A study examining the relationship between dissimilarity, in terms of personality and values,

and perceived inclusion among employees.

Svenja Burkhardt (6431933)

Utrecht University

Abstract

A great variety of research has concentrated on workplace diversity and its possible benefits and downsides for organizational performance. Recently, research has started to look beyond the demographic composition of the workforce and tried to understand what is necessary to integrate these diverse employees in the organization. This article contributes to the literature of workplace inclusion, by demonstrating that differences among coworkers can affect perceived feelings of belongingness, authenticity and ultimately inclusion. As a foundation for this research, Jansen's and Otten's (2014) definition of inclusion has been used to further investigate the topic. This research used a vignette design, in order to illustrate the effects of dissimilarity among coworkers, in terms of personality and values, on perceived sense of belonging and perceived sense of authenticity among coworkers. A total of 118 male and female participants of different nationalities who are currently part of a work group participated in this study. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) showed that dissimilarity among coworkers did affect their perceived feeling of inclusion. Participants that were exposed to the condition of dissimilarity indicated a significantly lower level of belongingness and authenticity. In spite of these findings, it appears that dissimilarity in general is the decisive reason for people to feel excluded, not personality nor values in particular, as neither of them had a specific effect on the dimensions authenticity and belonging.

Keywords: organizational inclusion; organizational diversity; belonging; authenticity; personality; values

A study examining the relationship between dissimilarity, in terms of personality and values, and perceived inclusion among employees

A diverse workforce is increasingly being recognized as a fundamental aspect of organization's performance and success (Nair & Vohra, 2015). Organizational diversity is considered a tool to promote substantial advantages to organizations. Research has revealed that organizational diversity can provide a series of positive impacts such as: improving organizations' relationship with diverse customer groups and markets; different perspectives, which may result in a more innovative and superior work outcomes and performance; increased financial performance; better problem solving and information processing; and employee retention (Shrader, Blackburn & Iles, 1997; Badal & Harter, 2014; Watson, Kumar & Michaelsen, 1997; Holvino, Ferdman & Merrill-Sands, 2004; Mannix & Neale, 2005) . However, the focus of diversity in the workplace has often been associated with visible characteristics, such as gender, race and disability, along with other individual differences that include religious practices and sexual orientation (Shore et al., 2009; Lee & Robbins, 1995; Nair & Vohra, 2015). Today, simply increasing the visible diversity is no longer the only task at hand. As organizations have strived to develop a more diversified workforce, significant new perspectives have emerged from such action. The questions now shifted to, for example, "how can we increase performance from a diverse workplace? How can we maintain diversity and reduce turnovers? Do diverse groups feel integrated? How can we promote integration of diverse groups?" These may be a few of many questions related to diversity. These potential questions have led researchers to investigate areas beyond demographic composition of the workforce; the current challenge shifts from diversity towards promoting integration of diverse employees in organizations (Thomas & Ely, 1996). In order to get a better understanding of the topic, the current study will focus on the question of how dissimilarity among coworkers relates to their feelings of inclusion.

Moving from a diverse work environment to an environment that fosters inclusion and integrates employees regardless of their differences appears to be a great challenge. Over the last decade, researches have increasingly suggested the importance of investigating the internal organizational processes created to facilitate inclusion rather than simply focusing on numerical illustrations of diversity (Shore et al., 2011; Wasserman et al., 2008; Nishii & Mayer, 2009). Organizational inclusion emphasizes employees' participation and involvement in the work life (Roberson, 2006). Thus, it appears that the main focus of organizational inclusion is to assure employees feel as part of the organizational processes and are considered as an insider by others in the work environment (Nair & Vohra, 2015). Despite the

distinct definitions and concepts of diversity and inclusion, these terms appear to be overlapping and coexisting concepts that may significantly impact organizational performance. The recruitment of diverse employees (diversity) continues to be important, whereas creating an inclusive organizational culture (inclusion) may result in lower turnover and increase the benefits of such diverse environment (Roberson, 2006; Chavez & Weisinger, 2008). Therefore, organizational inclusion should be considered as an approach to diversity management, which could significantly impact organization's outcomes (Roberson, 2006). Inclusion cannot only be found on an organizational, but also on an interpersonal level. The so-called social inclusion can be defined as the degree to which an employee can be his or her authentic self, and the perceived feeling of belonging within a group (Jansen, Otten, Van der Zee & Jans, 2014). Jansen considers inclusion to be "a two-dimensional concept, consisting of perceptions of belonging and authenticity" (p. 11). When inclusion is being defined as a two-dimensional construct, composed of the individual's perception of authenticity and belonging, employees can find themselves in one of four situations: Exclusion, Assimilation, Differentiation, and Inclusion (Jansen, 2015).

According to Shore et al. (2011), exclusion refers to an individual perception of not being treated as part of the organization, in which his or her values are not relevant for the workforce. On the other hand, assimilation reflects the acceptance of individuals as long as they agree and follow the organizational culture as well as its norms and distinctiveness. Differentiation occurs when an individual is treated as an outsider of the work group, however, his or her particular characteristics are considered valuable for organizational success. Finally, inclusion is obtained when individuals are not only treated as part of the organization, but are encouraged to stay true to their uniqueness and their contributions are considered of significant value within the workforce. These four situations are visually represented in *Figure* 1.

	Low belongingness	High belongingness
Low authenticity	*Exclusion*	*Assimilation*
High authenticity	*Differentiation*	*Inclusion*

Figure 1. Framework of Inclusion (adapted from Shore et al., 2011)

Recent researches have suggested that inclusion plays a major role in organizational performance (Martinez, Sawyer, Thoroughgood, Nuggs & Smith, 2016; Jansen, 2015; Triandis, 2003). In order to obtain such outcome, efforts have been made to provide a better understanding of the two components of inclusion. Firstly, belongingness or the feeling of belonging can be recognized as an essential need according to optimal distinctiveness theory (ODT) (Brewer, 1991; Brewer & Roccas, 2001). The urge to belong becomes the motivation to establish and continue meaningful relationships with others (Jansen, 2015). In general, people tend to include themselves in groups whose members share similar attributes, as it may allow for easier interaction and communication (Jansen, 2015). In addition, Byrne's similarity-attraction theory demonstrates that we are more attracted to people who are similar to us and who make us feel liked in return (Byrne, 1971). According to Sabharwal (2014), "individuals normally compare themselves with those they think are similar in an attempt to maintain a positive self-image". The result of such individual and natural comparison is the perception of inclusion or exclusion based on interpersonal interactions. Therefore, it is common for employees to look for inclusion in a group where they are not only accepted, but also made feel secure (Shore et al., 2011). In fact, for employees to actually experience inclusion, it is necessary that they feel valued and have their efforts and performances recognized from the organization (Sabharwal, 2014). As similarity seems to foster inclusion among group members, dissimilarity also has been found to undermine social inclusion (Sahin, Van der Toorn, Jansen, Boezeman & Ellemers, 2019). The question remains, what are the contributing factors for people to feel dissimilar and whether the dimensions of social inclusion are affected in different ways? Thus, this study posed the following research questions: (1) To what extent, if any, does dissimilarity in terms of personality and values affect perceived sense of belonging among coworkers; and (2) To what extent, if any, does dissimilarity in terms of personality and values affect perceived sense of authenticity among coworkers?

For instance, a study has shown that personality is the main reason people feel dissimilar at work (Jansen, 2018). The American Psychological Association defines personality as "individual differences in characteristic patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving" (Personality, 2019). Larsen and Buss (2014) provided a more elaborate definition of personality as a "set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the individual that are organized and relatively enduring and that influence his or her interactions with, and adaptions to, the intrapsychic, physical, and social environment" (p. 4). Although personality might be the most common explanation to experience a lack of belonging, there are others

reasons for dissimilarities among people, for instance, values. The effect on belongingness should not be much different between the forms of dissimilarity, as the, similarity-attraction theory would suggest that any kind of dissimilarity, including dissimilarity in terms of values, can be just as influential on perceived belongingness. For example, research has demonstrated that individuals choose to surround themselves with people who share their own ideologies or values to fulfill their need of belonging (Motyl, Iyer, Oishi, Trawalter, Nosek, 2014). This research might explain the relationship of different values on perceived sense of belonging, but it does not examine the relationship between different values and personality regarding authenticity, which is the other dimension of social inclusion.

Secondly, Jansen (2015) defines perceived authenticity as "the extent to which a group member perceives that he or she is allowed and encouraged by the group to remain true to oneself" (p. 26). In addition, living authentically includes the ability to live in compliance with one's own values and beliefs (Wood, Linley, Maltby, Baliousis, Joseph, 2008). Furthermore, authenticity is considered an important aspect of psychological mechanisms used to explain the reason an individual seeks identity management strategies such as disclosure or concealment of values, beliefs, and or ideologies (Martinez, et al., 2016). Identity management is considered to be an important psychological tool that allows individuals to reach an authentic sense of self at work, resulting in positive job attitude and experiences (Martinez et al., 2016). Because the present research is focused on people's ability to be their authentic self and live up to their values in the workplace, it is important to consider organizational values. Organizational values often refer to its norms and practices; for instance, organizations may be characterized for encouraging help seeking among employees, hierarchy relevance, and so forth. Sagiv and Schwartz (2007) investigated cultural values in organizations and defined them as "shared, abstract ideas about what a social collectivity views as good, right and desirable" (p.1). Moreover, organizations that allow employees to improvise and personalize the way they accomplish their tasks, are more likely to satisfy their sense of authenticity (Bettencourt, Molix, Talley & Sheldon, 2006). On the other hand, organizational practices that discredit authenticity tend to promote a sense of discomfort and reduced performance (Bettencourt et al., 2006). Van den Bosch, Taris, Schaufeli, Peeters and Reijseger (2018) suggested that authenticity is directly related to the relationship between environment and individual. For instance, a healthy relationship tends to promote higher feelings of experienced authenticity, which is also applicable for the contrary. Thus, as an employee reaches a satisfactory level of authenticity, the result may increase work

engagement and job satisfaction as well as a significant decrease in negative outcomes such as low performance and dissatisfaction (Van den Bosh et al., 2018).

Despite the large body of research focused on inclusion and the importance of belonging and authenticity, it appears that there is a lack of research examining the relationship of different values and personality traits among employees and the ability of being their authentic self in the workplace. Therefore, the influence of dissimilarity, in terms of personality and values, among co-workers on their perceived feeling of social inclusion and its two dimensions remains unclear. A diverse workforce is progressively recognized to play an important role in an organization's success. A better understanding of inclusion and its components could lead to an environment that could maximize employees' feeling of belonging and could encourage them to be their authentic self. Therefore, it seems essential to understand and examine all potential barriers to inclusion. On these grounds, this research study has tested four hypotheses.

Because of the predictions made by the similarity-attraction theory (Byrne, 1971) and an additional study showing that personality is the main reason people feel dissimilar at work (Jansen, 2018), it is expected that dissimilarity in terms of personality will reduce perceived feeling of belonging. Furthermore, we assume that authenticity will also be affected by dissimilarity in terms of personality.

H1a: Dissimilarities in terms of personality affects perceived sense of belonging

H1b: Dissimilarities in terms of personality affects perceived sense of authenticity

Because dissimilarity in terms of values will likely affect feelings of authenticity (Wood, 2008), in addition to people surrounding themselves with people who share similar values to fulfill their need of belonging (Motyl, 2014) it is expected that dissimilarity in terms of values will affect both authenticity and belonging.

H2a: Dissimilarities in terms of values affects perceived sense of authenticity

H2b: Dissimilarities in terms of values affects perceived sense of belonging

Methods

Participants

The study sample consisted of 163 employees, however, 118 fully completed the questionnaire (77% female, 41% male). Overall, participants illustrated great diversity in terms of nationality, yet the majority reported German (57,6%), Brazilian (8,5%), or American (7,7%) nationality. It was a requirement for all participants to confirm that they were employed at the time, that they had been working at the same company for six months,

and that in order to achieve their work goals, they had been collaborating with a minimum of two other employees.

Table 1

Demographic Statistics

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	41	34.7
Female	77	65.3
Nationality		
German	68	57.6
Brazilian	10	8.5
American	9	7.6

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics by Group

	Condition	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Belonging	Similar-Dissimilar	32	5.1797	1.15700
	Dissimilar-Similar	29	5.4526	.92908
	Similar-Similar	30	6.3042	.51974
	Dissimilar-Dissimilar	27	4.9352	1.19311
	Total	118	5.4767	1.10094
Authenticity	Similar-Dissimilar	32	5.0117	1.45371
	Dissimilar-Similar	29	5.5603	1.02405
	Similar-Similar	30	6.3958	.87166
	Dissimilar-Dissimilar	27	4.8565	1.42383
	Total	118	5.4629	1.34751

Procedure

The present research was partially conducted within a globally operating company. In order to send out the survey to its employees, several steps of approval had to be considered. The company reviewed the instrument from a data protection and a labor relation point of view. One major concern from a company perspective, was the tracing of information and compromised anonymity of research subjects. In the interest of granting absolute anonymity we decided to minimize questions regarding demographic information. No questions

regarding age, job title, or grade within the company were asked. Instead, we limited demographic questions to gender and nationality. Although more information would have been helpful to understand the research population, we decided that gender and nationality were most interesting when examining workplace inclusion.

In order to inform participants about the purpose of this study, an email was sent to the company's employees from various Human Resource functions within Europe. The study was introduced by an informed consent. The briefing included an explanation concerning anonymity, confidentiality and relevance of the study.

Unfortunately, an insignificant number of responses was obtained from the initial company alone. Therefore, the survey was additionally distributed among people outside of this company who met the requirements.

We first asked participants to fill out a questionnaire regarding their personality traits and their values. This questionnaire was not used for any analysis. The purpose of this questionnaire was for participants to reflect on their own personality and values and increase their salience before entering a hypothetical situation. This way, participants were able to compare their own personality and values with those of hypothetical coworkers more easily and help them with an imaginative situation.

This study used a vignette experiment with four conditions to understand the relationship between feelings of dissimilarity and perceived inclusion among employees. We informed participants that the alleged similarities and/or dissimilarities are hypothetical and are not reflective of their current work situation.

Afterwards, we asked participants to rate the extent to which they would feel included if their coworkers are similar or different in terms of personality and values. In addition, participants were asked if they feel dissimilar, in terms of personality and values, in their actual work environment and to indicate their feeling of inclusion based on that.

Measures

Personality. The Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI) assessed participants personality traits (Gosling, Rentfrow, Swann Jr., 2003). We asked participants to which extend they agree that a personality trait applies to them, examples being; "I see myself as: extroverted", or "I see myself as: open to new experience". Ten different personality traits were listed. We used a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 7 (agree strongly).

Values. In order to assess individual values, participants filled out Short Schwartz's Value Survey (SSVS) (Lindeman, 2005). Respondents were asked to what extend they agree

that a number of values applies to them, examples being: "I value: authority", or "I value: tradition". Ten different values were listed. We used a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 7 (agree strongly).

Vignette. Participants found themselves in one out of four situations: similar personality (p) and values (v), dissimilar in personality and values, similar in personality and dissimilar in values, similar in values and dissimilar on personality. The information given in the stories was hypothetical and did not represent true similarity or dissimilarities among co-workers. One example of a vignette is as follows:

> Imagine you are in a new work group. Most members of this work group are really **similar** to you in terms of personality. Please try to imagine this situation with you own personality style (e.g. if you are quite extraverted, so are they, if you are open to new experiences, so are they). In terms of values, they are also **similar**. Please imagine this situation with your own values (e.g. if you value authority, so do they, if you value tradition, so do they). In the next questionnaire, please indicate how this group makes you feel.

Felt inclusion. Participants filled out the 16-item perceived group inclusion scale (PGIS) (Jansen, 2015) in order to identify if perceived dissimilarity did affect their perception of inclusion. This 16-item questionnaire consists of two subscales (belonging and authenticity), which in fact each comprised two components. Belonging comprised group membership (e.g. "This group gives me the feeling that I belong.") and group affection (e.g. "This group appreciates me."). Authenticity contained room for authenticity (e.g. "This group allows me to be my authentic self.") and value in authenticity (e.g. This group encourages me to present myself the way I am."). Both components consist of 4 items, with answers ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). The instrument was found to be highly reliable (16 items; $\alpha = 0.97$)

Actual work environment. We asked participants to indicate if they feel dissimilar, in terms of personality and values, to most others at work in their actual work environment. Both questions were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7(completely agree).

Felt inclusion. [1]Thereupon, we asked participants to fill out the PGIS again. This questionnaire reflected their current feeling of inclusion in the organization and if they feel similar or dissimilar compared to their coworkers. This questionnaire was not manipulated so

---

[1] Although this data is not being used for this research, it can be used for future studies.

that its' results are representative of the effect of current potential dissimilarities, in terms of personality and values, on perceived feelings of inclusion among employees.

Design

The design of this study is a 2 (personality: similar vs. dissimilar) X 2 (values: similar vs. dissimilar) between-subject study. Each participant was only exposed to one vignette study, therefore, only exposed to one hypothetical situation.

Results

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine to what extent, if any, perceived dissimilarity affects sense of belonging and sense of authenticity among coworkers. Preliminary assumption checking revealed that data were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > .05$); there were no univariate or multivariate outliers, as assessed by boxplot and Mahalanobis distance ($p > .001$), respectively; there were linear relationships, as assessed by scatterplot; no multicollinearity ($r = .82$, $p < .001$); and there was homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, as assessed by Box's M test ($p = .288$). Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 2 for the four group conditions on both dependent variables.

The MANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference between the conditions on the combined dependent variables, $F(6, 226) = 6.10$, $p < .001$ Wilks' $\Lambda = .741$; partial $\eta_p^2 = .139$.

Follow-up univariate ANOVAs indicated a statistically significant difference in belonging scores between the four conditions, $F(3, 114) = 12.02$, $p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .240$. There was also a statistically significant difference in authenticity scores between the four conditions, $F(3, 114) = 17.87$, $p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .216$.

Tukey post-hoc tests (see Table 3) showed that for belonging, participants in the $similar_p$ – $similar_v$ group had statistically significantly higher mean scores than participants from the $similar_p$ -$dissimilar_v$ group ($p < .001$), the $dissimilar_p$ - $similar_v$ group ($p = .004$), and the $dissimilar_p$ - $dissimilar_v$ group ($p < .001$). For authenticity, Tukey post-hoc tests again showed that the $similar_p$ – $similar_v$ group had statistically significantly higher mean scores than participants in the $similar_p$ – $dissimilar_v$ group ($p < .001$), the $dissimilar_p$ -$similar_v$ group ($p = .033$), and the $dissimilar_p$ - $dissimilar_v$ group ($p = .001$).

In addition, the test of within-subject contrasts (Table 5) showed that people did not consistently score higher on authenticity than on belongingness ($p = .87$). However, a test of between-subjects effects (Table 6) showed that scores on authenticity and scores on belongingness were significantly different depending on the condition ($p = .00$).

Table 3

Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Condition	(J) Condition	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Belonging	Similar-Disimilar	Dissimilar-Similar	-.3250	.26543	.613	-1.0171	.3670
		Similar-Similar	-1.2664*	.26310	.000	-1.9524	-.5804
		Dissimilar-Dissimilar	.2438	.27054	.804	-.4616	.9492
	Dissimilar-Similar	Similar-Disimilar	.3250	.26543	.613	-.3670	1.0171
		Similar-Similar	-.9414*	.26960	.004	-1.6443	-.2384
		Dissimilar-Dissimilar	.5688	.27686	.175	-.1531	1.2907
	Similar-Similar	Similar-Disimilar	1.2664*	.26310	.000	.5804	1.9524
		Dissimilar-Similar	.9414*	.26960	.004	.2384	1.6443
		Dissimilar-Dissimilar	1.5102*	.27463	.000	.7941	2.2262
	Dissimilar-Dissimilar	Similar-Disimilar	-.2438	.27054	.804	-.9492	.4616
		Dissimilar-Similar	-.5688	.27686	.175	-1.2907	.1531
		Similar-Similar	-1.5102*	.27463	.000	-2.2262	-.7941
Authenticity	Similar-Disimilar	Dissimilar-Similar	-.6169	.33460	.258	-1.4893	.2555
		Similar-Similar	-1.5573*	.33166	.000	-2.4220	-.6925
		Dissimilar-Dissimilar	.1580	.34104	.967	-.7312	1.0472
	Dissimilar-Similar	Similar-Disimilar	.6169	.33460	.258	-.2555	1.4893
		Similar-Similar	-.9404*	.33986	.033	-1.8265	-.0542
		Dissimilar-Dissimilar	.7749	.34902	.124	-.1351	1.6849
	Similar-Similar	Similar-Disimilar	1.5573*	.33166	.000	.6925	2.4220
		Dissimilar-Similar	.9404*	.33986	.033	.0542	1.8265

		1.7153*	.34620	.000	.8126	2.6179
	Dissimilar-Dissimilar					
Dissimilar-Dissimilar	Similar-Dissimilar	-.1580	.34104	.967	-1.0472	.7312
	Dissimilar-Similar	-.7749	.34902	.124	-1.6849	.1351
	Similar-Similar	-1.7153*	.34620	.000	-2.6179	-.8126

Based on observed means.
 The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 1.703.
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 4

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Belonging	31.298a	3	10.433	10.762	.000
	Authenticity	42.829b	3	14.276	9.595	.000
Intercept	Belonging	3514.747	1	3514.747	3625.658	.000
	Authenticity	3499.578	1	3499.578	2352.065	.000
Condition	Belonging	31.298	3	10.433	10.762	.000
	Authenticity	42.829	3	14.276	9.595	.000
Error	Belonging	110.513	114	.969		
	Authenticity	169.618	114	1.488		
Total	Belonging	3681.125	118			
	Authenticity	3733.984	118			
Corrected Total	Belonging	141.811	117			
	Authenticity	212.447	117			

a. R Squared = .221 (Adjusted R Squared = .200)
b. R Squared = .202 (Adjusted R Squared = .181)

Table 5

Tests of Within-Subjects Contrasts

Measure: MEASURE_1

Source	Inclusion	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Inclusion	Linear	.008	1	.008	.027	.871	.000
Inclusion * Condition	Linear	.818	3	.273	.883	.452	.023
Error(Inclusion)	Linear	35.210	114	.309			

Table 6

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Measure: MEASURE_1
Transformed Variable: Average

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	7014.316	1	7014.316	3264.860	.000	.966
Condition	73.309	3	24.436	11.374	.000	.230
Error	244.921	114	2.148			

Discussion

Previous research has illustrated a relationship between similarity among coworkers and felt inclusion in the workplace. This research extended the knowledge around the topic of workplace inclusion, by examining what aspects could hinder inclusion among coworkers. This research sought to examine if dissimilarity, in terms of personality and values, does in fact undermine social inclusion, and if both aspects of inclusion, belongingness and authenticity, are equally affected by dissimilarity.

This research demonstrated that dissimilarity among coworkers did affect their perceived feeling of inclusion. Participants that were exposed to the condition of dissimilarity indicated a significantly lower level of belongingness and authenticity than people in the condition of similarity. However, no true difference was found for dissimilarities in terms of personality and values. It appears, that dissimilarity in general did affect the perceived feeling of inclusion, not personality or values in particular.

However, it is difficult to predict if those findings would be replicated if all study limitations would be resolved. What seems to be undeniable is the observation that differences in general have a negative impact on felt social inclusion. This study therefore, adds to and supports research which has shown the same results for decades. As Byrne already suggested through the similarity-attraction theory, we are more attracted to people who are similar to us and who make us feel liked in return (Byrne, 1971). This study illustrates that the same concept applies to social inclusion as well. In addition, recent research suggests that people tend to include themselves in groups whose members share similar attributes, as it may allow for easier interaction and communication (Jansen, 2015). Other than expected, this research did not find a specific effect of personality and values on belongingness and authenticity. One explanation might be that the effect just is not there. However, it could be possible that various limitations or the design of the study have influenced this outcome. Using hypothetical dissimilarities might have caused participants to fail to indicate the effect as they were not actually experiencing them.

Limitations and Suggestion for Future Research

This study includes several potential limitations that require further discussion. Initially, the study was intended to be conducted with employees of a single globally operating company. In order to send out the survey to its employees, several steps of approval had to be considered. One major concern was the tracing of information and compromised anonymity of research subjects. In the interest of granting absolute anonymity, questions regarding demographic information were minimized. No questions regarding age, job title, or grade within the company were excluded from the questionnaire. Instead, demographic questions were limited to gender and nationality. Although gender and nationality are most interesting when analyzing workplace inclusion, future research should include additional demographic information to gain greater insight into the research population. Relevant factors such as grade or department of participants could allow for a greater understanding of influencing factors on workplace inclusion.

The questionnaire was designed to be distributed within one company. Besides the questions about a hypothetical workplace situation, participants were also asked about their actual work environment and how they currently perceive it. Those answers were intended to be used as an indicator of workplace inclusion for this specific company. Unfortunately, an insignificant number of responses were obtained from this company alone. Therefore, the survey was additionally distributed among people outside of this company who met the

requirements. As a consequence, all questions regarding participant's actual workplace no longer possessed any value to the survey, nor the company.

Future research should aim for a greater number of participants to strengthen the validity of findings. Not only was the study sample relatively small, but many of the participants did not fully complete the survey. Further investigation of workplace inclusion in environments that feature a considerable level of diversity among its employees could provide relevant findings to this segment of literature. A combination of the findings from this study with further investigations regarding workplace inclusion may benefit not only organizations but also its employees. Additionally, future studies may seek to identify organizations that advocate for diversity and inclusion through their mission statements or cultural values and perhaps compare the results with the findings from this study. These comparisons could provide valuable information regarding workplace inclusion and therefore contribute not only to the literature, but also to a better understanding of barriers and benefits affiliated with inclusion efforts.

Conclusion

In summary, this research demonstrated that feeling dissimilar in comparison to one's coworkers, negatively affects a person's feeling of inclusion. Furthermore, it appears that differences in personality and values are not necessarily the deciding factors for a feeling of dissimilarity among coworkers. More research is needed to examine the contributing factors of dissimilarity. A greater understanding of inclusion and its components could lead to an environment that could maximize employees' feeling of belonging and could encourage them to be their authentic self. As an inclusive environment has shown to have a great impact on organizational performance, fostering such an environment would not only be beneficial for the individual or a group, but for an entire organization as a whole.

Reference

Badal, S., & Harter, K. J. (2014). Gender diversity, business-unit engagement, and performance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21*(4), 354-365.

Brewer, M. B., & Roccas, S. (2001). Individual values, social identity, and optimal distinctiveness. In C. Sedikides & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Individual self, relational self, collective self*. (pp.219-237), New York, NY US: Psychology Press.

Byrne, D., & Griffitt, W. (1973). Interpersonal attraction. *Annual review of psychology*, *24*(1), 317-336.

Chavez, C. I., & Weisinger, J. Y. (2008). Beyond diversity training: A social infusion for cultural inclusion. *Human Resource Management, 47*(2), 331-350. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20215

Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann Jr, W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in personality*, *37*(6), 504-528.

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

Jansen, W. S. (2015). *Social inclusion in diverse work settings*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Groningen, Netherlands.

Jansen, W.S., Otten, S., Van der Zee, K. I. and Jans, L. (2014), Inclusion: Conceptualization and measurement. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(4), 370-385. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2011

Jansen (2018). Unpublished data

Kernis, M. H., & Goldman, B. M. (2006). A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity: Theory and research. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology: Vol. 38. Advances in experimental social psychology,* Vol. 38, pp. 283-357). San Diego, CA, US: Elsevier Academic Press.http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(06)38006-9

Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2014). *Personality psychology: domains of knowledge about human nature*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

Lee, R. M., & Robbins, S. B. (1995). Measuring belongingness: The social connectedness and the social assurance scales. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 42*(2), 232-241.

Lindeman, M. & Verkasalo, M. (2005). Measuring values with the Short Schwartz's Value Survey. Journal of Personality Assessment, *85*(2),170-178.

Mannix, E., & Neale, M. A. (2005). What differences make a difference? *Psychological Science for the Public Interest, 6*(2), 31-55.

Martinez, L. R., Sawyer, K. B., Thoroughgood, C. N., Ruggs, E. N., Smith, N. A. (2016). The importance of being "me": The relation between authentic identity expression and transgender employees' work-related attitudes and experiences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance Online Publication. doi:10.1037/apl0000168

Mayer, J. D. (2007). Asserting the definition of personality. *The online newsletter for personality science*, *1*, 1-4.

Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Oishi, S., Trawalter, S., & Nosek, B. A. (2014). How ideological migration geographically segregates groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *51*, 1-14.

Nair, N, & Vohra, N. (2015). Diversity and inclusion at the workplace: A review of research and perspectives. *Journal of Corporate Strategies, 8*(7), 36-42.

Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader-member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1412-1426.

Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion in Organizations. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(2), 212-236. doi:10.1177/1059601104273064

Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Cultural values in organisations: Insights for Europe. *European J. of International Management, 1*(3), 176. doi:10.1504/ejim.2007.014692

Sahin, O., Van der Toorn, J., Jansen, W. S., Boezeman, E. J., & Ellemers, N. (2019). Looking beyond our similarity: How perceived (in)visible dissimilarity relates to feelings of inclusion at work. *Front. Psychol. 10*, 575. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00575

Shrader, C. B., Blackburn, V. B., & Iles, P. (1997). Women in management and firm financial performance: An exploratory study. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 9*, 355-372.

Triandis, H. C. (2003). The future of workforce diversity in international organisations: A commentary. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 52*(3), 486-495.

Watson, W. E., Kumar, K., & Michaelsen, L. K. (1997). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction processes and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 590-602.

Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Baliousis, M., & Joseph, S. (2008). The authentic personality: A theoretical and empirical conceptualization and the development of the Authenticity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*(3), 385-399. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.55.3.385

Appendix

Research Survey

Q1 This is an invitation to take part in a short survey. Below is a description of the research procedures and an explanation of your rights as a research participant. In accordance with the ethics code of the American Psychology Association (APA), you are asked to read this information carefully.

If the following applies to you, you may take part in this study:

 - You are currently employed.
 - You have been working at the same company for more than 6 months.
 - In order to achieve your work objectives, you collaborate with a minimum of 2 other employees.

If you decide to participate, you agree to complete a series of questions regarding your personality, values, and perception of inclusion in your workplace. The questionnaires do not require any sensitive information. Nevertheless, it is essential to know that all answers will be anonymised.

 With regard to the use of your study data, the following conditions apply: - Your data will be used for scientific purposes. All data collected, up until the moment you discontinue participation or the experiment has ended, will be used for research. - Your data will be processed and kept confidentially, unless disclosure is required by law. Your data itself cannot be traced back to you, it is not personally identifiable. After the point of publication, only the data that is necessary for the verification of the study results will be stored safely for at least 10 years. - Researchers can use the collected data for scientific publications. However, no data in publications can be traced back to individuals or organizations. Only the anonymized data might be shared for open science purposes with third parties. - You have the right to withhold the responses you have provided from subsequent analysis. This means we will not use your data for the current or follow-up research, nor share it anonymously for open science purposes. You can decide to withdraw your data until the study results accepted for publication, or until anonymization prevents us to track down your response.

You are at no point of time obligated to take part or finish this study, participation is completely voluntary. If at any point you decide to withdraw from this study there will be no penalties. All data collected will be held confidential and will only be used for research purposes.

The entire survey will take around 10 min to complete.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the researcher at s.burkhardt@students.uu.nl

Researcher: Svenja Burkhardt Correa
Supervisor: Onur Sahin, Toon Taris

- -

Q4 I have read and understood the information above. I will grant permission to use my (anonymous) data for research purposes.

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

End of Block: Default Question Block

Start of Block: Cannotparticipate

Display This Question:

  If I have read and understood the information above. I will grant permission to use my (anonymous) d... = No

Q24 We are sorry to see you decided not to take part in this survey. Regardless, we would like to thank you for your time.

Skip To: End of Survey If We are sorry to see you decided not to take part in this survey. Regardless, we would like to tha...() Is Displayed

End of Block: Cannotparticipate

Start of Block: Block 10

Q26 What is your gender?

○ Male (1)

○ Female (2)

○ Other (3) _____

○ Prefer not to say (4)

- -

Q28 What is your nationality?

○ My nationality is: (4) _____

○ I don't want to answer this question (5)

Q5 Below are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please indicate to which extend you agree or disagree with the statement.

Personality I see myself as:

	Disagree strongly (1)	Disagree moderately (3)	Disagree a little (4)	Agree a little (6)	Agree moderately (7)	Agree strongly (8)
Extraverted, enthusiastic (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Critical, quarrelsome (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Dependable, self-disciplined (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Anxious, easily upset (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Open to new experience, complex (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Reserved, quiet (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sympathetic, warm (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Disorganized, careless (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Calm, emotionally stable (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Conventional, uncreative (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q2 Below are a number of values that may or may not apply to you. Please indicate to which extend you agree or disagree with the statement.

Value I value:

	Disagree strongly (1)	Disagree moderately (2)	Disagree a little (3)	Agree a little (5)	Agree moderately (6)	Agree strongly (9)
POWER (social power, authority, wealth) (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACHIEVEMENT (success, ambition, influence on people and events) (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
HEDONISM (gratification of desires, enjoyment in life, self-indulgence) (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
STIMULATION (daring, a varied and challenging life, an exciting life) (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
SELF-DIRECTION (creativity, freedom, independence) (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○
UNIVERSALISM (broad-mindedness, social justice, equality) (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○
BENEVOLENCE (helpfulness, honesty, forgiveness, loyalty) (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○
TRADITION (respect for tradition, humbleness, modesty) (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○
CONFORMITY (obedience, self-discipline, politeness) (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○

| SECURITY (national security, family security, social order) (10) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Q10 *Imagine you are in a new work group. Most members of this work group are really **similar** to you in terms of personality. Please try to imagine this situation with your own personality style (e.g. if you are quite extraverted, so are they, if you are open to new experiences, so are they). In terms of values, they are also **similar**. Please imagine this situation with your own values (e.g. if you value authority, so do they, if you value tradition, so do they). In the next questionnaire, please indicate how this group would make you feel:*

Q18 *Imagine you are in a new work group. Most members of this work group are really **dissimilar** to you in terms of personality. Please try to imagine this situation with your own personality style (e.g. if you are quite extraverted, they are introverted, if you are open to new experiences, they do not like new experiences). However, in terms of values, they are **similar** to you. Please imagine this situation with your own values (e.g. if you value authority, so do they, if you value tradition, so do they). In the next questionnaire, please indicate how this group would make you feel:*

Q19

Imagine you are in a new work group. Most members of this work group are really **dissimilar** to you in terms of personality. Please try to imagine this situation with your own personality style (e.g. if you are quite extraverted, they are introverted, if you are open to new experiences, they do not like new experiences). In terms of values, they are also **dissimilar** to you. Please imagine this situation with your own values (e.g. if you value authority, they do not , if you value tradition, they do not). In the next questionnaire, please indicate how this group would make you feel:

Q20 *Imagine you are in a new work group. Most members of this work group are really **similar** to you in terms of personality. Please try to imagine this situation with your own personality style (e.g. if you are quite extraverted, so are they, if you are open to new experiences, so are they. However, in terms of values, they are **dissimilar** to you. Please imagine this situation with your own values (e.g. if you value authority, they do not , if you value tradition, they do not). In the next questionnaire, please indicate how this group would make you feel:*

End of Block: Assimilation (similar/dissimilar)

Start of Block: Inclusion questionnaire

Q13 This group...

	Completely disagree (8)	Disagree (9)	Disagree somewhat (10)	Neither agree nor disagree (11)	Agree Somewhat (12)	Agree (13)	Completely agree (14)
gives me the feeling that I belong (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
gives me the feeling that I am part of this group (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
gives me the feeling that I fit in (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
treats me as an insider (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
likes me (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
appreciates me (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
is pleased with me (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
cares about me (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
allows me to be authentic (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
allows me to be who I am (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
allows me to express my authentic self (11)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

allows me to present myself the way I am (12)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
encourages me to be be authentic (13)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
encourages me to be who I am (17)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
encourages me to express my authentic self (18)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
encourages me to present myself the way I am (19)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Inclusion questionnaire

Start of Block: Block 12

Q31 The following questions are concerning your **ACTUAL** work environment and how you currently perceive it.

End of Block: Block 12

Start of Block: Block 11

Q32 In terms of personality, I feel dissimilar to most others at work.

	Completely disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Disagree somewhat (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Agree somewhat (5)	Agree (6)	Completely agree (7)
1 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q33 In terms of values, I feel dissimilar to most others at work.

	Completely disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Disagree somewhat (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Agree somewhat (5)	Agree (6)	Completely agree (7)
1 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Block 11

Start of Block: Block 4

Q14 Below you will find the same questionnaire as before. This time, please indicate how you are **ACTUALLY** feeling in your current workgroup.

Q15 My group...

	Completely disagree (8)	Disagree (9)	Disagree somewhat (10)	Neither agree nor disagree (11)	Agree somewhat (12)	Agree (13)	Completely agree (14)
gives me the feeling that I belong (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
gives me the feeling that i am part of this group (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
gives me the feeling that I fit in (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
treats me as an insider (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
likes me (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
appreciates me (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
is pleased with me (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
cares about me (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
allows me to be authentic (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
allows me to be who I am (10)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
allows me to express my authentic self (11)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

allows me to present myself the way I am (12)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
encourages me to be authentic (13)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
encourages me to be who I am (14)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
encourages me to express my authentic self (15)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
encourages me to present myself the way I am (16)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

End of Block: Block 4

Start of Block: Debriefing

Q25 Thank you for participating in this study! We hope you enjoyed the experience. Please feel free to ask any questions or to comment on any aspect of the study. As you know, your participation in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. All data collected will be used for research. You have the right to withhold the responses you have provided from subsequent analysis. This means we will not use your data for the current or follow-up research, nor share it anonymously for open science purposes. You can decide to withdraw your data until the study results accepted for publication, or until anonymization prevents us to track down your response.
Svenja Burkhardt Correas.burkhardt@students.uu.nl

Onur Sahin, MSc
o.sahin@uu.nl

End of Block: Debriefing