

# International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies

Research Article / Survey Paper / Case Study

Available online at: [www.ijarcsms.com](http://www.ijarcsms.com)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Open Access, International Journal - Included in  
the International Serial Directories

## *Exploring Dimensions of Workforce Diversity in Higher Education Institutes: An Empirical Study from Northern India*

**Kanupriya Thakur<sup>1</sup>**

Research Scholar, HPKV Business School,  
Department of Commerce and Management Studies,  
Central University of Himachal Pradesh,  
Dharmashala (H.P) India.

**Dr. Aditi Sharma<sup>2</sup>**

Assistant Professor, HPKV Business School,  
Department of Commerce and Management  
Studies, Central University of Himachal Pradesh,  
Dharmashala (H.P) India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61161/ijarcsms.v13i3.7>

**Abstract:** *This study explores the multidimensional structure of workforce diversity within Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) in Northern India by identifying key dimensions and evaluating the reliability and construct validity of associated measurement items. Employing a descriptive and exploratory research design, the study utilized a systematic multistage sampling approach to collect data from 400 faculty members across various universities. Factor analysis was conducted to assess the underlying structure of workforce diversity, and the findings revealed four distinct and reliable dimensions: Receptivity to Diversity and Diversity Management (RECP), Equal Representation and Developmental Opportunities (EQUAL), Hire and Retain Diverse Employees (HIRE), and Promotion of Gender Diversity (GEND). All dimensions demonstrated strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding the acceptable threshold. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure (.857) and Bartlett's test ( $p < .001$ ) confirmed the data's suitability for factor analysis. The four extracted components explained 66.81% of the total variance, validating the multidimensional framework of workforce diversity. These findings provide empirical support for the structured assessment of diversity practices in academic institutions and offer insights for policymakers and administrators aiming to foster inclusive organizational cultures in HEIs.*

**Keywords:** *Workforce Diversity, Receptivity to Diversity, Equal Representation, Gender Diversity etc.*

### I. INTRODUCTION

Liberalization and globalization have greatly impacted the structure of contemporary workforces, making diversity a core foundation of organizational thinking. Jain and Verma (1996) were some of the earliest observers who linked the liberalization of the economy and globalization to workforce diversity in India, drawing attention to the new blends of employees. Vedpuriswar(2008) also supported this view noting that there was a profound change in workforce demographics in India which, like other economies around the world, highlighting the need for effective management of diversity. A variety of scholars seem to build a consensus on the positive benefits of diversity on organizational performance. Hayles (1996) provided a comprehensive definition of diversity claiming that it cuts across more than observable differences such as gender or race because it also includes differences in ideas, motivation, ambition, and sensitivity. Yadav and Lenka (2020) have stated that diverse workforce allows organizations to respond to customer's needs in a timely manner which enhances organizational performance. Along these lines, Nishii (2013) and Khan et al. (2019) validate the positive impact of diversity on employee engagement and performance, thereby underscoring the importance of fostering inclusive workplaces. From the literature, there

is evidence that suggests that managing diversity effectively creates a more positive work environment by fostering inclusion, improving morale, and reducing turnover.

Selvaraj (2015) and Worman (2005) remark that organizations enjoy improved job satisfaction and employee retention when diversity is respected and inclusivity is given preference. For Rehman's (2013) comments, recognition of difference and similarity among employees is equally important in promoting culture integration and organizational coherence. But not all scholars are overly optimistic. Harrison and Klein (2007) warn that unmanaged diversity along race, age, and gender lines diversity becomes a source of lower cohesion, reduced productivity, and increased interpersonal conflict. For Rehman (2013), the problem lies in the "melting pot" strategy many organizations take. By assuming that employees will automatically adjust to the culture, deeper integration problems are created. Although there is an increasing volume of research around the world, there is still a significant gap in studying the dynamics of diversity in emerging economies. Yadav and Lenka (2020) argue that while Western contexts have been well examined, the particular aspects of diversity in countries like India are unexplored. This gap is crucial as Indian organizations are undergoing rapid industrialization and globalization, which needs a contextual understanding of diversity's influence. With these differing views in mind, this study aims to examine the different aspects of workforce diversity in higher education institutes in India.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

With particular regard to the development of cohesion and performance, there is an increasing focus on and literature about culture and diversity management. Hofstede (1991) describes organizational culture as the collective programming of the mind, which entails all belief systems, values, language, and even demographic factors that differentiate one organization from another. Likewise, Spector et al. (2001) underscored that culture influences the value system of an individual which as a result shapes attitude and behavior in organization. These concepts strongly support a claim that managing diversity is more effective when there is sufficient knowledge about culture. Some scholars articulate the value of diversity when it is systematically managed. Adler (1986) argued that structured approaches to cultural diversity put creativity, skills and ideas of the employees to good use and enhances the competitiveness of the organization. According to Thomas (1991), managing diversity means dealing with a complex set of differences, which design and implement clear strategies to unprecedented levels. This was also supported by Khan (2019) stating that when diverse talents and skills are harnessed and synergized, enhanced performance of employees results. In the context of South African higher education, Setati et al., (2019) reported that gender and ethnic diversity positively affect employee performance. In support of this view, Gellner and Stephen (2009) demonstrated that age diversity can increase productivity due to cross use of skills and interaction among people with varying competencies and skills. In the same vein, Johnson And Jonhson's (2010) and Zemke, Raines and Filipczak's (2013) studies also looked into specific differences within generations, arguing that common socio-political events within a generational cohort shape certain attitudes towards work, positing that managing differences among generations is critical for the peace of an organization. Kundu, Bansal, and Purthi (2019) accentuated the subjective nature of the perception of diversity policies, arguing that organizational performance is improved when policies are implemented. In contrast, some studies pointing to the complexity of diversity's impact. Barry and Bateman (1996) introduced the concept of social traps where individual and collective interests may be at odds with one another, accounting for how diversity is managed in organizations. That is, they argue that the outcomes from diversity are the result of strategic choice, best supported through training programs and network groups. Ross (2011) noted that the interplay of culture, diversity and conflict is fluid, suggesting that even in ethnically homogeneous groups, the existence of conflict is possible, highlighting the need to move beyond mere alignment to create unity without division—to address diversity management. More contradictions emerge from the evidence. Joseph and Selvaraj (2015) conducted a study with 316 employees in Singapore, showing no significant relationship between employee performance and diversity measures such as age, gender and ethnicity, indicating that the presence of diverse characteristics do not in themselves lead to favorable outcomes. The latter supports Mathan (2018) who noted that in the banking industry, the effect of diversity varies by

management level, suggesting that organizational hierarchy moderates its effect. In hospitality, Yao et al. (2019) reasoned that the high rate of employee turnover in Chinese hotels was more an issue of operations than diversity, thus shifting the focus from demographics to a workforce issue. In the aggregate, the literature reveals a divide: one alms that diversity is a useful asset for creativity, cohesion, and organizational performance while the other relies on warning that unmanaged diversity can lead to misalignment, conflict, or near-zero impact. This emphasizes the need for targeted approaches in diversity research, particularly in specific sectors and regions.

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To examine the dimensions of workforce diversity in Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) in Northern India, this study employs a descriptive and exploratory research design. A systematic multistage sampling method was adopted to ensure balanced representation across diverse institutions. In the first stage, Random sampling was used to select universities based on their geographic distribution and designation as tertiary education providers. Following this, departments within the selected universities were chosen randomly. At the final stage, stratified sampling was applied to faculty members, ensuring representation across various academic ranks and disciplines. Data collection was carried out through structured questionnaires administered to faculty members. Out of 500 distributed questionnaires, 400 valid responses were obtained for analysis.

### IV. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This section presents the empirical outcomes derived from the analysis of workforce diversity dimensions in Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) in Northern India. The findings are organized to reflect the reliability of the measurement scale, sampling adequacy, factor structure, and the validation of the underlying dimensions through exploratory factor analysis. The results provide internal consistency of constructs, the adequacy of data for factor analysis, and the identification of key dimensions shaping diversity practices within academic institutions.

Table 1: Reliability statistics for dimensions of workforce diversity

S.No.	Dimensions Of Workforce Diversity	Number of variables	Reliability statistics
1	Receptivity to diversity and diversity management (RECP)	8	.896
2	Equal representation and developmental opportunities (EQUAL)	5	.860
3	Hire and retain diverse employees(HIRE)	3	.844
4	Promotion of gender diversity(GEND)	2	.892

The reliability statistics presented in Table 1 indicate that all four dimensions of workforce diversity demonstrate high internal consistency, as reflected in their Cronbach's alpha values. The dimension 'Receptivity to diversity and diversity management (RECP)' consists of eight items and shows a strong reliability coefficient of .896. Similarly, 'Equal representation and developmental opportunities (EQUAL)' with five items records a reliability score of .860, while 'Hire and retain diverse employees (HIRE)', comprising three items, has a reliability of .844. Notably, even 'Promotion of gender diversity (GEND)', despite being measured with only two items, yields a high reliability score of .892. These values, all above the generally accepted threshold of .70, confirm the internal consistency and reliability of the measurement instruments used for assessing various dimensions of workforce diversity.

Table 2:KMO and Bartlett's Testfor dimensions of workforce diversity

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.857
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3551.539
	df	153
	Sig.	.000

Table 2 presents the results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. The KMO value of .857 suggests that the sampling is more than adequate for factor analysis, indicating that the data is likely to yield reliable and distinct factors. Furthermore, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is highly significant (Chi-Square = 3551.539, df = 153,  $p < .001$ ),

which confirms that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix and that the variables are sufficiently correlated to justify the application of factor analysis.

Table 3: Total Variance Explained for dimensions of workforce diversity

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.115	28.416	28.416	5.115	28.416	28.416	4.654	25.855	25.855
2	3.834	21.300	49.715	3.834	21.300	49.715	3.276	18.200	44.054
3	1.749	9.718	59.433	1.749	9.718	59.433	2.264	12.579	56.634
4	1.328	7.378	66.811	1.328	7.378	66.811	1.832	10.177	66.811
5	.627	3.481	70.292						
6	.608	3.375	73.667						
7	.567	3.151	76.819						
8	.538	2.991	79.810						
9	.500	2.776	82.586						
10	.484	2.686	85.272						
11	.434	2.413	87.685						
12	.393	2.183	89.868						
13	.385	2.142	92.010						
14	.362	2.011	94.021						
15	.335	1.859	95.880						
16	.321	1.782	97.662						
17	.250	1.387	99.049						
18	.171	.951	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 3 details the total variance explained through principal component analysis. Four components have eigenvalues greater than 1 and together account for approximately 66.81% of the total variance. Specifically, the first component explains 28.42% of the variance, followed by the second (21.30%), third (9.72%), and fourth (7.38%). After rotation, the variance explained becomes more evenly distributed, with the rotated sums of squared loadings showing that the first four components account for 25.86%, 18.20%, 12.58%, and 10.18% of the variance respectively. This further confirms the multidimensional structure of the workforce diversity construct and validates the presence of four distinct underlying factors. Overall, the results from reliability, sampling adequacy, and factor analysis provide robust support for the construct validity of the measurement instrument.

Table 4: Rotated Component Matrixes for dimensions of workforce diversity

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
RECP7	.799			
RECP5	.798			
RECP6	.791			
RECP2	.763			
RECP1	.754			
RECP8	.749			
RECP3	.721			
RECP4	.692			
EQUAL2		.827		
EQUAL1		.806		
EQUAL4		.758		
EQUAL3		.757		
EQUAL5		.752		
HIRE1			.841	
HIRE3			.824	
HIRE2			.824	
GEND1				.937
GEND2				.936

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

The rotated component matrix in Table 4 displays the results of a **principal component analysis with Varimax rotation** for the dimensions of workforce diversity. This table presents how each item (statement) loads onto four distinct components, aligning with the conceptual framework comprising **RECP, EQUAL, HIRE, and GEND**. The Varimax rotation helps clarify the factor structure by maximizing the variance of loadings across components, thereby making interpretation more straightforward. The first component captures all eight items from the dimension **Receptivity to Diversity and Diversity Management (RECP)**, with high loadings ranging from .692 (RECP4) to .799 (RECP7). This strong clustering of items on a single factor confirms the unidimensionality of the RECP construct, suggesting that these items are consistently measuring attitudes and organizational practices related to embracing and managing diversity. The second component includes all five items from **Equal Representation and Developmental Opportunities (EQUAL)**, with loadings from .752 (EQUAL5) to .827 (EQUAL2). These loadings reflect a coherent grouping of variables that relate to fairness in representation and career growth opportunities, supporting the internal validity of this dimension. The third component consists of the three items related to **Hire and Retain Diverse Employees (HIRE)**, with similarly strong loadings between .824 (HIRE2 and HIRE3) and .841 (HIRE1). The consistency of these loadings indicates that this component clearly captures practices and policies related to recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce. The fourth component is defined by two items — GEND1 and GEND2 — from the **Promotion of Gender Diversity (GEND)** dimension, with extremely high loadings of .937 and .936, respectively. Despite comprising only two items, the very high factor loadings suggest that this component robustly represents organizational efforts focused specifically on gender inclusion.

Overall, the rotated component matrix confirms that each of the four intended dimensions of workforce diversity forms a distinct factor with strong item loadings, validating the construct structure. This reinforces the multidimensional nature of workforce diversity as conceptualized in the study and supports the appropriateness of the items used in measuring each factor.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study offers a comprehensive assessment of workforce diversity within Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) in Northern India by identifying and validating four key dimensions: Receptivity to Diversity and Diversity Management (RECP), Equal Representation and Developmental Opportunities (EQUAL), Hire and Retain Diverse Employees (HIRE), and Promotion of Gender Diversity (GEND). Using a robust methodological framework, including multistage sampling and factor analysis, the study confirms that workforce diversity in academic institutions is a multidimensional construct with distinct and internally consistent factors. The reliability statistics and factor loadings reinforce the validity of the measurement instrument, while the explained variance and sampling adequacy further substantiate the empirical strength of the model. These findings highlight the importance of adopting a structured approach to diversity management, emphasizing equitable representation, inclusive hiring practices, and targeted gender diversity initiatives. As HEIs aim to evolve into more inclusive and globally competitive environments, integrating these diversity dimensions into institutional policies and practices becomes essential. The study contributes to the literature on organizational diversity by providing validated dimensions applicable to the higher education context and offers a foundation for future research, comparative studies, and policy interventions aimed at enhancing diversity outcomes in educational institutions.

References

1. Adler NJ. Cultural Synergy: Managing the impact of Cultural Diversity, Annual: Development Human Resource.1986;229-238.
2. Barry, Bateman. A Social Trap Analysis of the Management of Diversity.The Academy of Management Review. 1996; 21(3) :757-790.
3. Gellner, Stephens V. The Impact of Aging and Age Diversity on Company Performance. 2009.
4. Hayles VR. Diversity Training and Development.ASTD Training and Development Handbook.Mc. Graw Hill. 1996
5. Hofstede G. Cultures and organisation: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival. software of the mind. Harper Collins. London.

- 1991.
6. Jain HC, Verma A. Workforce Diversity employment equity/affirmative action programs & public policy in selected countries. *International Journal of manpower*. 1996; 17(4):14-29.
7. Rahman H. Effects of Workforce Diversity on Human Resource Management: A Theoretical Perspective. *Asian academic research journal of social sciences and humanities*. 2013; 1(12) :61-70.
8. Ross H. Reinventing diversity: Transforming Organizational Community to Strengthen People, Purpose and Performance, Rowman& Littlefield Publishers. NewYork. 2011.
9. Spector PE, Cooper CL, Sparks K, et al. An International Study of the Psychometric Properties of the Hofstede Values Survey Module 1994: A Comparison of Individual and Country/Province Level Results, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*50. 2001; 269–81.
10. Thomas RR. Beyond Race and Gender: Unleashing the Power of Your Total Work Force by Managing Diversity. New York : AMACOM; 1991. 130.
11. Thomas RR. Jr. Managing Diversity: A Conceptual Framework, in *Diversity in the Workplace* by Jackson and Associates. New York: Guilford Press; 1992. 131.
12. Thomas WHNG, Feldman D C. Evaluating six common stereotypes about older workers with meta- analytical data. *Personnel Psychology*.2012; 65: 821-858.
13. WormanDianah. Is there a business case for diversity? *Personnel Today*. 2005.
14. Bhushan, Y. K. (1993). *Fundamentals of Business Organisation and Management*.Sultan Chand & Sons, p. PF-82.
15. Gomez, L. F., & Valdés, M. G. (2019).The evaluation of teacher performance in higher education.*Journal of Educational Psychology-Propositos y Representaciones*, 7(2), 499–515.
16. Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1199–1228. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.26586096>
17. Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., & Bell, M. P. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256901>
18. Haynes, B. P. (2008). An evaluation of the impact of the office environment on productivity.*Journal of Facilities*, 26(5/6), 178–191.
19. Jackson, S. E., May, K. E., & Whitney, K. (1995). Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision-making teams. In R. A. Guzzo, E. Salas, & Associates (Eds.), *Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations* (pp. 204–261). Jossey-Bass.
20. Johnson, C., & Johnson, R. (2010).Generations, Inc.: From Boomers to Linksters—Managing the friction between generations at work. AMACOM.
21. Kube, S. (2011). Do wage cuts damage work morale? Evidence from a natural field experiment. Available at <http://www.iew.uzh.ch/wp/iewwp471.pdf>
22. Kundu, S. C. (2004). Workforce diversity status: A study of employees' reactions. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 104(3), 332–345.
23. Mahmood, S., & Ali, B. (2011). Morale imagination and management decision making: An empirical study. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(4), 1466–1480.
24. Marimuthu, M. (2008).Ethnic diversity on boards of directors and its implications on firm financial performance.*Journal of International Social Research*, 1(4), 431–445.
25. Meena, K. (2015). Diversity dimensions of India and their organizations challenges: An analysis. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 17(7), 77–90.
26. Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996).Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups.*Academy of Management Review*, 21(2), 402–433. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9605060217>
27. Morrison, A. M., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990).Women and minorities in management.*American Psychologist*, 45(2), 200–208.
28. Nishii, L. H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for diverse groups.*Academy of Management Journal*, 56(6), 1754–1774. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.0823>
29. Patrick, H. A., & Kumar, V. R. (2012). Managing workplace diversity: Issues and challenges. *Sage Open*, 2(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244012444615>
30. Pathak, A. A., &Purkayastha, A. (2016). More women on Indian boards: Moving beyond mere regulations and tokenism. *Strategic Direction*, 32(3), 13–15.
31. Schwind, H., Das, H., &Wagar, T. (2007).Diversity management. In H. Schwind, H. Das, & T. Wagar (Eds.), *Canadian Human Resource Management: A Strategic Approach* (8th ed., pp. 486–524).
32. Setati, S. T., Zhuwao, S., Ngirande, H., &Ndlovu, W. (2019). Gender diversity, ethnic diversity and employee performance in a South African higher education institution.*SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(1), 1–8.
33. Singh, V., &Vinnicombe, S. (2004). Why so few women directors in top UK boardrooms? Evidence and theoretical explanations.*Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 12(4), 479–488.
34. Talmud, I., &Israeli, D. N. (1999).The relationship between gender and performance among directors in public corporations.*International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 7(3), 185–199.
35. Tiwari, U. (2014). A study on employee welfare facilities and its impact on employee efficiency at VindhaTelelinks Ltd Rewa (M.P.) India.Abhinav

36. Vedpuriswar, A. V. (2008). The power of differences. *Indian Management*, 47(1), 76–83.
37. Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2013). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of Boomers, Gen Xers, and Gen Yers in the workplace* (2nd ed.). AMACOM.

### *How to cite this article?*

Thakur, K., Sharma, Dr. A. (2025). Exploring Dimensions of Workforce Diversity in Higher Education Institutes: An Empirical Study from Northern India. *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies*, 13(3), 62–68 <https://doi.org/10.61161/ijarcsms.v13i3.7>