strictly referencing work and task-related activities; although a minority of interactions were strictly social in nature (191; 16%) or a combination of work-related and social related (67; 5.6%). Among these, work involvement cues were the most often referenced (894; 75%), suggesting that inclusion practices aimed at involving employees in work-related functions of the organization are of primary importance in employees’ day-to-day inclusion experiences. This was surprising given that diversity climate perceptions were a main hypothesized predictor in the current study. However, references to diversity and fairness barely emerged, with only 11 (1%) of reports referencing diversity/social identities and 7 (<1%) of reports referencing fair treatment, the two primary components of diversity climate perceptions. This resulted in revising the diversity climate construct to positive climate in the daily analyses. Although more research is needed to investigate this finding further, the current data suggest that diversity/fairness-related inclusion cues are less common than work-related inclusion cues in employees’ day-to-day interactions.

This makes some sense as perceptions of diversity/fairness are often based on one’s understanding of formal diversity policies and procedures (Gilbert, 1999; McKay & Avery, 2015; Roberson, 2006), information which, plausibly, may be infrequently referenced in day-to-day interactions with coworkers. To the extent that perceptions of diversity/fairness are conflated with policies and procedures, such perceptions may have more weight in formulating general
inclusion perceptions than in momentary perceptions. Future research should build on this insight and investigate when diversity climate perceptions versus work-related cues have more or less weight in inclusion perceptions.

Additionally, when diversity/fairness-related cues do arise, they might often be negative in nature, such as EEO violations, sexual harassment, and discrimination. Such experiences, although impactful, are generally rare in frequency. In a recent national survey of US employee, the maximum prevalence rates reported for discrimination and workplace mistreatment were 25% and 13%, respectively (Fekedulegn et al., 2019). The relative rareness of negative diversity/fairness experiences is further highlighted in research on workplace discrimination, harassment, and stigma that often reports low mean values on measures of these experiences among general employee samples. Thus, in the current study, these experiences may have not been referenced in reports of work-related interactions because they were simply unlikely in that context.

To the extent that negative diversity/fairness cues are more likely than positive diversity/fairness cues, this, inevitably, raises the question of whether there are subgroup (e.g., gender, race) differences in the frequency of diversity/fairness-related experiences. Perhaps, individuals who are members of groups that have historically been the target of prejudice, negative stereotypes, and discrimination are more likely to attend to diversity/fairness-related cues than those who have not been targets of prejudice, negative stereotypes, and discrimination. The low rate (11 out of 1172) of references to diversity in the daily reports in the current study made it difficult to examine any subgroup differences in the frequency of reported diversity cues. However, frequency rates of the other inclusion practice cues were possible, but these generally
did not differ by race, gender, or disability subgroups, with a few exceptions. Women reported a higher proportion (31%) of positive climate cues than men (22%, $\chi^2 = 10.09, p = .001$). Workers with a physical disability reported a higher proportion (61%) of work involvement cues than workers without a physical disability (44%, $\chi^2 = 13.93, p < .001$). Workers with a cognitive disability reported a lower proportion (21%) of work involvement cues than workers without a cognitive disability (47%, $\chi^2 = 12.04, p < .001$). Additionally, workers with a cognitive disability reported a lower proportion (13%) of positive climate cues than workers without a cognitive disability (27%, $\chi^2 = 4.53, p = .033$). No differences were found for race subgroups (White vs. Black and White vs. Non-White) or psychological disability (vs. no psychological disability).

Thus, there is some, albeit limited, evidence suggesting that the frequency of perceived inclusion cues may differ by subgroup; although, this varies by inclusion practice and subgroup comparison. Future research should investigate this further, particularly as it relates to diversity/fairness-specific cues, as the current analysis involved inclusion practice cues in which references to diversity/fairness were underrepresented.

Limitations

One obvious limitation characteristic of all self-report studies is potential risks to response quality, such as social desirability, recall error, and careless responding. In the current study, I sought to reduce recall error and increase measurement precision by employing a repeated measures design that assessed perceptions at shorter time intervals than if only measures of general perceptions were used. However, such a design presents new threats to measurement precision. Participants were asked to complete two measures each day during work
hours. The potential for competing demands (e.g., work tasks) in this type of measurement context could have reduced response quality. Further, daily surveys contained repetitive content and were completed twice daily for two weeks, each of which presents the risk of fatigue or boredom effects. To reduce the opportunity for competing demands or fatigue/boredom effects, daily surveys were kept as short as possible. The average time for completion was 2.83 minutes ($SD = 3.39$); therefore, the majority of participants completed surveys in a very short timeframe. This can be good in the sense that the survey added little additional demand in terms of time to complete, or it can be bad in the sense that the average time to completion could have been a result of other work/time demands leading participants to rush through the survey. The fact that qualitative responses were generally thoughtful and detailed provides some reassurance that participants were actively engaged with the daily surveys and completed them as instructed.

Another obvious limitation is the correlational nature of the data. This is less so a limitation and more so a point of caution with interpreting results in light of the direction of relationships hypothesized in the theoretical model. Although the theoretical basis for causal links between the current study variables is strong, all evidence of direct associations and indirect associations examined in the current study is purely statistical and cannot be interpreted as casual given the data collection design.

A limitation more specific to the current study is the revision of the diversity climate construct to “positive climate” in the daily data. As mentioned, this was necessary given what the data delivered. Although there was a lack of references to diversity climate in daily reports, references to the general organizational climate were abundant. Consequently, the climate construct was retained but expanded to reflect a general positive organizational climate. There
were some parallels in the analysis results from the baseline data and the daily data that provide
some reassurance that positive climate was a valid inclusion practice construct. For example,
work involvement and diversity climate or positive climate both consistently emerged as
significant predictors in multiple regression analyses and tests of indirect effects through felt
inclusion. Also, diversity climate (baseline) and positive climate (daily) had similar patterns of
correlations with their respective inclusion practices and outcomes—magnitudes varied but
correlations were in the same direction and generally significant. Nonetheless, the daily data
might have involved a different climate construct than what was hypothesized; therefore, the
theoretical implications related to diversity climate in the current study may be suspect.

Another potential limitation is that, as mentioned, daily reports were primarily all work-
related interpersonal interactions. Other contextual features that characterize workplace
inclusion, such as organizational policies, diversity, and fairness were rarely mentioned. Thus,
results of the current study do not provide a broad picture of workplace inclusion practices in
daily data. As such, the daily data are essentially reduced to a study of inclusion experiences by
way of routine social interactions. This is not necessarily a disastrous circumstance, as it is a
reflection of the data and provides insight into the relevance and frequency of workplace
inclusion cues; however, it limits a full understanding of the types of inclusion cues that might
shape inclusion experiences.

Another potential limitation was the use of weekly data in the analysis of indirect effects
of inclusion practices on outcomes through felt competence. The Level 1 sample size for the
weekly data \( N_{\text{Level} 1} = 208, N_{\text{Level} 2} = 104 \) was substantially smaller than the daily data \( N_{\text{Level} 1} = 1172, N_{\text{Level} 2} = 118 \). Further the cluster size in the weekly data was 2 for all groups, whereas the
cluster sizes in the daily data ranged from 3 to 20 ($M = 12.80, SD = 4.98$). Thus, the structure of the data was comparably different between daily data and weekly data. Tests of indirect effects through felt competence relative to other hypothesis tests were not subjected to equivalent statistical rigor. Additionally, the frame of reference for the weekly data used to test Hypotheses 12-14 differed from the daily data used to test all other hypotheses. This makes any conclusions on the basis of the results or comparisons to other results difficult to contextualize or justify. Results of the tests of indirect effects involving felt competence and subsequent theoretical implications should be interpreted in light of these shortcomings.

Conclusion

The current study sought to provide a theoretically grounded contribution to the workplace inclusion literature. Building on the insights of Shore et al. (2011), the current study found strong support for the hypothesis that inclusion practices predict felt inclusion experiences, which in turn, predict well-being and work outcomes for employees. Data from both between-person measurements and repeated measurements supported this general hypothesis among a variety of inclusion practices and outcomes. These results add to existing confidence in the effectiveness of workplace inclusion to promote beneficial psychological and work-related individual outcomes, as well as additional clarification by disentangling inclusion practices constructs and felt inclusion. Additional contributions to the conceptual development of workplace inclusion come from evidence of felt competence as a potential additional mechanism linking inclusion practices and felt inclusion, and from evidence of subgroup differences in these relationships. Taken together, this opens avenues for continued research and development of the
workplace inclusion concept and for informing the development of diversity and inclusion initiatives in work organizations.
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APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT MESSAGES
Overview
Researchers from Northern Illinois University are conducting a study that will examine employees’ daily social experiences at work. This is a two-part study consisting of (1) a one-time preliminary survey to determine eligibility and (2) a main study consisting of repeated surveys over approximately two weeks.

The information below explains what will be asked of you as a participant in this study. Read this information thoroughly before proceeding with this survey. Please complete this survey only if you are interested in potentially participating in all parts of this study. Ultimately, your eligibility to participate in the main study will depend on your responses to this survey.

Preliminary Survey
The preliminary survey will ask you for some basic demographic and employment-related information. Your responses to these questions will determine your eligibility for the main study. The preliminary survey will take 2-3 minutes to complete. You will be compensated for completing the preliminary survey regardless of whether you are eligible for the main study.

Main Study
The main study will consist of a series of daily surveys administered over approximately two weeks. This includes a series of brief 5-minute surveys completed twice daily over 10 consecutive work days, as well as three longer surveys (~20 minutes) completed at the start, mid-point, and end of the study. All surveys will ask about your work-related experiences and behaviors (e.g., social interactions, job attitudes, helping behaviors) and various psychological traits and states (e.g., personality, mood). The types of surveys and timeline of the main study are outlined below:

Baseline Survey
The main study starts with a baseline survey. This is a one-time survey that will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The baseline survey will ask about your general perceptions of your workplace and various psychological traits and states. The baseline survey will be completed during the week prior to the start of the daily survey period.

Daily Surveys - Week 1
Once you complete the baseline survey, you will begin to receive links to the daily surveys on the very next calendar Monday. Daily surveys will take about five minutes to complete, and you will be asked to complete two of these each day during your work hours on Monday through Friday (one at 12 PM and one at 3 PM). Daily surveys will ask you to reflect on your work experiences that occurred over the past three hours.
Mid-Point Survey
At the end of the first week of daily surveys, you will complete a mid-point survey. The mid-point survey is similar to the baseline survey (~15-20 minutes) and will ask you to report on your work experiences and behaviors over the past week.

Daily Surveys - Week 2
A second week of daily surveys will begin on the very next calendar Monday. These surveys are identical to the ones completed during Week 1. Therefore, there will be a total of 20 daily surveys (10 on Week 1 and 10 on Week 2).

Exit Survey
At the end of Week 2, you will complete an exit survey. The exit survey is identical to the mid-point survey (~15-20 minutes). The exit survey is the last part of the study.

Communication/Survey Prompts
You will receive all survey completion prompts/reminders and the links for each survey through your Prolific e-mail. Thus, it is very important that you consistently check your Prolific e-mail while participating in this study and complete the surveys at the scheduled times.

Compensation
The total available compensation for completing the main study is $22.25. The compensation structure breaks down as follows:

Prescreen Survey
$0.25 for completing 100% of the survey

Baseline, Mid-point, and Exit Surveys
- $2 for completing at least 80% of the baseline survey
- $2 for completing at least 80% of the midpoint survey with the opportunity for a $1 bonus for completing the baseline and midpoint surveys (at least 80% of each)
- $2 for completing the exit survey with the opportunity for a $2 bonus for completing the baseline, midpoint, and exit surveys (at least 80% of each)
This results in total possible compensation of $9 for completing the baseline, midpoint, and exit surveys.

Daily Surveys
- $0.50 for completing 80% of each Week 1 daily survey with the possibility of a $2 bonus for completing all 10 daily surveys (Total: $0.50 × 10 = $5.00 + $2 bonus = $7)
- $0.75 for completing 80% of each Week 2 daily survey with the possibility of a $2.50 bonus for completing all 10 daily surveys (Total: $0.75 × 10 = $7.50 + $2.50 bonus = $10)
This results in a total possible compensation of $17 for completing all 20 daily surveys. The overall compensation available for completing the entire study is $22.25 ($0.25 for the prescreen; $22 for the main study).
If you are interested in participating and are confident that you will be able to commit to the entire study, please complete this preliminary survey. If you are eligible for the main study, you will be contacted by a researcher with further instruction. If you have any questions about the study and what your participation entails, do not hesitate to contact the lead investigator, Robert Keating, through Prolific messaging or at rkeating@niu.edu.

Thank you for your interest in this study!

Main Study (Baseline Survey)

Thank you for your interest in this study and for completing the preliminary survey!

Based on your responses, you are eligible to participate in the main study. As a reminder, here is an overview of what your participation will entail:

[Same information from prescreen recruitment message under Main Study, Communication/Survey Prompts, and Compensation headings will be provided here].

The first step in participating is to complete the baseline survey. Upon accessing the baseline survey link, you will be redirected to the survey where you will first see a study consent form. The consent form provides full details about what your participation entails, risks and benefits of participating, how your data will be handled, and your rights as a participant. Please read this information carefully before deciding whether you want to participate.

If you agree to participate, please complete the baseline survey no later than this Friday at 11:59 PM. Upon completion of the baseline survey, you will begin to receive links to the daily surveys on the next calendar Monday. These links will be sent at 12 PM and 3 PM each workday (Monday through Friday) for the next two weeks. We recommend completing the surveys within 30 minutes, but no later than 1 hour, after receiving the links. Reminder e-mails will be sent if the surveys have not been completed within 30 minutes.

Thank you again for your interest and participation. The information you provide for this study is invaluable to our research goals. We look forward to working with you! At any time if you have questions or concerns, please contact the lead investigator, Robert Keating, via Prolific or at rkeating@niu.edu.
APPENDIX B

PRE-SCREEN SURVEY MEASURES
Preliminary (Prescreen) Survey

(*indicates eligibility criterion. Other demographics are included as filler items but will be merged with main dataset).

**Age.**
What is your age?

**Gender.**
What is your gender identity? You may select more than one.
___Man
___Woman
___Transman
___Transwoman
___Non-binary
___Prefer to self-describe: __________

**Race/Ethnicity.**
What is your race/ethnicity? You may select more than one if mixed-race/ethnicity.
___American Indian or Alaskan Native
___Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American
___Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
___Hispanic or Latino
___Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American
___East Asian or Asian American
___South Asian or Indian American
___Middle Eastern or Arab American
___Prefer to self-describe: __________

**Sexual Orientation.**
Do you think of yourself as:
___Bisexual
___Lesbian, gay or homosexual
___Straight or heterosexual
___Prefer to self-describe: __________
___Prefer not to answer

**Disability.**
Do you have any physical impairment, disability, or health issue (e.g., missing limb, diabetes, chronic pain)?
___Yes
___No
___Prefer not to answer
Do you have any psychological impairment, disability, or health issue (e.g., depression, eating disorder, anxiety)?
___Yes
___No
___Prefer not to answer

Do you have any cognitive impairment, disability, or health issue (e.g., dyslexia, memory loss, attention deficit disorder)?
___Yes
___No
___Prefer not to answer

**Residence.**
In which state do you reside? (Drop down: 50 states)

Please select the time zone in which you work.
___Eastern Time
___Central Time
___Mountain Time
___Hawaii
___Alaska
___Other (please specify)

**Employment status.**
Please select the option that best applies to your current employment status.
___Employed full-time (35+ hours per week) for an organization
___Employed part-time (<35 hours per week) for an organization
___Self-employed
___Unemployed but actively searching for a job
___Retired
___Homemaker
___Other (please describe)

**Job title.** (If option, 1, 2, or 3 is selected for Employment Status)
What is your occupation/job title?

**Workgroups.**
How often do you interact or communicate with coworkers as part of your job?
___Never/I work alone
___Less than once per week
___Once or twice per week
___Three or four times per week
___Once per day
___Two or more times per day
Supervisor.*
Do you have a direct supervisor/manager?
___No
___Yes

*If “Yes” to having a direct supervisor/manager.
How often do you interact with your direct supervisor during a typical work week? Interactions can be in-person, virtual/video, audio (e.g., phone), or electronic messaging (e.g., E-mail or other text format).
___Less than once per week
___Once or twice per week
___Three or four times per week
___Once per day
___Two or more times per day
APPENDIX C

MAIN STUDY MEASURES
Main Study

Baseline, Midpoint, and Exit Surveys

(These surveys are identical with the exception of individual differences measures which will only be measured at baseline)

Inclusion Practices

**Mor Barak Inclusion-Exclusion Scale (MBIE; Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; updated Mor Barak, 2005).** The MBIE measures the degree to which employees feel part of three critical organizational processes—decision making (DM), information networks (IN), and level of participation/involvement (LP) at five organizational levels—work group, organization, supervisor, higher management, and social informal.

Baseline instructions: Rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements about your employing organization using the scale provided.

Midpoint and Exit instructions: Based on your work experiences **over the last week**, rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements about your employing organization using the scale provided.

**Response scale:** 1 (**Strongly disagree**), 2 (**Moderately disagree**), 3 (**Slightly disagree**), 4 (**Slightly agree**), 5 (**Moderately agree**), 6 (**Strongly agree**)

(R) indicates the item is reverse coded

{language use in baseline survey only}

[language used in midpoint and exit surveys only]

**Work group**

I {have} [had] influence in decisions taken by my work group regarding our tasks. (DM)

My coworkers openly {share} [shared] work-related information with me. (IN)

I {am typically} [was] involved and invited to participate in work-related activities of my work group. (LP)

**Organization**

I {am} [was] able to influence decisions that affect my organization. (DM)

I {am usually} [was] among the last to know about important changes in the organization. (IN)

(R)

I {am usually} [was] invited to important meetings in my organization. (LP)

**Supervisor**
My supervisor often asks for my opinion before making important decisions. (DM)
My supervisor did not share information with me. (IN) (R)
I was invited to actively participate in review and evaluation meetings with my supervisor. (LP)

Higher Management
I was invited to contribute my opinion in meetings with management higher than my immediate supervisor. (DM)
I received communication from management higher than my immediate supervisor (i.e., memos, e-mails). (IN)
I was invited to participate in meetings with management higher than my immediate supervisor. (LP)

Social Informal
I was asked to contribute in planning social activities not directly related to my job function. (DM)
I was informed about social activities and company social events. (IN)
I was not invited to join my coworkers when they go for lunch or drinks after work. (LP) (R)

Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ; Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000).
The ELQ measures subordinates’ perceptions of the frequency of leader behaviors across five dimensions: leading by example, participative decision-making, coaching, informing, showing concern/interacting with the team. The three dimensions that are most relevant to inclusive leadership were selected for this study.

Baseline instructions: The following statements refer to your direct supervisor. Using the scale provided, indicate the frequency of your direct supervisors’ performance of each of the following behaviors in general.

Midpoint and Exit instructions: The following statements refer to your direct supervisor. Using the scale provided, indicate the frequency of your direct supervisors’ performance of each of the following behaviors over the last week.

Response scale: 1 (Never), 2 (Rarely), 3 (About half of the time), 4 (Often), 5 (Always)

Participative Decision-Making
Encourages work group members to express ideas/suggestions
Listens to my work group's ideas and suggestions
Uses my work group's suggestions to make decisions that affect us
{Gives} {Gave} all work group members a chance to voice their opinions
{Considers} {Considered} my work group's ideas when he/she disagrees with them
{Makes} {Made} decisions that are based only on his/her own ideas

**Informing**

{Explains} {Explained} company decisions
{Explains} {Explained} company goals
{Explains} {Explained} how my work group fits into the company
{Explains} {Explained} the purpose of the company's policies to my work group
{Explains} {Explained} rules and expectations to my work group
{Explains} {Explained} his/her decisions and actions to my work group

**Showing Concern/Interacting with the Team**

{Cares} {Cared} about work group members' personal problems
{Shows} {Showed} concern for work group members' well-being
{Treats} {Treated} work group members as equals
{Takes} {Took} the time to discuss work group members' concerns patiently
{Shows} {Showed} concern for work group members' success
{Stays} {Stayed} in touch with my work group
{Gets} {Got} along with my work group members
{Gives} {Gave} work group members honest and fair answers
{Knows} {Knew} what work is being done in my work group
{Finds} {Found} time to chat with work group members

**Diversity Climate (McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008).** This scale measures the extent to which employees perceive that their organization is committed to/values diversity.

Baseline instructions: Rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements about your employing organization using the scale provided.

Midpoint and Exit instructions: Based on your work experiences over the last week, rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements about your employing organization using the scale provided.

Response scale: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly agree)

I trust the organization to treat me fairly.
The organization maintains a diversity-friendly work environment.
The organization respects the views of people like me.
Top leaders demonstrate a visible commitment to diversity.
**Perceived Group Inclusion Scale (PGIS; Jansen et al., 2014).** The PGIS assesses the extent to which belongingness and authenticity needs are satisfied by one’s work group.

Baseline instructions: Rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements about your employing organization using the scale provided.

Midpoint and Exit instructions: Based on your work experiences over the last week, rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements using the scale provided.

Response scale: 1 (*Strongly disagree*), 2 (*Disagree*), 3 (*Neither agree nor disagree*), 4 (*Agree*), 5 (*Strongly agree*)

{language use in baseline survey only}
[language used in midpoint and exit surveys only]

My organization…

*Belongingness subscale*
…gives me the feeling that I belong.
…gives me the feeling that I am part of this group.
…gives me the feeling that I fit in.
…treats me as an insider.
…likes me.
…appreciates me.
…is pleased with me.
…cares about me.

*Authenticity subscale*
…allows me to be authentic.
…allows me to be who I am.
…allows me to express my authentic self.
…allows me to present myself the way I am.
…encourages me to be authentic.
…encourages me to be who I am.
…encourages me to express my authentic self.
…encourages me to present myself the way I am.

*Felt competence*

**Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction Scale (WBNS; Van den Broeck et al., 2010).** The WBNS measures the extent to which employees perceive that basic needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are satisfied at work. The current study will use the need for competence subscale only.
Baseline instructions: Rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements.

Midpoint and Exit instructions: Based on your work experiences over the last week, rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements using the scale provided.

Response scale: 1 (Totally disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Totally agree)

I don’t really feel competent in my job (R)
I really master my tasks at my job
I feel competent at my job
I doubt whether I am able to execute my job properly (R)
I am good at the things I do in my job
I have the feeling that I can even accomplish the most difficult tasks at work .59

Outcomes

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule Short Form (PANAS-SF; Mackinnon et al., 1999; Watson et al., 1988). The PANAS-SF measures the affective component of subjective well-being and is a truncated version of the original PANAS (Watson et al., 1988).

Baseline instructions: This scale consists of a number of words and phrases that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and indicate the extent that you feel this way in general using the scale provided.

Midpoint and Exit instructions: This scale consists of a number of words and phrases that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and indicate the extent that you have felt this way over the past week using the scale provided.

Response scale: 1 (Very slightly or not at all), 2 (A little), 3 (Moderately), 4 (Quite a bit), 5 (Extremely)

Positive Affect
Inspired
Alert
Excited
Enthusiastic
Determined

Negative Affect
Afraid
Upset
Nervous
Scared
Distressed

**Organizational Commitment** (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Jaros, 2007). The affective subscale of the organizational commitment scale measures employees’ emotional attachment to and identification with their organization.

Baseline instructions: Rate the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements.

Midpoint and Exit instructions: **Thinking about your work experience over the past week**, rate the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements.

Response scale: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither disagree nor agree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly agree).

- I am very happy being a member of this organization.
- I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it.
- I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
- I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one. (R)
- I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization. (R)
- I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization. (R)
- This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
- I do not feel a ‘strong’ sense of belonging to my organization. (R)

**Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006).** The UWES measures employees’ positive work-related state of fulfillment across three dimensions: vigor (VI), dedication (DE), and absorption (AB).

Baseline instructions: The following statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, select “0” (zero) next to the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by selecting the point on the scale (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

Midpoint and Exit instructions: The following statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide the extent to which you have felt this way about your job **over the past week**. If you have never had this feeling, select “0” (zero) next to the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by selecting the point on the scale (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

Baseline response scale: 0 (Never), 1 (Almost never/A few times a year or less), 2 (Rarely/Once a month or less), 3 (Sometimes/A few times a month), 4 (Often/Once a week), 5 (Very often/A few times a week), 6 (Always/Every day)
Midpoint and Exit response scale: 0 (Never), 1 (Almost never), 2 (Rarely), 3 (Sometimes), 4 (Often), 5 (Very often), 6 (Always)

{language use in baseline survey only}
[language used in midpoint and exit surveys only]

At my work, I {feel} [felt] bursting with energy. (VI)  
At my job, I {feel} [felt] strong and vigorous. (VI)  
I {am} [was] enthusiastic about my job. (DE)  
My job {inspires} [inspired] me. (DE)  
When I {get} [got] up in the morning, I {feel} [felt] like going to work. (VI)  
I {feel} [felt] happy when I {am} [was] working intensely. (AB)  
I {am} [was] proud of the work that I {do} [did]. (DE)  
I {am} [was] immersed in my work. (AB)  
I {get} [got] carried away when I {am} [was] working. (AB)

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C) 10-Item Short Version (Spector, Bauer, & Fox, 2010).** The OCB-C measures the frequency with which employees engage in citizenship behaviors at work.

Baseline instructions: How often do you generally do each of the following things at your present job? Keep in mind that this survey is completely anonymous and confidential and that there are no right nor wrong answers.

Response scale: 1 (Never), 2 (Once or twice), 3 (Once or twice/month), 4 (Once or twice/week), 5 (Every day)

Midpoint and Exit instructions: **Over the last week**, how often did you do each of the following things at your present job? Keep in mind that this survey is completely anonymous and confidential and that there are no right nor wrong answers.

Response scale: 1 (Never), 2 (Once), 3 (Twice), 4 (Three or four times), 5 (Every day)

{Take} [Took] time to advise, coach, or mentor a co-worker.  
{Help} [Helped] co-workers learn new skills or shared job knowledge.  
{Help} [Helped] new employees get oriented to the job.  
{Lend} [Lent] a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem.  
{Offer} [Offered] suggestions to improve how work is done.  
{Help} [Helped] a co-worker who had too much to do.  
{Volunteer} [Volunteered] for extra work assignments.  
{Work} [Worked] weekends or other days off to complete a project or task.  
{Volunteer} [Volunteered] to attend meetings or work on committees on own time.  
{Give} [Gave] up a meal and other breaks to complete work.
Individual Differences (Moderators)

The Need to Belong Scale (NTBS; Leary et al., 2013). The NTBS measures the extent to which individuals have a strong need to belong/fit in.

Instructions: Indicate the extent to which each statement is true or characteristic of you.

Response scale: 1 (Not at all true of me), 2 (Slightly true of me), 3 (Moderately true of me), 4 (Very true of me), 5 (Extremely true of me)

If other people don’t seem to accept me, I don’t let it bother me. (R)
I try hard not to do things that will make other people avoid or reject me.
I seldom worry about whether other people care about me. (R)
I need to feel that there are people I can turn to in times of need.
I want other people to accept me.
I do not like being alone.
Being apart from my friends for long periods of time does not bother me. (R)
I have a strong “need to belong.”
It bothers me a great deal when I am not included in other people’s plans.
My feelings are easily hurt when I feel that others do not accept me.

Authentic Personality Scale (APS; Wood, Linley, Maltby, Baliousis, & Joseph, 2008). The APS measures individuals’ trait-level of authenticity across three dimensions: authentic living (AL), accepting external influence (EI), and self-alienation (SA)

Instructions: Indicate the extent to which each of the following statements describe you.

Response scale: 1 (Does not describe me at all) to 7 (Describes me very well)

1. I think it is better to be yourself, than to be popular. (AL)
2. I don’t know how I really feel inside. (SA)
3. I am strongly influenced by the opinions of others. (EI)
4. I usually do what other people tell me to do. (EI)
5. I always feel I need to do what others expect me to do. (EI)
6. Other people influence me greatly. (EI)
7. I feel as if I don’t know myself very well. (SA)
8. I always stand by what I believe in. (AL)
9. I am true to myself in most situations. (AL)
10. I feel out of touch with the ‘real me.’ (SA)
11. I live in accordance with my values and beliefs. (AL)
12. I feel alienated from myself. (SA)
Daily Survey

Current mood

How are you feeling right now?

Inclusion cues/work interactions

Splash page: The following questions will ask you about any work-related interactions, communications, or other interpersonal experiences you may have had in the past 3 hours. This can include interactions with one or more coworkers (e.g., informal conversation, work meeting) or one-way communications (e.g., an e-mail from the company CEO/President, human resources manager, etc.). This can also include interactions or communications that take place across any medium, such as in-person, virtual/video, phone, E-mail, text message, etc.

Interaction.
In the past 3 hours, have you had any interactions, communications, or other interpersonal experiences involving others at work?
___No
___Yes
*If no, skip to felt inclusion measure.

Did you have more than one interaction/communication in the past 3 hours?
___Yes
___No

Source.
*If “Yes” to having any interactions/communications:
With whom have you interacted/communicated in the past 3 hours? Select all that apply.
___Peer coworker(s) from a work group or team of which you are a member
___Other peer coworker(s) who are not part of a work group or team
___Direct supervisor/manager
___Company executive or member of higher management
___Human resources representative
___Client or customer
___Other person(s) (please specify)
Salience.
If “Yes” to having more than one interaction/communication:
Of the different interactions/communications you had in the past 3 hours, think of the one that
stands out to you the most.

Source of salient interaction
With whom did this noticeable interaction/communication occurred. Select all that apply.
___Peer coworker(s) from a work group or team of which you are a member
___Other peer coworker(s) who is/are not a member of your regular work group or team
___Direct supervisor/manager
___Company executive or member of higher management
___Human resources representative
___Client or customer
___Other person(s) (please specify)

Communication format
How did this interaction occur?
___In-person
___Virtual with video (e.g., Zoom, Teams, Skype, FaceTime, etc.)
___Phone call (audio only)
___E-mail or other text communication
___Other (please describe)

Psychological response to interaction.
*If “yes” to having an interaction:
THINKING ABOUT THAT INTERACTION, how are you currently feeling?

Felt Inclusion

PGIS (Jansen et al., 2014). An altered version of the PGIS described at baseline will be used in
daily surveys. The PGIS will be shortened to two items to reduce time demand for daily
measurements and phrasing will be altered to account for feelings of belonging and value in
authenticity in the present moment.

Instructions: Rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements BASED ON HOW
YOU FEEL IN RESPONSE TO THE INTERACTION.
*If no to having an interaction:
Instructions: Rate the extent of your agreement with the following statements based on how you currently feel, right now at work.

Response scale: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly agree)

**Belongingness**
I feel that I belong

**Authenticity subscale**
I feel that I am valued for my authentic self

**Event.**
Briefly describe the interaction or communication. Include what happened and what about this experience has influenced the degree to which you feel you belong or are valued for your authentic self?

To what extent have you been thinking about this interaction/communication since it occurred?

Response scale: 1 (Very slightly or not at all), 2 (A little), 3 (Moderately), 4 (Quite a bit), 5 (Extremely)

**Outcomes**

**Organizational Commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Jaros, 2007).** An altered version of the affective commitment subscale described at baseline will be used in the daily surveys. The scale will be shortened to the two non-reverse coded items with the highest factor loadings from the original validation study by Allen and Meyer (1990). One of these items is a revised item by Jaros (2007).

Instructions: Rate the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements based on your experiences over the last three hours.

Response scale: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither disagree nor agree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly agree).

I am very happy being a member of this organization.
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
UWES (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006). An altered version of the UWES described at baseline will be used in daily surveys. The UWES will be shortened to three items (one per each subscale) to reduce time demand for daily measurements. Item phrasing and instructions will be altered to account for work engagement in the present moment.

Instructions: Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which you have felt this way about your job in the past three hours.

Response scale: Response scale: 0 (Not at all), 1 (Very slightly), 2 (A little bit), 3 (Moderately), 4 (A fair amount), 5 (Quite a bit), 6 (Extremely)

At my work, I feel bursting with energy. (VI)
I am enthusiastic about my job. (DE)
I am immersed in my work. (AB)

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C) 10-Item Short Version (Spector, Bauer, & Fox, 2010). An altered version of the OCB-C described at baseline will be used in daily surveys. The OCB-B will be shortened to five items to reduce time demand for daily measurements. Item phrasing and instructions will be altered to account for OCBs in the present moment.

Instructions: Have you engaged in any of the following behaviors in the last three hours? Select all that apply. Keep mind that this survey is completely anonymous and confidential and that there are no right nor wrong answers.

Took time to advise, coach, or mentor a co-worker.
Helped co-workers learn new skills or shared job knowledge.
Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem.
Offered suggestions to improve how work is done.
Helped a co-worker who had too much to do.