Is it the person or the place?
The effects of diversity on the rotation mindset or focus and engagement via perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety or learning culture.
I’m present in every place you go
Depending on your lens I’m friend or foe
I’m a force to be reckoned with
Like the winds of change I move. I’m swift
I’m present when two or more are together
If embraced I can make the good even better
I’m not limited to age, gender, or race
I’m invisible at times and yet all over the place
Don’t exclude me due to a lack of knowledge
Welcome me like the recruit fresh out of college
Let me take my seat at the table
Even though I may be differently able
My experience, my passion the authentic me
Can help add value for your company
Learn about me; improve my underrepresentation
And I can provide a competitive edge to your entire nation
I exclude no one. I am strengthened by all
My name is Diversity and yes I stand tall
Recognize me and keep me in the mix
Together there’s no problem that we can’t fix
I am your best hope towards true innovation
And to many, I reflect hope and inspiration
Your lives and companies will continue to change
Thus the need for Diversity and Inclusion will also remain
Do all that you can to truly embrace me
And experience life’s fullness totally
I’m the thought lurking behind the unfamiliar face
I’m the ingenuity that helps your team win the race
I’m the solution that came from the odd question that was asked
I stand out in the crowd when I, Diversity, am allowed to be unmasked
I’m Diversity embrace me and we’ll journey far
I’m Diversity include me and we will reach the shining star
Coupled with Inclusion our lights burn longer
Together we are smarter, better and stronger
I am Diversity
Yes, that’s me
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Abstract

People who have been encouraged to take risks in approaching new tasks (promotion focus) will take more non-conventional ways to gain results, which is beneficial in terms of innovation. Studies show that the most motivated and resilient individuals are not the ones who think they have a lot of fixed or innate intelligence (fixed mindset). Instead, the most motivated and resilient individuals are the ones who believe that their abilities can be developed through their effort and learning (growth mindset). Companies that encourage their employees to engage in self-starting behaviors (initiative) and provide a personally non-threatening work environment (psychological safety) and focus on continuous learning (learning culture) are more successful in terms of firm goal achievement and return on assets.

Constantly improving the company with new and creative ideas and innovations while maintaining a generally positive view of both the company itself, and their relation with it, is what is called employee engagement. Earlier studies show that diversity has a positive effect on the likelihood of introducing an innovation and that a positive relation exists between an open culture towards diversity and innovative performance.

In this research is firstly investigated if there is a relation between focus, mindset, climate for initiative, psychological safety, learning culture and engagement. Secondly, it was tested if personal traits, such as mindset and focus, would be good predictors for perceived work climate such as initiative, safety and learning culture and what the relation is with engagement. Lastly, the effect of a diverse workforce on these relations is tested.

A questionnaire was designed containing 75 Likert-scale questions and was sent out to 496 IDEXX Laboratories, Inc. employees, which are based all over the world. The response rate was 66%. In total 300 surveys (60%) were fully completed and could be used for this research.

Based on previous research it was the expectation that the relation between mindset or focus and engagement is mediated by (a) the perception of a climate for initiative, (b) the perception of psychological safety or (c) the perception of learning culture, while the relation between mindset or focus and engagement via each mediator is moderated by (1) gender diversity, (2) position diversity, (3) location diversity, (4) diversity in own nationality (5) diversity in nationality of co-workers or (6) generation diversity.

A significant relation was found between focus and engagement when this was mediated by (a) the perception of a climate for initiative, (b) the perception of psychological safety or (c) the perception of learning culture. This relation was not found for mindset except when the relation was mediated by (b) the perception of psychological safety, which was moderated by (2) position diversity or when the relation was mediated by (c) the perception of learning culture, which was moderated by (2) position diversity or (5) diversity in nationality of co-workers.
For future research it would be interesting to see if a better understanding of mindset would lead to more significant relations. One of the limitations of this research was the limited amount of questions that was asked to determine the employees’ mindset.

Diversity was based on various sub items. These items were specifically created for this research. It could be interesting to focus on one or only a few items and their relation with the model. In that case more questions could be asked which will hopefully lead to more in-depth results. These results could help with defining HR practices to use diversity to drive engagement.

The research model that was developed for this research was built with the Job Demands-Resources model in mind. I focused on the resources side of the model. For future research it could be interesting to see if focus or mindset play a key role in the complete model.

Three different groups of employees (global Human Resources department, employees who are based in the Netherlands offices and managers who are based in one of the EMEA offices) were invited for this research. Remarkable is that the global Human Resources group had significant relations, while these were not found for the other two groups. This could be an area to further investigate in future research.

The central question of this research “Is it the person or the place?” can be answered as follows:
- Employers can drive engagement via safety, initiative and learning culture (moderately strong relation with R=.485) – all three items give information about the place.
- Via focus – the person – an employer could influence the above-mentioned relations. An employer could test new hires for their focus during the selection process or a regulatory focus could be developed with current employees.
- A diverse workforce has, as far as can be seen in this research, only a small effect.
  Perhaps not everything that count’s can be counted….

Picture 1: research model
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1 Introduction

The world is becoming smaller and smaller and talent will become scarce (The 2020 Workplace, Meister, Willyerd, 2010).

It’s important that we know what drives and motivates employees in order to keep them engaged. Employee engagement is not a new concept. Most employers recognize that engaged employees produce more and stay longer in an organization that treats them well, listens to their needs and helps them develop. In a world in which things are changing more rapidly, we see that the importance of innovation becomes more and more important. To keep ahead of competition, employers will need all their resources and especially the resources that make their enterprise unique: their employees.

The drivers for employee engagement are widely known and can be summarized as enthusiasm, energy, passion and vigor (Handbook of Employee Engagement, Albrecht, 2010). To create a climate that supports innovative thinking, we know that, amongst other things, employees need to feel free to take risks, try out new things, learn and feel safe and supported.

It is interesting to see what the effect is of the safety level that employees experience in an organization so that they dare to take risks and try out new things. What’s the mindset of employees and how do they define the learning culture or the climate for initiative of the organization? Will these perceived organization cultures have an effect on employee engagement? Is it possible to influence these relations in case you know more about the employees state of mind, meaning the mindset or focus an employee holds? And with a world that becomes smaller, more global hence more diverse, will diversity have an impact on all these relations and ultimately thus on employee engagement?

In a workplace where people are working from different generations, nationalities, level of positions, locations, it only seems natural to include this item in research as well.

In this research a model is developed to see if there is positive relation between promotion focus or growth mindset of the employee via the perceived level of psychological safety, initiative and organizational learning culture and engagement. Furthermore, it is tested if the level of diversity has an effect on this model.
2 Literature review and hypotheses

The concept of employee engagement is not something new; over the past years a significant amount of academic research has been published on the topic. Within the broader academic domains numerous definitions of engagement can be found. Kahn was one of the first who described engagement. He stated that engaged employees are fully physically, cognitively and emotionally connected with their work roles. More recently employee engagement has been described as “an individual's sense of purpose and focused energy, evident to others in the display of personal initiative, adaptability, effort, and persistence directed toward organizational goals” (Albrecht 2010). And perhaps the most widely used definition is the one that has been developed by Schaufeli et al. (2004) who defined engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption”. At IDEXX engagement has been defined as “The way people think, feel and act towards IDEXX’s goals”. IDEXX believes that empowering their employees means giving them the tools and flexibility they need to communicate with one another and to foster innovation, collaboration and, above all, camaraderie (IDEXX 2012).

Meta-analysis showed that feedback, autonomy, social support and organizational climate are consistently associated with engagement and or particular facets of engagement. Personal resources like self-efficacy and optimism are strongly related to engagement as well.

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is the most widely used measure of engagement. The shorter 9-item version is reflecting the core aspects of employee engagement like vigor, dedication and absorption. The 9-item version is validated in many different countries with the use of sophisticated statistical data analytic models (Schaufeli, Bakker, Salanova, 2006).

For this research the definition of engagement that will be used is the one that is used for creating the UWES: “Engagement is a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Rather than a momentary and specific state, engagement refers to a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior. Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one’s work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. Dedication refers to being strongly involved in one’s work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Absorption, is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one’s work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work” (Schaufeli, Bakker, 2004).

In this research, I am interested to see what the effect of the employee’s mindset is on engagement. This item is thus far not so much described and tested in earlier research. Mindsets are described “as the assumptions people hold about the their abilities and the options to change these” (Dweck, 2012). Individuals with a fixed mindset believe that they have a certain amount of intelligence, and that’s it – it cannot be changed.
These individuals agree to statements such as “You have a certain amount of ability and really can’t do much to change it”. People holding a growth mindset believe that they can develop their intelligence over time and statements including “You can always greatly develop your abilities” are describing how they feel about their abilities. While people’s mindsets are generally relatively stable compelling or continuing messages may also relatively easily influence them. Heslin has described in his research that employees with a growth mindset are eager to learn take on new challenging tasks and perform more effectively. The mindsets of managers play an important role; managers with a growth mindset tend to invest more in the development of employees and this leads to higher engagement. Dweck (1998, 2008, 2010) has argued in other research that the role of parents and educators has a significant effect on the performance and mindset of students. In line with earlier research and as Visser (2013) states in his research “cultivating a growth mindset might be a good way to increase work engagement and thereby, employees mental health and performance”.

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant positive relation between growth mindset and engagement.

In the current business environment worldwide competition is increasing dramatically. A strong focus on innovation will keep enterprises ahead of competition and will lead to solid financial performance. Many organizations see employee creativity as key to innovation and performance. Employee creativity is described as the generation of new and useful ideas (Amabile, 1988, 1996, Burnes, 2014). Employees are thus encouraged to take on new activities and to take a certain amount of risks (Dewett, 2007). The willingness for employees to take on a new task is related to past experiences – produces the new task a feeling of excitement or a feeling of shame based on these experiences? According to the regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 2001), all goal-directed behavior is regulated by two distinct motivational systems. People either hold a promotion or a prevention survival focus. This means that either individuals focus on positive outcomes or gains (promotion focus) or on preventing negative outcomes or non-losses (prevention focus). It depends on the focus a certain individual holds, if and how new tasks are undertaken. For instance, a promotion-focused individual will undertake extra activities, which can help in achieving the desired end goal. Individuals with a prevention focus will strongly focus on the end goal and make sure that they avoid mismatches and are not distracted. Promotion and prevention pride can be seen as orientations to new goals that are based on a subjective history of the way (either via a promotion or prevention focus) they achieved past goals. Because it involves a subjective history of success, what matters is the individuals' own personal sense of their history of promotion or prevention success in goal completion.

In order to measure focus I used for this research the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, Taylor, 2001).

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant positive relation between promotion focus and engagement.
The two items that have been described above—mindset and focus—are giving information about an individual. The next step in this research is to see what the relation is between these two items and three other items, namely climate for initiative, psychological safety and the organizational learning culture, all describing the state or climate of the organization according to employees.

An organizational climate is important for creativity and innovation. Employees perceive climates as creative when one is encouraged to take risks and employees are expected to take initiatives so that organizational continuously change and improve (Gumusluoglu and Ilsev, 2009, Mueller, Melwani, Goncalo, 2012). Baer and Frese have formulated climate for initiative as “the formal and informal organizational practices and procedures guiding and supporting a proactive, self-starting, and persistent approach toward work”. Proactive employees perform better; they plan better, acquire more useful information and prevent negative events from occurring (Wall, Jackson, Davids, 1992). Therefore a climate that is perceived as a climate that supports initiatives will lead to higher organizational-level performance. The questionnaire Baer and Frese developed investigates factors that motivate employees to take charge, which relates to feeling responsible and self-efficacy. Besides these factors, management support for a general climate for initiative is important for people to show initiative.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant positive relation between perceived climate for initiative and engagement.

According to Bear and Frese “a climate for psychological safety to formal and informal organizational practices and procedures guiding and supporting open and trustful interactions within the work environment. Thus, a climate for psychological safety describes a work environment where employees are safe to speak up without being rejected or punished”.

Organizations with a psychological safe environment will score higher on team learning, job involvement, and collaboration and problem solving. Therefore, a strong climate for psychological safety will perform better than competitors with a less strong climate. Schneider, Macey, Barbera and Young (2010) describe, in their research that psychological safety is, together with trust and fairness, an important predictor of engagement.

In various other researches the relation of psychological safety with engagement was already tested and significant positive relations with work engagement were found. In one study determinants and mediating effects of meaningfulness, safety and availability on employees’ engagement. Rewarding relations with co-workers and managers were positively associated with safety and meaningfulness and safety were positively related with engagement. Availability was not related with engagement (May, Gilson and Harter (2004).

Nahrgang, Morgeson and Hofmann (2010) tested the relationship between job demands and resources and burnout, engagement, and safety outcomes in the workplace. Support has been found for a positive relation between employee engagement and working safely.
Garrick, Mak, Cathcart, Winwood, Bakker and Lushington (2014) have found support for the psychological safety which would moderate the effects of teachers’ daily job demands on fatigue and work engagement.

Hypothesis 4: There is a significant positive relation between perceived level of psychological safety and engagement.

The final item that I include in this model is the perceived learning culture in the organization.

Workplaces are changing fast and for employees to keep up with all these changes, it is important that they stay connected with the way work needs to be done. The world of work is changing and therefore they need to keep on developing and learning (Meister, Willyerd, 2010). Organizational learning cultures significantly contribute to organizational performance (Yu Yuan Hung, Yang, Ya-Hui Lien, McLean, Kuo, 2010).

When employees have the necessary training to do their jobs—and are rewarded for their efforts- they are more productive and more engaged (Lockwood, 2007). Organizations often expect that learning just takes place and that employees will automatically share what they know so that others can learn from them. Whether learning is structured, not structured, formal or informal, it’s important for organizations to measure how well they unlock all in the organization available knowledge since organizations that have anchored integral learning into their culture have less turnover of talent and they show on average 26% more output per employee (Lanting, 2014).

To support all various ways of learning, it is important that organizations build a learning climate and culture. Such a climate and culture can “be built by leaders and other key people who learn from their experience, influence the learning of others, and create an environment of expectations that shapes and supports desired results that in turn get measured and rewarded” (Marsick, Watkins, 2003). To measure the perceived level of learning I use in this research the DLOQ questionnaire, which measures an organization’s climate, culture, systems, and structures that influence whether individuals learn. Workplace learning in this model is defined as how much room experience employees have for ongoing experimentation, using lessons learned to draw a link between learning outcomes and changes in knowledge performance.

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant positive relation between perceived learning culture and engagement.

Now that we have seen the relation between the two items mindset and focus that describe the person and the three items that describe the place; climate for initiative, psychological safety and learning culture that describe the perceived culture on organizational level, we can further build our research model.

In this research I am interested in finding out if mindset and focus influence engagement via initiative, safety and learning culture. This idea is loosely based on the Job Demands-Resources model (JD-R) (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001). The JD-R model can be used to predict employee engagement and burnout.
The JD-R model explains two simultaneous processes; job demands (work pressure, emotional, mental and physical demands, etc.) exhaust employees' mental and physical resources and in contrast, job and personal resources (autonomy, performance feedback, social support, supervisory coaching, optimism, self-efficacy, resilience, self-esteem, etc.) foster employee engagement.

The model, which I created for this research, is looking at the resources side of the JD-R model. I use the items initiative, safety and learning culture to measure this. As an extra layer on top of the JD-R model or as a different starting point, I use items that give information about the employee: mindset and focus. I'm in this research interested in finding out if it is possible to realize higher engagement via in this case initiative, safety and learning when an employee holds a growth mindsets or a promotion focus. Therefore, the following hypotheses are developed.

Hypothesis 6: The relation between mindset and engagement is mediated by (a) the perception of a climate for initiative, (b) the perception of psychological safety or (c) the perception of learning culture

Hypothesis 7: The relation between regulatory focus and engagement is mediated by (a) the perception of a climate for initiative, (b) the perception of psychological safety or (c) the perception of learning culture.

In today's workplace the world is getting smaller and smaller. We are connecting with colleagues and customers from all over the world. When we are not directly or physically connected with a mixed group of people, then, in today's hyperconnected world, we most likely are connected via a variety of media with people born, living or working in a different country or time zone. And even when this is not the case, then one is most likely working with a colleague who is part of a different generation. Thus, diversity is all around us and needs to be included in research.

Diversity can be described as a group characteristic that reflects the degree to which there are objective or subjective differences among members (van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007).

Diversity may concern differences in demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, or ethnicity; job-related characteristics, such as functional background or organizational tenure; deeper psychological characteristics, such as personality, attitudes, and values; or other attributes. Although diversity can (in principle) involve many different member characteristics, most researchers have focused on diversity in age, gender, ethnicity, tenure, functional background, and educational background.

A diverse group shows better results when work is complex or when out-of-the-box thinking is important. The effects are even stronger when group members are able to relate and at the same time are allowed to stay true to their unique-self (Van Dijk 2012). Diversity seems to foster group creativity (Woodman, Sawyer, Griffin, 1993).
Based on research, the link with the perceived climate for initiative and psychological safety looks an obvious one (Bassett-Jones, 2005, Stevens, Plaut, Sanchez-Burks, 2008). Enterprises with a variety of knowledge, experience, and skills among their employees are better in sharing knowledge because employees interact better and share knowledge (Østergaard, Timmermans & Kristinsson, 2010).

There are so many different ways to describe diversity. In earlier research there are no clear statements about the relation with engagement. The relation with psychological safety, initiative or learning culture hasn’t been researched much either.

For this research I am interested in a variety of diversity items. First I am looking at gender diversity, meaning gender differences between the employee, the manager and the employee’s team. Research shows that gender differences have effects on the workplace (Avery, McKay, Wilson, 2007, Guillaume, Dawson, Woods, Sacramento, West, 2013, Jones, Harter, 2005, Elenkov, Manev, 2005).

I am also looking at position and generation diversity. When an employee perceives its age similar to that of his manager or co-worker, then s/he feels more psychological safe. Which leads to a greater feeling of engagement. This seems especially the case for employees who are 55+ years old (Avery, McKay, Wilson, 2007).

It seems that the higher the diversity, the greater the opportunity for creating a learning culture (Zahra, Ireland, Hit, 2000). On the other hand: high diversity can also be challenging to establish a learning culture (Mueller, Melwani, Goncalo, 2012).

Especially in complex international organizations people need to work with co-workers at different position levels, who are based in various countries and who may be part of different generations.

Besides the potential differences between de employee and others (co-workers, leaders), I am also interested in the diversity “within” the employee, which I defined in this research as nationality diversity. The enterprise where this research has been done has many people working from all over the world. Often they moved from one country to another, are working in teams working with co-workers who are born in the same country or region and are speaking the same native language. Some are living for a long time in a different country, some have changed their official nationality, and some feel fully integrated and have the feeling that a different nationality describes better how or what they feel. Many of these dimensions haven’t been used in research earlier.

This research could therefore perhaps shed a new or different light on diversity in environments where many people from a huge variety of backgrounds are working.
Hypothesis 8: The relation between mindset and engagement is mediated by (a) the perception of a climate for initiative, (b) the perception of psychological safety or (c) the perception of learning culture, while the relation between mindset and each mediator is moderated by (1) gender diversity, (2) position diversity, (3) location diversity, (4) diversity in own nationality (5) diversity in nationality of co-workers or (6) generation diversity.

Hypothesis 9: The relation between regulatory focus and engagement is mediated by (a) the perception of a climate for initiative, (b) the perception of psychological safety or (c) the perception of learning culture, while the relation between mindset and each mediator is moderated by (1) gender diversity, (2) position diversity, (3) location diversity, (4) diversity in own nationality (5) diversity in nationality of co-workers or (6) generation diversity.

Model 1: Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

Model 2: Hypotheses 6a, 6b, 6c and 7a, 7b, 7c
Model 3: Hypotheses 8a1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8b1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8c1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Model 4: Hypotheses 9a1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9b1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9c1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
3. Method

Context and sample. Data was collected from an enterprise where more than 6,000 employees work in more than 175 countries around the world to develop, manufacture and commercialize innovative products and services that keep animals healthy and milk and water safe.

The survey was send to three different groups. The first group is the global Human Resources department (n=119). People in this group are spread all over the globe, hold positions on various levels, work with colleagues who work all over the world, all speak English well and are direct colleagues of me; that’s one of the reasons for selecting this specific group.

The second group consists all employees working in the company’s European Middle East and Africa (EMEA) Headquarters based in Hoofddorp in the Netherlands (n=292). This group was selected because in The Netherlands people are working on various levels, with a very broad range of nationalities and this group works often closely together with people in EMEA. All employees speak English, as this is the business language.

The third group contains people who manage at least one direct report and are based in one of the EMEA offices (n=157). This group was added to get a better understanding of the model for people who are not based in the Netherlands. Only managers were selected to ensure that language would not be a problem. Not all EMEA employees speak English well enough to complete a survey in English, so it was decided not to invite other EMEA employees for this research.

Some employees are part of multiple groups. For instance a participant could be a manager (group 3) working in the HR department (group 1) and based in the Netherlands (group 2).

In November and December 2013 all participants received a pre-information e-mail (Appendix A). In this e-mail the reason for the survey was explained. Furthermore, it was made clear to all participants that this survey was supported by senior management and that all data was used confidential and strictly for research purposes. In December 2013 one reminder e-mail was sent out. The collection of data was closed early January 2014.
Table 1: overview of survey participants and response data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global HR</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HR NL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMEA Mgrs</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NL Mgr (excl. HR)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HR Mgr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (incl. doubles)</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>191 (34%)</td>
<td>28 (5%)</td>
<td>349 (61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the final sample of 300 employees (excl. doubles), 38.7% of the respondents had a Bachelor’s degree, 32.7% a Master’s degree, 8% a Doctorate degree and 20.7% started working after secondary school. The average employee age was 40.9 years (sd = 9.194) and on average employees work 3.21 years for the company (sd = 1.353). 50.7% Of the respondents were female; employees are working in 17 different countries and hold 29 different nationalities, as stated in their current passport.

A questionnaire was employed to measure different, underlying constructs. In total the questionnaire contained 75 Likert-scale questions.

Four questions were control variables. I controlled for year of birth, job tenure, department and education. Then people were asked to answer fifteen questions to identify the level of diversity. The survey continued with asking in total fifty-six questions regarding initiative, focus, safety, mindset, learning culture and engagement. All questions were multiple-choice questions and were based on already tested questionnaires.

I tested the three different groups to see if they were comparable. I used Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances (95% confidence interval) and found that the three groups differ.

The HR group differed from the NL group for gender, initiative, learning culture, engagement and four diversity items (gender, position, own nationality and team nationality).

The HR group differed from the EMEA Managers group for gender, age, tenure, education, position, department, initiative, mindset and three diversity items (own nationality, team nationality and generation).

The NL group differed from the EMEA Managers group for age, tenure, education, position, department and 4 diversity items (position, own nationality, team nationality and generation).
To ensure that differences between groups are not playing a role in the interpretation of the results, I have included the item “Group” as a covariate into the calculations.

**Engagement.** To assess employee engagement, the measure of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale–9 (UWES-9) developed by Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova (2006) was used. This is a nine-item measure, assessed on a seven-point scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always/every day). After testing the items, it was decided to reword item number eight. The original item was “I am immersed in my work”. In this research this item was changed into “I am deeply involved in my work. The estimated reliability was $\alpha = 0.61$.

1. “At my work, I feel bursting with energy”
2. “At my job, I feel strong and vigorous”
3. “I am enthusiastic about my job”
4. “My job inspires me”
5. “When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work”
6. “I feel happy when I am working intensely”
7. “I am proud on the work that I do”
8. “I am deeply involved in my work”
9. “I get carried away when I’m working”

**Mindset.** The items to measure mindset were based on the questionnaire developed by Dweck (2012). The complete questionnaire created by Dweck is a sixteen-item measure, assessed on a six-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree). Dweck uses in her book the below eight-items to measure ones mindset. In other research she even uses less items to measure mindsets. For this research, it was decided to use the below eight items with an estimated reliability of $\alpha = 0.84$.

1. “Your intelligence is something very basic about you that you can’t change very much”*
2. “You can learn new things, but you can’t really change how intelligent you are”*
3. “No matter how much intelligence you have, you can always change it quite a bit”
4. “You can always substantially change how intelligent you are”
5. “You are a certain kind of person, and there is not much that can be done to really change that”*
6. “No matter what kind of person you are, you can always change substantially”
7. “You can do things differently, but the important parts of who you are can’t really be changed”*
8. “You can always change basic things about the kind of person you are”
* results are reversed before using the data

**Focus.** To assess the perceived focus, the measure of perceived regulatory focus developed by Lockwood, Jordan and Kunda (2002) was used. This is an eighteen-item measure, assessed on a nine-point scale, ranging from 1 (not at all true of me) to 9 (very true of me). The estimated reliability was $\alpha = 0.69$.

1. “In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life”*
2. “I am anxious that I will fall short of my responsibilities and obligations”*
3. “I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations”
4. “I often think about the person I am afraid I might become in the future”*
5. “I often think about the person I would ideally like to be in the future”
6. “I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future”
7. “I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my work goals”*
8. “I often think about how I will achieve my work goals”
9. “I often imagine myself experiencing bad things that I fear might happen to me”*
10. “I frequently think about how I can prevent failures in my life”*
11. “I am more oriented toward preventing losses than I am toward achieving gains”*
12. “My major goal at work right now is to achieve my work ambitions”
13. “My major goal at work right now is to avoid becoming a failure”*
14. “I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to reach my "ideal self" - to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations”
15. “I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to become the self I "ought" to be - to fulfill my duties, responsibilities, and obligations”*
16. “In general, I am focused on achieving positive outcomes in my life”
17. “I often imagine myself experiencing good things that I hope will happen to me”
18. “Overall, I am more oriented toward achieving success than preventing failure”
* results are reversed before using the data

**Initiative.** The items to measure initiative were adopted from Baer and Frese (2003). The measure of climate for initiative was by Baer and Frese adapted from the 7-item measure of self-reported initiative by Frese et al. (1997). The perceived climate for initiative was assessed using seven items on a five-point scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The estimated reliability was $\alpha = 0.84$.
1. “People in our company actively tackle problems”
2. “Whenever something goes wrong, people in our company search for a solution immediately”
3. “People in our company take initiative immediately—more often than in other companies”
4. “People in our company usually do more than they are asked to do”
5. “People in our company are particularly good at realizing ideas”
6. “Whenever there is a chance to get actively involved, people in our company take it”
7. “People in our company use opportunities quickly in order to achieve goals”

**Psychological safety.** The measure of the perceived climate for psychological safety was created by Baer and Frese as well and contained seven items developed by Edmondson (1999). All items could be answered on a five-point scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The estimated reliability was $\alpha = 61$. After removal of item 3 “No one in this organization would deliberately act in a way that undermines others’ efforts” the estimated reliability was increased to 0.75. With removing more questions from this construct the estimated reliability would not improve further, therefore it was decided not to remove more questions. It’s not surprising that item 3 had to be removed from this measure because in earlier research it was already mentioned that this item was misleading (Baer, Frese, 2003). The estimated reliability was $\alpha = 0.61$.
1. “In our company some employees are rejected for being different”*
2. “When someone in our company makes a mistake, it is often held against them”*
3. “No one in this organization would deliberately act in a way that undermines others’ efforts”**
4. “It is difficult to ask others for help in our company”*
5. “In our company one is free to take risks”
6. “The people in our company value others’ unique skills and talents”
7. “As an employee in our company one is able to bring up problems and tough issues”
* results are reversed before using the data
** removed to increase reliability

**Learning culture.** The perceived learning culture was identified based on the questionnaire developed by Marsick & Watkins (2003). The original and complete questionnaire developed by Marsick contains sixty-two items. For this research the seven items that were marked by Yang are used. These seven items “may also be used separately as the seven items that together create a single scale of a learning culture”. All seven items were assessed on a six-point scale, ranging from 1 (almost never) to 6 (almost always). The estimated reliability was $\alpha = 0.89$.
1. “In my organization, people are rewarded for learning”
2. “In my organization, people spend time building trust with each other”
3. “In my organization, teams/groups revise their thinking as a result of group discussions or information collected”
4. “My organization makes its lessons learned available to all employees”
5. “My organization recognizes people for taking initiative”
6. “My organization works together with the outside community to meet mutual needs”
7. “In my organization, leaders continually look for opportunities to learn”

The different diversity items were constructed as follows:

**Gender diversity.** Three items were used to measure gender diversity. The gender of the respondent was compared with the gender of the manager and of the co-workers. No points were given in case the gender of the participant; manager and co-workers were (mainly) the same. One point was given in case the gender of the participant differed from the gender of the manager and/or the co-workers. Two points were given in case the gender of the participant differed from the gender of the manager and the gender of the co-workers differed.

**Position diversity.** One item was used to measure position diversity. The item that was therefore constructed was: “The position levels of the people I mainly work with are”. This item could be answered with “at the same level as me”, “at a higher level than me”, “at a lower level than me” or “on all various levels”. In case the respondent selected “at the same level as me”, zero points were given. For “at a higher level than me”, “at a lower level than me” one point was given. In case the respondent had selected “on all various levels”, then two points were given.
Location diversity. One item was used to measure location diversity. The item that was developed to measure this was: “I mainly work with people”. This question could be answered with “in my own department”, “in my own building”, “in my own country” or “all over the world”. In case the respondent selected “in my own department”, zero points were given. For “in my own building”, “in my own country”, one point was given. In case the respondent had selected “all over the world”, then two points were given.

Own nationality diversity. Four items were used to measure own nationality diversity. The items that were created to measure this was: “In which country do you live today”, “My born nationality is”, “My current nationality (as stated in my passport) is” and “The following nationality describes best how I feel”. These questions could be answered by selecting a country or nationality from a drop-down menu including 179 different options from “Afghans” to “Zimbabwe”. The category “Other” was available for the questions regarding nationalities (and was in total only 19 times selected). Zero points were given in case “country today”, “born nationality”, “current nationality” and “felt nationality” did not differ. For each variety in one of the questions one point was given. In total respondents scored between zero and three points.

Team nationality diversity. Two items were used to measure team nationality diversity. The items that were created to measure this was: “I have the feeling that my direct manager has” and “I have the feeling that my direct team mainly exists out of people with”. The first item could be answered by selecting “the same nationality as I have” or “a different nationality than I have”. The second item could be answered by selecting “the same nationality as I have”, “different nationalities than I have” or “a variety of nationalities”. Zero Points were given in case the respondent selected that the direct manager and the co-workers had the same nationality as the respondent. One point was given in case the direct manager holds a different nationality, however the co-workers had the same nationality as the respondent or in case the manager holds a different nationality however the co-workers hold different nationalities. Two Points were given in case the manager holds the same nationality as the respondent, however the nationalities of the co-workers vary or the nationality of the manager and co-workers is different than the one of the respondent. Finally, three points were given in case the nationality of the manager differs from the nationality of the respondent and the nationalities of co-workers vary.

Generation diversity. Three items were used to measure generation diversity. The items that were created to measure this was: “I would describe myself as a”, “I would describe my manager as a” and “my direct team exists mostly out of”. These items could be answered by selecting one of the following options: “Baby Boomer”, “Generation X”, “Millennial” or “Gen2020”. A brief description of the different characteristics was given at the introduction of this question. These descriptions are based on the ones that are used in the book The 2020 Workplace (Meister, Willyerd, 2010). This book, is well known within the organization as it is used by the Human Resources departments to discuss future needs and changes in the organization. The following descriptions were used in this questionnaire: Baby Boomer: confidence in tasks, emphasize teambuilding, seek collaboration, group decision making, avoid conflict.
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Generation X: high-quality end results, productivity, work to live not live to work, flexible work hours, comfortable with authority but not impressed with titles, technically competent, ethnic diversity.

Millenial: wants to understand the big picture, work is expression of themselves; not a definition, exceptional multi-taskers – need multiple activities at a time, seek flexibility in work hours and dress code, seek work environment with bright colors, open seating, personal touches, expect corporate social responsibility in work and products, continuous learning, want everything now.

Gen2020: are about to start entering the workplace now.

Zero points were given in case the generation of the participant was similar to that of their manager and their team. One point was given in case one of the variables differed and two points were given in case all two variables differed.

The complete questionnaire is attached to this research (Appendix B).

**Analytical approach**

Firstly, the reliability of all items will be tested so that means, standard deviations and correlations among all research variables for the complete group as well as for the three separate groups can be calculated. To ensure that there were no outliers in the data, the normality of the items will be tested.

Multiple regression analyses will be used to test the different hypotheses. The control variables will be entered in the first regression model. All independent variables are entered in the second model. In models three, four, five and six each separate independent variable together with the significant control variables will be entered in the model. In model seven all significant independent and control variables are entered in the model. In appendix E all models for the three separate groups can be found.

To test hypotheses 6 and 7 Hayes PROCESS Model 4 will be used. Results will be available for the complete group.

As a last step Hayes PROCESS Model 7 will be used to test hypotheses 8 and 9. Results will again be available for the complete group.
4 Results
All variables except for the variables safety ($\alpha = .61$) and focus ($\alpha = .69$), showed acceptable reliability coefficients ($\alpha > 0.7$), which means that the variables are reliable and that there is sufficient internal consistency. Table 2 reports the descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables. Since there is a difference between the three groups, therefore an overview of the descriptive statistics and correlations for all three groups separately and the results for all groups combined can be found in table 3. In Appendix D all descriptive statistics and correlations can be found in detail for each specific group.

Mindset is significantly positively related to focus and it is significantly negatively related to tenure, education and department. Taking a closer look at the three different groups, then one can see that mindset is significantly negatively related to education for the groups HR and NL. With the NL group a significant positive relation was found with gender diversity. With the group EMEA Managers I found four significant positive relations, namely with focus, safety, learning culture and engagement.

Focus is significantly positively related to mindset, initiative, safety, learning culture, engagement and location diversity. For all separate groups a significant positive relation was found between focus and engagement. For the NL and EMEA Managers groups significant positive relations were found between focus and safety. The EMEA Managers also show significant and positive relations with learning culture and location diversity.

Initiative is significantly positively related to focus, safety, learning culture and engagement. There is a significant negative relation found between initiative and gender, generation diversity and department. For all three separate groups significant positive relations were found between initiative and safety, initiative and learning culture and initiative and engagement. Within the HR group we found two significant negative relations; namely the relation with gender diversity and location diversity. The EMEA Managers group showed three other significant positive relations: location diversity, age and position.

Safety is significantly positively related to focus, initiative, learning culture, engagement and position. Significant positive relations between safety and learning culture and safety and engagement were found for each separate group. For the NL group a significant positive relation was found between safety and position diversity. For the EMEA Managers group safety significantly positively relates with position.

Learning culture is significantly positively related to focus, initiative, safety and engagement. Significant negative relations were found between learning culture and team nationality and generation diversity and tenure. Significant positive relations were found within all separate groups for the relations learning culture and initiative, learning culture and safety and learning culture and engagement. The HR group showed significant negative relations between learning culture and location diversity and learning culture and position. The NL group showed significant negative relations between learning culture and gender diversity and gender.
The EMEA Managers show a significant positive relation between learning culture and focus, learning culture and mindset and learning culture and age. A significant negative relation was found for this group between learning culture and gender.

Engagement is significantly positively related to focus, initiative, safety, learning culture, age and position. Significant negative relations were found between engagement and generation diversity. All three separate groups show a significant positive relation with focus, initiative, safety and learning culture as well. For the HR group significant negative relation was found with gender. The NL group showed significant positive relations between engagement and age and engagement and position. The EMEA Managers showed a significant and positive relation with mindset, location diversity, age and position. Significant negative relations were found with generation diversity.

Many other significant relations were found. Table 2 shows all correlations between all variables.
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Table 2: means, standard deviations, Cronbachs alfa and correlations
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Table 3: correlations of all different groups and all data combined
To ensure that there were no outliers in the data, the normality of the items was tested. In Appendix C you will see that all items are normally distributed and that no outliers were found.

Significant relations have been found between focus, initiative, safety, learning culture and engagement. Thus, hypotheses 2, 3, 4 and 5 are supported. Furthermore, I found that focus, safety and learning culture together also significantly influence engagement. The details can be found in the below table.

There is no significant relation found between mindset and engagement; hypothesis 1 is thus not supported. It is interesting to see that for the EMEA Managers group a weak but significant relation was found (adjusted $R^2$ 3%); for this group support has been found for hypothesis 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset</td>
<td>-0.089 (.082)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>0.318* (.000)</td>
<td>0.374* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.307* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>0.130 (.173)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.540* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>0.269* (.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.617* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.309* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning culture</td>
<td>0.215* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.380* (.000)</td>
<td>0.250* (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>-0.139 (.080)</td>
<td>-0.096 (.162)</td>
<td>-0.163* (.019)</td>
<td>-0.222* (.001)</td>
<td>-0.170* (.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.102 (.299)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.156 (.057)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.013* (.028)</td>
<td>0.014* (.008)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.013* (.024)</td>
<td>0.012* (.015)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.013* (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.086* (.034)</td>
<td>-0.043 (.211)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.079* (.033)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.064 (.275)</td>
<td>-0.079 (.116)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>0.084* (.001)</td>
<td>0.061* (.005)</td>
<td>0.081* (.000)</td>
<td>0.056* (.009)</td>
<td>0.053* (.017)</td>
<td>0.077* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.953 (.000)</td>
<td>0.950 (.077)</td>
<td>2.967 (.000)</td>
<td>2.797 (.000)</td>
<td>2.696 (.000)</td>
<td>3.809 (.000)</td>
<td>7.46 (.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>4.105 (.001)</td>
<td>15.731 (.000)</td>
<td>22.202 (.000)</td>
<td>14.471 (.000)</td>
<td>20.976 (.000)</td>
<td>27.977 (.000)</td>
<td>36.653 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p$-values are reported between brackets

Table 4: overview of relations between independent items, control variables and engagement (Ee)

Based on Hayes PROCESS templates for SPSS the research model was tested further. A series of linear regressions were conducted to understand if there were mediating and moderating effects.
First, I used model 4 (PROCESS templates) to see if initiative, safety or learning culture mediated the relation between mindset or focus and engagement. Mindset or focus was entered as the independent variable (X) and engagement was entered as the outcome variable (Y). Initiative, safety or learning culture was entered as the mediator variable (M). The item group was added as covariate. As test variables the items group, gender, age, tenure, education and position were added.

The 95% bias-corrected confidence interval (CI) for the indirect effect (derived from 5,000 bootstrap samples) did not contain zero. This pattern of results demonstrates that initiative, safety or learning culture mediates the relation between focus and engagement.

There was no significant relation found between mindset via initiative, safety or learning culture separately as well as combined and engagement. There was no evidence found to support hypotheses 6a, 6b and 6c.

Significant relations were found between focus via initiative, safety or learning culture separately as well as combined and engagement. Hypotheses 7a, 7b and 7c are supported.

The relations focus via initiative, safety or learning culture and engagement are plotted and can be found below.

Figure 1a shows that employees’ engagement increased as focus moved towards a promotion focus. For employees working in an environment where they perceive the climate for initiative as high, engagement increased more rapidly than in environments where the climate for initiative is perceived as low, supporting hypothesis 7a.

Figure 1b shows that in workplaces with higher perceived psychological safety, employee engagement increased as focus moved towards promotion focus. For workplaces with lower perceived psychological safety it was not possible to report a trend.

Figure 1c shows that in workplaces with a higher perceived learning culture, employee engagement increased as focus moved towards promotion focus. In workplaces with a lower perceived learning culture, engagement levels increased more rapidly. However, in a high learning culture workplace the starting level was already higher than the highest engagement level for employees working in an environment in which the learning culture is perceived as low. Hypothesis 7c is thus supported.
The second step in this research was to see if various diversity items have a moderating effect on the model. Therefore, I have used Hayes PROCESS model 7. The mediating effect of the various diversity items were tested by calculating bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals using bootstrapping with n = 5,000 resamples. This model examines the effects of mindset or focus (X) on engagement (Y), mediated by initiative, safety or learning culture and moderated by gender diversity, position diversity, location diversity, own nationality diversity, team nationality diversity or generations diversity.

In the table 5 you can see that position diversity had an indirect effect on the by safety mediated relation between mindset and engagement. Position diversity had an indirect effect as well on the by learning culture mediated relation between mindset and engagement. The same mediated relation was indirectly effected by team nationality diversity. Hypotheses 6b2, 6c2 and 6c5 are supported.

The other hypotheses are not significant and therefore cannot be confirmed.
Table 5: regression summary for the mediating role of perceived initiative, safety or learning culture (separately) moderated by diversity on the relation between focus, mindset and engagement (Hayes PROCESS Model 4 and 7)
 Independent variables (centralized)

| Partial effects via all mediators together | .0284 (.0324 - .0949) | .0419 (.0194 - .1056) | .0798* (.0258 - .1380) | .0809* (.0289 - .1408) |
| Initiative | .0036 (.0050 - .0291) | .0106 (.0018 - .0414) | .0085 (.0031 - .0360) |
| Safety | .0210 (.0082 - .0616) | .0202 (.0051 - .0608) | .0387* (.0114 - .0859) | .0412* (.0135 - .0879) |
| Learning culture | .0039 (.0247 - .0406) | .0112 (.0148 - .0517) | .0326* (.0040 - .0812) | .0397* (.0059 - .0901) |

| Generators Diversity (DG) | | | | |
| Initiative | .0014 (.0037 - .0089) | .0050 (.0350 - .0582) | .0013 (.0093 - .0230) |
| Safety | .0112 (.0263 - .0565) | .0122 (.0205 - .0555) | .0190 (.0682 - .0851) | .0172 (.0629 - .0994) |
| Learning culture | .0015 (.0424 - .0405) | .0016 (.0423 - .0400) | .0084 (.0050 - .0101) | .0323 (.0891 - .0122) |

| Position Diversity (DP) | | | | |
| Initiative | .0043 (.0053 - .0366) | .0087 (.0059 - .0447) | .0011 (.0238 - .0125) |
| Safety | .0484* (.0089 - .1130) | .0456* (.0089 - .1086) | .0186 (.0093 - .0687) | .0174 (.0135 - .0651) |
| Learning culture | .0306 (.0001 - .0832) | .0376* (.0054 - .0962) | .0342 (.0055 - .1029) | .0292 (.2020 - .0981) |

| Location Diversity (DL) | | | | |
| Initiative | .0031 (.0069 - .0316) | .0062 (.0095 - .0386) | .0051 (.0385 - .047) |
| Safety | .0261 (.0133 - .0860) | .0257 (.0090 - .0793) | .0114 (.0148 - .0533) | .0143 (.0137 - .0579) |
| Learning culture | .0088 (.0325 - .0515) | .0140 (.0242 - .0624) | .0067 (.0386 - .0541) | .0123 (.0395 - .0655) |

| Own Nationality Diversity (DON) | | | | |
| Initiative | .0054 (.0063 - .0404) | .0050 (.0136 - .0397) | .0020 (.0110 - .0285) |
| Safety | .0500 (.0614 - .0450) | .0027 (.0562 - .0433) | .0013 (.0435 - .0404) | .0026 (.0400 - .0495) |
| Learning culture | .0025 (.0522 - .0529) | .0009 (.0529 - .0556) | .0198 (.0816 - .0246) | .0107 (.0740 - .0477) |

| Team Nationality Diversity (DTN) | | | | |
| Initiative | .0039 (.0271 - .0028) | .0076 (.0351 - .0199) | .0039 (.0261 - .0224) |
| Safety | .0222 (.0646 - .0001) | .0204 (.0616 - .0002) | .0052 (.0119 - .0300) | .0061 (.0127 - .0318) |
| Learning culture | .0039 (.00746 - .0096) | .0355* (.0803 - .0112) | .0136 (.0444 - .0079) | .0125 (.0454 - .0144) |

| Generations Diversity (DGen) | | | | |
| Initiative | .0033 (.0362 - .0094) | .0039 (.0365 - .0160) | .0054 (.0373 - .0066) |
| Safety | .0310 (.0925 - .0059) | .0248 (.0833 - .095) | .0174 (.0645 - .0117) | .0173 (.0593 - .0145) |
| Learning culture | .0023 (.0730 - .0180) | .0121 (.0618 - .0325) | .0127 (.0587 - .0330) | .0087 (.0567 - .0490) |

| Control variables | | | | |
| Group | -.1242 (.0894) | -.0878 (.2016) |
| Gender | .1538 (.0777) | .1466 (.0737) |
| Age | .0133* (.0148) | .0094 (.0052) | .0129* (.0117) | .0103* (.0282) |
| Tenure | -.0441 (.2258) | -.0361 (.2897) |
| Education | -.0376 (.4776) | -.0606 (.2185) |
| Position | .0588* (.0104) | .0346 (.0861) | .0893* (.0061) | .0322 (.0887) |
| Intercept | 2.2056 (.0000) | 1.9300 (.0000) | .6716 (1908) | .8083 (.0492) |

| R² | .2891 | .2621 | .3687 | .3386 |
| F-value | 11.7508 (.0000) | 17.3433 (.0000) | 16.8799 (.0000) | 30.0966 (.0000) |

| N | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 |

Table 6: regression summary for the mediating role of perceived initiative, safety and learning culture (combined) moderated by diversity on the relation between focus, mindset and engagement (Hayes PROCESS Model 4 and 7)
5 Conclusion and discussion

The two central questions of this thesis were if evidence could be found to support the idea that selecting or developing employees with a certain mindset or focus would have an effect on engagement via initiative, psychological safety and learning culture. Secondly, I was interested in the question if diversity in a very broad form would have a mediating effect on these relations. Partial support for this has been found.

Focus
As expected a significant relation was found between regulatory focus and engagement when mediated by perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety or learning culture. All relations can be classified as moderately strong with adjusted $R^2$’s ranging from 15.3% (initiative) to 21.3% (learning culture). The model in which focus, safety and learning culture were combined showed that there was a strong relation with engagement (adjusted $R^2$ 32.3%). Initiative had to be left out of this model because it was not significant.

The diversity items had no moderating effect on these relations.

Mindset
The item mindset unexpectedly showed no significant relation with perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety, learning culture and engagement.

Interestingly, three significant moderating relations were found in the situation that one of the diversity items mediated one of the relations. The following significant relations were found:
- mindset – engagement, mediated by safety and moderated by position diversity;
- mindset – engagement, mediated by learning culture and moderated by position diversity;
- mindset – engagement, mediated by learning culture and moderated by team diversity.

In earlier research engagement was characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Bakker, Salanova, 2006). Based on the findings of this research I can now say that the perceived climate of psychological safety, perceived level of learning culture and a persons focus play an important role as well and are good predictors of the level of engagement.

Initiative fell out of the model. Although it was the expectation that in case people feel free to take initiative that these initiatives are rewarded, they would feel more connected with the organization and that this would lead to higher levels of engagement. Initiative and engagement have a moderately strong relation when the direct relation is tested. However, in a combination with the other items, initiative is not playing a significant role anymore. Apparently, a person’s focus, his will to vigilantly take on new tasks and goals and his feeling of success when taking these activities on, the feeling of being safe in the organization and the option to learn, leads apparently to the fact that being able to take initiatives becomes less important.
It was surprising to see that the mindset of individuals did not play a pivotal role in influencing the other items. This was not completely expected since past research (Heslin in Handbook of Employee Engagement, 2010) describes positive relations with engagement, safety, initiative and learning culture. In this research only an 8-item scale was used. Perhaps usage of a different scale would lead to different results?

New in this research was the model where the relation focus or mindset and engagement was mediated by initiative, safety or learning culture. The personal traits of employees were added so that an “extended version” of the JD-R model could be created. I found this an interesting concept, since it is possible and perhaps easier to test the mindset and focus of an employee. If the model works, then you know that in case you hire those individuals that via the job resources, as were tested in this research, engagement would go up.

I found that this indeed would be beneficial for the relation focus – engagement. All three relations were strong; with $R^2$ ranging from 26.7% for initiative to 31.4% for learning culture. I also found that when I took all three items together, I had to take initiative out to ensure significance. The relation focus – engagement which was mediated by safety and learning culture shows a strong relation with $R^2$ of 33.9%. If I compare this model with the model in which focus has been left out, thus relation safety and learning culture to engagement ($R^2$: 25.4%) I see that the relation, in the model in which focus plays a role, is 33.3% stronger.

The item diversity was included in this research since many research show evidence that diverse workgroups lead to better results and engagement. Often the focus lies on differences in gender, race or age. In this research new scales were constructed to test if other diversity items would have an effect on engagement either directly or via items such as mindset, focus, initiative, safety or learning culture.

A variety of direct significant relations were found as can be seen in table 3. Mainly there were relations found between diversity items and other diversity items or control variables.

One diversity item stood out, since this was the only item that showed a significant relation with engagement. This was the item generation diversity. It’s interesting that this relation was found, since earlier research found that the discussions about generations and generation management were misplaced. People from different generations still work, act and feel the same about the workplace. In this research I found that generation diversity has a significant negative relation with engagement, which means that the more different generations an employee works with, the lower his engagement level. However, with an adjusted $R^2$ of only 2%, the relation must be interpreted as weak.

Generation diversity also had significant relations with other items; I found a negative relation with initiative (adjusted $R^2$: 1%) and learning culture (adjusted $R^2$: 2.3%).

It’s perhaps a bit early to conclude based only on this limited research but although generations still have the same expectations and motivations about the workplace, many different generations in the same workplace could have a negative effect on initiative, learning culture and engagement.
Position diversity and nationality diversity played a role in three other relations (mindset – engagement via safety moderated by position diversity, mindset – engagement via learning culture moderated by position diversity and mindset – engagement via learning culture moderated by team nationality diversity) and this was surprisingly enough when there was a combination with mindset. I found this interesting, since mindset did not play a role in all other models.

Apparently working with people who are holding diverse positions has a positive moderating effect on the relation mindset and engagement, which is mediated by safety or learning culture. The opposite can be concluded for working in a team with a great variety of nationalities; this has a negative effect on the relation mindset and engagement, which is mediated by learning culture.

Noteworthy to mention is that initiative, learning culture and engagement relate negatively to some of the diversity items. For instance gender and, as described above, generation diversity relates negatively to perceived climate for initiative. Perceived learning culture relates negatively to team nationality diversity and generation diversity.

People scoring high on position diversity score significantly higher on various control variables. This means that people who are working with co-workers holding a broad variety of positions, are older, work longer for the enterprise, are higher educated and function on a higher position in the organization. This is perhaps not a big surprise, since in general older people, work longer for the enterprise and those who are educated on a higher level then often hold higher positions. People in higher positions have contact with a more diverse group of co-workers, meaning people on all levels in the organization, which leads to a high score on position diversity.

Higher scores on diversity of own nationality has a negative relation with almost all control variables (age, education, position, department and gender). Only one positive relation was found and that was with team nationality diversity. This is, for IDEXX, probably explainable since people who score high on own nationality diversity have the opportunity to work in teams with co-workers holder a broad variety of nationalities. It could be the case that people scoring high on own nationality diversity prefer to work for an employer who employs many employees with different nationalities – a true international organization.

With this research engagement is explained a little bit more. Besides this, I learned more about the importance of a persons focus when we talk about engagement.

It was interesting to see that the diversity items had no effect on the significant relations (focus, initiative, safety, learning culture and engagement) but that some moderated the relation with mindset, which was in the first models not significant. Can we, based on these results, conclude that in a diverse group ones mindset indeed does play a role?
Working in a diverse environment works better for employees who indeed believe that intelligence can be changed and that working with a diverse group of people (e.g. different position levels and different nationalities in the team) is helpful which then leads to a greater feeling of safety and the believe that the organization is supporting learning which will then result in more engagement?

To finalize: should enterprises now select future employees only by testing their focus? And should these same enterprises solely create groups with people who work with colleagues holding different position levels and all holding different nationalities?

Well, I would say that it’s more complex than that. Not everything that counts can be counted and vice versa. Does it help for employers to recognize that individuals hold different focuses and that diversity in the broadest sense has an effect on engagement: absolutely.

Managerial implications
This study has several managerial implications. For instance it could be interesting for employers to ask employees some simple questions during their selection process to find out if the candidate tends to have a promotion or prevention focus. These employees will drive engagement and initiative, psychological safety and learning culture which will lead to better performance.

Furthermore, another idea could be to influence the focus of employees who are already hired so that they move towards a promotion focus as well.

Often in workplaces people are talking about the importance of the ability to take initiative. Based on this research, I would recommend managers to focus more on creating a safe environment in which people can learn. The items psychological safety and learning culture seem to be good job resources and strong predictors for engagement.

Another option for action for managers is to keep in mind that a team with diverse generations could need extra attention. At least, in case one likes to drive engagement and performance.

Limitations and directions for future research
It was the expectation that mindset would play a more significant role in the research models. This was not the case only in three instances mindset related significantly with other items. For further research it would be interesting to see if the results are the same or that more interesting, valuable and significant information could be found. In this research only eight questions were asked to determine a person’s mindset. Perhaps using Dweck’s complete questionnaire, which contains thirty-two questions, will lead to different information. Which could shed more light on the influence of a person’s mindset on engagement, initiative, safety and learning culture and various diversity items.
The diversity items were created specifically for this research. Although some interesting results were found, for future research it could be interesting to do further research on these items. It could be helpful to focus only on a few diversity items and broaden the research questions and scales around these items. This will hopefully give more valuable and significant information. In a world that becomes more and more international, the item diversity is, in my opinion, not researched enough.

Another item for future research could be to further look into the role of a person’s focus in relation to engagement. It would be interesting to for instance see if in case an enterprise actively works on a person’s focus, it would indeed improve scores on initiative, safety, learning culture and ultimately on focus. It would also be interesting to see if larger groups of employees with a promotion focus would have other (positive) effects in the enterprise.

The research model that I created for this research was loosely based on the JD-R model. Another opportunity for further research could be to test the complete JD-R model and start with mindset or focus. Perhaps focusing not only on the resources, but also on demands, will lead to new insights?

Specifically for researchers in the HR domain, it would be interesting to dive into the differences that were found in this research. The HR group showed some significant relations whilst these were not found for the other groups. What could be the driver of these differences and is this typically for this organization or is it a common finding?

Lastly, it would be interesting to see which role the perceived climate for initiative plays in a business environment. It’s widely known that initiative is important for organizations, since this drives innovation. In this research initiative fell however out of the model where focus, safety and learning culture related to engagement. Could an organization drive initiative via other items as well? It would be interesting to see in more depth what the interaction of initiative is with other important items in an organization.
Is it the person or the place?
The effects of diversity on the relation mindset or focus and engagement via perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety or learning culture.
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Appendix A survey invitations

From: Arbouw-Heimans, Pennie
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2013 1:30 PM
Subject: Your help is very much appreciated: survey for my master thesis

Please complete a survey for my master thesis.

Dear HR colleagues,

The past period I have worked on my master study Strategic Human Resources. I’m now working on my final master piece: the thesis. I’m doing research on psychological safety, initiative, risk taking, learning organization and engagement and this specifically in relationship with diversity. Therefore, I have created a survey.

You will all receive an e-mail with a personalized link to a 10-15 minute survey (in English) on short notice and I would very much appreciate it if you could complete this survey the coming days.

I will use the results for my thesis and I will share the outcome of my research with you all. The information that you will put in your survey, will be treated confidentially and no individual data will be shared with IDEXX.

If you have questions or like to know more about my study, then feel free to contact me immediately by clicking here.

Thank you very much!

Pennie Arbouw-Heimans

Copyright © 2013 Pennie Arbouw-Heimans. All rights reserved.
Thank you for helping me with my master thesis.
The past period Pennie Arbouw-Heimans, one of my HR colleagues, has worked on her Master Study Strategic Human Resources. She is now working on her final master piece: the thesis. She is doing research on Psychological Safety, Initiative, Risk Taking, Learning Organization and Engagement and this specifically in relationship with Diversity. Therefore, she has created a survey.

Pennie and I would very much appreciate it if you could participate in this study. You will all receive an e-mail with a personalized link to a 10-15 minute survey (in English) on short notice and it is very much appreciated if you could complete this survey the coming days. Pennie will use the results for her thesis and she will share the outcome of her research with all participants. The information that you will put in your survey, will be treated confidentially and no individual data will be shared with IDEXX.

If you have questions or like to know more about Pennie’s study, then feel free to contact her immediately by clicking here.

Thank you very much!

Thijs Glasz
HR Director International
Appendix B complete questionnaire

Welcome & Introduction

Dear colleague,

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. In total there are 16 questions in this survey and 1 question can have multiple sub questions. The survey was tested and on average it took people 10-15 minutes to complete it.

I am doing research on the relationship between Engagement, Mindset, Psychological Safety, Initiative, Learning Culture and Diversity at the Workplace. I will use the results for my Master Thesis only. As soon as the overall results are available I will share these with you!

Have a great day!
Pennie Arbouw-Heimans

1. Today, my age is
   16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70

2. I started working for IDEXX
   < 1 year ago
   1 - 2 years ago
   2 - 5 years ago
   5 - 10 years ago
   More than 10 years ago

3. What department do you work in?
   Customer Support
   Facilities
   Finance
   General Management
   Human Resources
   Information Technology
   Legal
   Marketing
   Operations Distribution
   Operations Manufacturing
   Quality Assurance
   Reference Lab Operations
   Regulatory
   Research & Development
   Sales
   Supply Chain
   Veterinary Professionals

4. What is the highest level of school education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
   Elementary school
   Secondary school or equivalent
   Bachelor degree or equivalent
   Master’s degree or equivalent
   Doctorate

5. Please select the correct answer to the follow 3 questions
   - I am a
   - My manager is a
   - My team exists out of
     Man, woman
     Man, woman
     Mainly men,
     Mainly women,
     Slightly more men,
     Slightly more women,
     An even number of men and women,
6. Please select the correct answer to the follow 3 questions

- My position can be described best as
  - Individual contributor - grade 100 and lower
  - Individual contributor - grade 200 – 400
  - Individual contributor - grade 500 – 700
  - Individual contributor - grade 800 and higher
  - Supervisor/manager of 1-2 persons
  - Supervisor/manager of 3-5 persons
  - Supervisor/manager of 6-10 persons
  - Supervisor/manager of 11+ persons

- The position levels of the people I mainly work with
  - At the same level as me
  - At a higher level than me
  - At a lower level than me
  - On all various levels

- I mainly work with people
  - In my own department
  - In my own building
  - In my own country
  - All over the world

7. In which country do you live, today?

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Aruba, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Republic of the Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Curacao, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, East Timor (see Timor-Leste), Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, The Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hong Kong, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Korea, North, Korea, South, Kosovo, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macau, Macedonia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, Netherlands Antilles, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Korea, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Palestinian Territories, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sint Maarten, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Korea, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

8. Please answer the following 3 questions regarding nationalities

- Born nationality
- Current nationality (as stated in my passport)
- The following nationality describes best how I feel

9. Please answer the following 2 questions regarding nationalities

- I have the feeling that my direct manager has The same nationality as I have,
- I have the feeling that my direct team mainly A different nationality than I have
  exists out of people with The same nationality as I have
- I have the feeling that my direct team mainly Different nationalities than I have
  exists out of people with A variety of nationalities

10. This question requires you to identify generations. The characteristics of the different generations can be described as follows:

Baby Boomer: confidence in tasks, emphasize teambuilding, seek collaboration, group decision making, avoid conflict.

Generation X: high-quality end results, productivity, work to live not live to work, flexible work hours, comfortable with authority but not impressed with titles, technically competent, ethnic diversity.

Millennial: wants to understand the big picture, work is expression of themselves; not a definition, exceptional multi-taskers—need multiple activities at a time, seek flexibility in work hours and dress code, seek work environment with bright colors, open seating, personal touches, expect corporate social responsibility in work and products, continuous learning, want everything now.

Gen2020: are about to start entering the workplace now.

- I would describe myself as a Baby Boomer
- I would describe my manager as a Generation X
- My direct team exists mostly out of Millennial
  Gen2020

11. Initiative

- People at IDEXX actively tackle problems Never
- Whenever something goes wrong, people at Rarely
  IDEXX search for a solution immediately Sometimes
- People at IDEXX take initiative immediately— Often
  more often than in other companies Always
- People at IDEXX usually do more than they are
  asked to do
- People at IDEXX are particularly good at
  realizing ideas
- Whenever there is a chance to get actively
  involved, people at IDEXX take it
- People at IDEXX use opportunities quickly in
  order to achieve goals
12. Pride
- In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life
- I am anxious that I will fall short of my responsibilities and obligations
- I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations
- I often think about the person I am afraid I might become in the future
- I often think about the person I would ideally like to be in the future
- I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future
- I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my work goals
- I often think about how I will achieve my work goals
- I often imagine myself experiencing bad things that I fear might happen to me
- I frequently think about how I can prevent failures in my life
- I am more oriented toward preventing losses than I am toward achieving gains
- My major goal at work right now is to achieve my work ambitions
- My major goal at work right now is to avoid becoming a failure
- I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to reach my “ideal self” - to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations
- I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to become the self I “ought” to be - to fulfill my duties, responsibilities, and obligations
- In general, I am focused on achieving positive outcomes in my life
- I often imagine myself experiencing good things that I hope will happen to me
- Overall, I am more oriented toward achieving success than preventing failure

13. Psychological Safety
- At IDEXX some employees are rejected for being different
- When someone at IDEXX makes a mistake, it is often held against them
- No one in this organization would deliberately act in a way that undermines others’ efforts
- It is difficult to ask others for help in our company
- At IDEXX one is free to take risks
- The people at IDEXX value others’ unique skills and talents
- As an employee at IDEXX one is able to bring up problems and tough issues

Not at all true of me 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
Very true of me 9

Never
Rarely
Sometimes
Often
Always
14. Mindset
- Your intelligence is something very basic about you that you can’t change very much
- You can learn new things, but you can’t really change how intelligent you are
- No matter how much intelligence you have, you can always change it quite a bit
- You can always substantially change how intelligent you are
- You are a certain kind of person, and there is not much that can be done to really change that
- No matter what kind of person you are, you can always change substantially
- You can do things differently, but the important parts of who you are can’t really be changed
- You can always change basic things about the kind of person you are

15. Learning Culture
- In my organization, people are rewarded for learning
- In my organization, people spend time building trust with each other
- In my organization, teams/groups revise their thinking as a result of group discussions or information collected
- My organization makes its lessons learned available to all employees
- My organization recognizes people for taking initiative
- My organization works together with the outside community to meet mutual needs
- In my organization, leaders continually look for opportunities to learn

16. Engagement
- At my work, I feel bursting with energy
- At my job, I feel strong and vigorous
- I am enthusiastic about my job
- My job inspires me
- When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work
- I feel happy when I am working intensely
- I am proud on the work that I do
- I am deeply involved in my work
- I get carried away when I’m working
The effects of diversity on the relation mindset or focus and engagement via perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety or learning culture.

Appendix C histograms
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Initiative

Safety

Learning culture

Engagement
Appendix D means, standard deviations and correlations per group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>DG</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>DON</th>
<th>DTN</th>
<th>Dgen</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ten</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus (F)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.1247</td>
<td>0.8464</td>
<td>1</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>Mindset (M)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.186</td>
<td>0.8165</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>1</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>Initiative (I)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7718</td>
<td>0.4633</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</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>Safety (S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6138</td>
<td>0.6393</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>1</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>Learning Culture (LC)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9547</td>
<td>0.5593</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.426**</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>1</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>Engagement (E)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3848</td>
<td>0.7509</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.228*</td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td>.425**</td>
<td>1</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>Gender Diversity (DG)</td>
<td>3***</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Diversity (DP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Diversity (DL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Nationality Diversity (DON)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Nationality Diversity (DTN)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generations Diversity (Dgen)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.232*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.228*</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.262*</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.266*</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.241*</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.243*</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>3***</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.222*</td>
<td>.248*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.243*</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Item is calculated separately and as part of gender diversity
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
N=82
The effects of diversity on the relation mindset or focus and engagement via perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety or learning culture.

### Means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alfa and correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2 - NL</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>DG</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>DON</th>
<th>DTN</th>
<th>Gegen</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ten</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Dep</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>N=161</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus (F)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0248</td>
<td>.7742</td>
<td>1</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>Mindset (M)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0272</td>
<td>.7953</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>1</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>Initiative ()</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5466</td>
<td>.5221</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>1</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>Safety (S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6315</td>
<td>.5663</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>1</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>Learning Culture (LC)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6628</td>
<td>.84476</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>1</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>Engagement (EE)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.138</td>
<td>.89372</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>1</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>Gender Diversity (DG)</td>
<td>3***</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>1</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>Position Diversity (DP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1</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>Location Diversity (DL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>1</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>Own Nationality Diversity (DON)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Nationality Diversity (DTN)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generations Diversity (DGen)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.43</td>
<td>8.785</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.059</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Item is calculated separately and as part of gender diversity
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
N=161
The effects of diversity on the relation mindset or focus and engagement via perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety or learning culture.

| Group 3 - EMEA Mgr | Items          | Mean    | Std. Dev | F    | M    | I    | S    | LC   | EE   | DG   | DP   | DL   | DON  | DTN  | Dgen | Age  | Ten  | Edu  | Pos  | Dep  | Ge  |
|-------------------|---------------|---------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| Focus (F)         | 18            | 5.9575  | .8011    |      | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Mindset (M)       | 8             | 3.8349  | .7696    | 268  | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Initiative (I)    | 7             | 3.5121  | .4808    | .176 | 159  | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Safety (S)        | 7             | 3.7091  | .5024    | .357 | .379 | .453 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Learning Culture (LC) | 7       | 3.8059  | .8400    | .237 | .237 | .450 | .490 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Engagement (EE)   | 9             | 5.2746  | .7378    | .429 | .197 | .362 | .368 | .416 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Gender Diversity (DG) | 3***       | .58     | .803     | .098 | .013 | .074 | .087 | .125 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Position Diversity (DP) | 1          | 1.43    | .633     | .09  | .023 | .038 | .109 | .033 | .111 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Location Diversity (DL) | 1        | 1.3     | .745     | .015 | .211 | .012 | .023 | .312 | .005 | .043 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Own Nationality Diversity (DON) | 4   | .46     | .65      | .137 | .132 | .117 | .024 | .07  | .043 | .063 | .260 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Team Nationality Diversity (DTN) | 2    | 1.56    | 1.13     | .141 | .126 | .102 | .05  | .073 | .131 | .045 | .375 | .346 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |
| Generations Diversity (DGen) | 3    | .92     | .692     | .135 | .038 | .001 | .008 | .04  | .236 | .167 | .02  | .005 | .109 | .024 | 1    |      |      |      |      |     |
| Age (Ten)         | 1             | 4.44    | 7.885    | .101 | .068 | .223 | .077 | .196 | .191 | .118 | .089 | .049 | .167 | .044 | .174 | 1    |      |      |      |     |
| Education (Edu)   | 1             | 3.83    | 1.167    | .038 | .184 | .052 | .054 | .11  | .056 | .046 | .023 | .017 | .021 | .029 | .171 | .351 | 1    |      |      |     |
| Position (Pos)    | 1             | 3.67    | .891     | .128 | .143 | .03  | .067 | .099 | .009 | .034 | .138 | .123 | .079 | .203 | .03  | .076 | .065 | 1    |      |     |
| Department (Dep)  | 1             | 6.28    | 1.554    | .089 | .164 | .241 | .219 | .147 | .266 | .003 | .029 | .024 | .077 | .121 | .031 | .251 | .015 | .137 | 1    |     |
| Gender (Gen)      | 1***          | 4.22    | 2.005    | .065 | .038 | .119 | .058 | .066 | .014 | .026 | .023 | .146 | .253 | .18  | .158 | .09  | .138 | .03  | .078 | 1    |     |

*** Item is calculated separately and as part of gender diversity
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
N=106
## Appendix E overview of relations between independent items, control variables and engagement per group

Group 1 HR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset</td>
<td>0.112 (.568)</td>
<td>0.196 (.055)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>0.306* (.002)</td>
<td>0.294* (.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>0.186 (.345)</td>
<td>.369* (.039)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>0.031 (.761)</td>
<td>.440* (.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning culture</td>
<td>0.174 (.111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.010 (.961)</td>
<td>-0.082 (.639)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.006 (.552)</td>
<td>.002 (.890)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.111 (.105)</td>
<td>-.029 (.690)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.012 (.927)</td>
<td>-.039 (.633)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.050 (.374)</td>
<td>.079 (.143)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.310 (.000)</td>
<td>1.349 (.131)</td>
<td>4.566* (.000)</td>
<td>3.584* (.000)</td>
<td>3.994* (.000)</td>
<td>3.793* (.000)</td>
<td>4.026* (.000)</td>
<td>1.885* (.027)</td>
<td>2.251* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>0.702 (.624)</td>
<td>4.484* (.000)</td>
<td>3.793 (.055)</td>
<td>9.878* (.002)</td>
<td>4.392* (.039)</td>
<td>9.412* (.003)</td>
<td>17.636* (.000)</td>
<td>7.514* (.000)</td>
<td>14.346* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is it the person or the place?

The effects of diversity on the relation mindset or focus and engagement via perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety or learning culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset</td>
<td>-.206* (.007)</td>
<td>-.156 (.088)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>.370* (.000)</td>
<td>.426* (.000)</td>
<td>.347* (.000)</td>
<td>.346* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>.190 (.163)</td>
<td>.597* (.000)</td>
<td>.149 (.284)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.273* (.037)</td>
<td>.688* (.000)</td>
<td>.311* (.020)</td>
<td>.361* (.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning culture</td>
<td>.213* (.012)</td>
<td>.431* (.000)</td>
<td>.246* (.004)</td>
<td>.270* (.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.215 (.133)</td>
<td>.362* (.003)</td>
<td>.235 (.106)</td>
<td>.224 (.097)</td>
<td>.266 (.052)</td>
<td>.199 (.126)</td>
<td>.321* (.016)</td>
<td>.307* (.012)</td>
<td>.285* (.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.016 (.080)</td>
<td>.020* (.013)</td>
<td>.017* (.037)</td>
<td>.024* (.002)</td>
<td>.016* (.031)</td>
<td>.020* (.006)</td>
<td>.017* (.021)</td>
<td>.023* (.001)</td>
<td>.024* (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.087 (.151)</td>
<td>-.040 (.423)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.120 (.185)</td>
<td>-.161* (.036)</td>
<td>-.069 (.427)</td>
<td>-.047 (.552)</td>
<td>-.015 (.611)</td>
<td>-.042 (.587)</td>
<td>-.064 (.414)</td>
<td>-.066 (.353)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.089* (.018)</td>
<td>.058 (.065)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.556* (.000)</td>
<td>4.464 (.562)</td>
<td>4.986* (.000)</td>
<td>1.467* (.043)</td>
<td>2.124* (.001)</td>
<td>1.697* (.005)</td>
<td>2.636* (.000)</td>
<td>-.634 (.390)</td>
<td>-.578 (.391)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>2.733* (.021)</td>
<td>10.187* (.000)</td>
<td>2.327 (.059)</td>
<td>8.069* (.000)</td>
<td>7.350* (.000)</td>
<td>11.618* (.000)</td>
<td>10.718* (.000)</td>
<td>12.502* (.000)</td>
<td>17.088* (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effects of diversity on the relation mindset or focus and engagement via perceived climate for initiative, psychological safety or learning culture.

### Group 3 EMEA Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
<th>Ee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset</td>
<td>.031 (.731)</td>
<td>.189* (.043)</td>
<td>.006 (.942)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>.312* (.000)</td>
<td>.395* (.000)</td>
<td>.295* (.001)</td>
<td>.309* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>.224 (.146)</td>
<td>.555* (.000)</td>
<td>.266 (.076)</td>
<td>.291* (.042)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.059 (.713)</td>
<td>.532* (.000)</td>
<td>.085 (.583)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning culture</td>
<td>.186* (.045)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.365* (.000)</td>
<td>.203* (.022)</td>
<td>.220* (.008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.046 (.762)</td>
<td>.041 (.763)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.015 (.142)</td>
<td>.007 (.456)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.069 (.289)</td>
<td>-.048 (.412)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.013 (.871)</td>
<td>-.043 (.559)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.103* (.035)</td>
<td>.076 (.087)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.322* (.000)</td>
<td>1.322 (.096)</td>
<td>4.549* (.000)</td>
<td>2.923* (.000)</td>
<td>3.326* (.000)</td>
<td>3.302* (.000)</td>
<td>3.884* (.000)</td>
<td>1.468* (.020)</td>
<td>1.572* (.008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>2.216 (.058)</td>
<td>4.484* (.000)</td>
<td>4.212* (.043)</td>
<td>23.401* (.000)</td>
<td>15.646* (.000)</td>
<td>16.276* (.000)</td>
<td>21.743* (.000)</td>
<td>9.377* (.000)</td>
<td>15.764* (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INITIATIVE

MINDSET

Diversity