



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT/MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

**„Staying in and Speaking out: Internal Diversity
Communication and Feeling of Inclusion's Differing Impact
on Remote Working Women's and Men's Employee Voice“**

verfasst von / submitted by

Sarah Kathleen Griffin

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science (MSc)

Wien, 2023 / Vienna 2023

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

UA 066 550

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Communication Science

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.- Prof. Dr. Sabine Einwiller

Introduction

Women have faced numerous challenges in the fight for an egalitarian working environment and this fight doesn't stop when a pandemic begins. The introduction of a new dynamic, remote work, brought about a new set of challenges for organizations looking to create working communities in a digital world. This new challenge inspires questions about how women navigate inclusion and voice in a digital workplace and how their experience differs from their male colleagues'.

According to the United States Census Bureau, "Between 2019 and 2021, the number of people primarily working from home tripled from 5.7% (roughly 9 million people) to 17.9% (27.6 million people)" (2022). While the requirement for remote work has slowed or ended completely for many organizations, there has been an increase in remote work demand among employees. According to Gifford and Green (2020) as cited by Gifford (2022), "6 in 10 UK employees working remotely indicated they would be more likely to request [work from home] in the future, whereas only 5% thought they would be less likely to do so". The growing demand for work-from-home positions signals a change in how we perceive the workplace. With this new classification of the working environment, it is important to continue promoting diversity and inclusion in the workplace, even in a digital format.

While there are other ways to promote these concepts in the workplace, communication is at the forefront of creating an inclusive and diverse space thus providing positive effects to organizations (Dos Reis et al., (2007) as cited by Singal, M., (2014)). Internal communication within organizations is how a company stays connected and it could have an impact on how strongly employees feel included. These feelings of inclusion could impact how women in remote work perceive their employee voice. Employee voice otherwise defined as having a say (Shore et al.,

2011) plays an important role in organizational effectiveness leading to an increase in commitment, engagement and motivation amongst employees (Ahmad et. al., 2017).

This Study seeks to build upon research completed in the previous semesters by approaching the topic of inclusion and internal diversity communication in the workplace and how it affects employee voice within a specific subgroup; remote-working women and men and will examine how their experiences differ. This study will aim to answer the following research question.

RQ: Does internal diversity communication within organizations affect feelings of inclusion amongst remote-working women and men differently and, in turn, differently affect employee voice?

Diversity, Perceived Inclusion and Diversity Management

Diversity is a large concept but is defined, in general, by Mor Barak (2015) as demographic differences (gender, age, race, ethnic heritage, sexual orientation, mental/physical impairments, etc.). Various definitions of diversity in the workplace have been articulated. According to Roberson et al. (2017), diversity encompasses all differences in composition among individuals within a work unit and emphasizes the inclusion of status characteristics, such as power and privilege, to illustrate social stratification, hierarchies, and other phenomena of social distancing. Mor Barak (2015, p. 85) defines it once more as observable and non-observable differences between people within an organization. In the context of the current study, the focus is on gender diversity in relation to two genders: female and male.

Diversity can have many positive effects within the organizational realm, one being feelings of inclusion. Mor Barak and Cherin (1998) define inclusion as employees' feeling of having say within their organization, such as being a part of the

decision-making process and having access to resources within the company. Shore et al., (2011) make the same argument, explaining that in order to feel included, employees must participate in the decision-making process, feel as though they receive ample information and that their opinion matters. Mor Barak (2015) continues this sentiment to say that the meaning of workplace inclusion is employees' perceptions participation is actively encouraged and that their unique contribution is valued. Friedman (2014) argues that inclusive work culture is often associated with diversity. "Using a pluralistic frame, inclusion provides the opportunity for socially marginalized groups to participate concurrently and contribute equally at all organizational levels with nonmarginalized groups while retaining their authentic social identity (gender, race, age etc.)", (Shore, Cleveland, and Sanchez, 2018 as cited by Byrd, 2022, p.145). Employees' social identity contributes to the intricacies of how different people experience inclusion. Consequently, organizations that have emphasized a culture of inclusion and diversity management preceding a transition to remote work, have produced a space to "operationalize goals of humanity that can build a bridge for greater empathy and inclusion of marginalized groups" (Kennedy and Jain, 2021 as cited by Byrd, 2022, p. 151).

Diversity management refers to voluntary organizational actions designed to create greater inclusion of employees from various backgrounds into the formal and informal organizational structures (Mor Barak, 2017, p. 222). Its aim is to transform the organizational culture from a majority-oriented to a heterogeneous-pluralistic culture in which different value systems are heard and thus equally affect the work environment (Mor Barak, 2017, p. 221). Developing an organization's diversity management, and generally increasing organizational diversity and feelings of inclusion can result in positive effects on business performance as evidenced in

numerous sources (Mastella, Vancin & Kirch, 2021; Scholtz & Kieviet, 2017; Kılıç & Kuzey, 2016, Kunze, Boehm & Bruch, 2013, Yousuf et al., 2019).

Although diversity management is an important area of research, few studies have investigated the communication practices associated with it. Long et al. (2015) explored external diversity communication, such as how organizations position themselves on diversity issues or communicate their diversity management practices to the public. In a study by Okoro and Washington (2012), effective communication at the cultural level was found to be critical for maintaining a healthy workplace and achieving excellent performance. To promote diversity, recommended communication practices include targeted diversity initiatives and intercultural communication workshops.

H1: The more inclusive internal communication is perceived, the stronger employees' perception of inclusion.

Remote Work, Inclusion in the Workplace and Employee Voice

Shore et al. (2011) investigated how inclusion and diversity are significant in work organizations. They reasoned employees that felt as though they had a say, participated in decision-making and the sharing of information felt stronger feelings of inclusion. Additionally, these can be considered measures of workplace inclusion (Shore et al., 2011). However, considering the already complex nature of inclusion in the workplace, the new challenge of defining inclusion in the digital workplace proves difficult by the lack of scholarly research on the topic. In one study, the benefits of inclusive leadership are investigated proving that it leads to employees' feelings of confidence and voice (Ashikali et al., 2020). Wolfgruber et al. (2021, p.1) highlighted that communication is the “cornerstone of an inclusive workplace”. They found

employees that do not have strong feelings of inclusion in their work environment, perceived “more excluding and marginalizing communication and practices in their organizations” (Wolfgruber et al, 2021, p.1).

Inclusivity is crucial in creating a diverse and thriving workplace, which makes it necessary to examine employee voice as a crucial component of an inclusive digital organizational environment. According to LePine and Van Dyne (1998, p. 109), employee voice involves “promotive behavior” that aims to express constructive criticism to improve the work environment instead of merely criticizing it. They argue that employee voice should be used to make innovative suggestions for change, even in situations where others disagree with the recommended modifications. Detert and Treviño's (2010) extensive research on employee voice is one of the primary sources of guidance for this study, where they define employee voice as speaking up and sharing opinions and concerns with supervisors or leaders. Morrison (2011) and Raub (2016) (as cited in Jolly & Lee, 2020), however, interpret employee voice as multi-dimensional and classify it as prosocial, proactive, and discretionary behavior that is influenced by how employees perceive the consequences of speaking up or voicing their opinion.

H2: The stronger employees' perception of inclusion, the more likely they use their employee voice.

All of these sources emphasize the relationship between employee voice and its effect on employees' confidence in expressing their opinions and criticisms. According to Jolly and Lee (2020), many employees remain silent due to fear of facing negative outcomes, but inclusive leader behaviors can motivate them to speak up by meeting their basic needs for relatedness and competence, resulting in increased

self-reported voice behavior. But it must be acknowledged that while there is a general perception of employee voice, women experience a different facet of the concept. Eibl et al., (2020) used this theory to aid in their investigation of women and employee voice and found “that women reported lower general self-efficacy beliefs than men, which was in turn related to lower voice” (p. 579).

The virtual workspace presents new challenges in tackling biases and feelings of exclusion. In the case for generational biases, virtual workspaces, according to Urick (2020), have “further exacerbated negative perceptions (i.e. having biased interactions due to negative perceptions of generational differences regarding technology use) that individuals may have of colleagues of other generations, leading to a breakdown in interactions and less effective workplaces” (p.392).

H3: The more inclusive internal communication is perceived, the more likely employees use their employee voice.

Internal Diversity Communication and Gender Disparity in the Workplace

Before approaching the concept of internal diversity communication, gender disparity must be discussed. Sex discrimination is explained more thoroughly by social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986 as cited by Fine et.al, 2020). According to this theory, people “use salient or observable characteristics to categorize others, and sex is a readily observable characteristic that automatically triggers such categorization processes” (Kulik & Bainbridge, 2006 as cited by Fine et.al, 2020, p.47). Power dynamics within the social setting, in this case the work setting, stems from the idea of social exchange or resource exchange, Blau (1964) presents the argument that in social dynamics, there is always a resource to be gained or lost. Because there are resources being exchanged there are some social actors that control

more valued resources than others leading to the subordination of those lacking these highly valued resources (Blau (1964) as cited by Cook et al., 2013, p. 64). When these unequal power dynamics come into play it proves troublesome for those with limited with limited social power as is shown by the detrimental effect of sexual discrimination to women's well-being within the workplace (O'Neil, Sojo, Fileborn, Scovelle, & Milner, 2018; Sojo, Wood, & Genat, 2016 as cited by Fine et al., 2020). Sexual harassment, sexual coercion, and sexual comments have been shown to negatively affect women's "personal and occupational well-being" (O'Neil, Sojo, Fileborn, Scovelle, & Milner, 2018; Sojo, Wood, & Genat, 2016 as cited by Fine et al., 2020, p.48). Social role theory introduced and discussed by Eagly & Wood (2012) helps us understand the basis of sex discrimination:

"Social role theory assumes that gender role beliefs influence women's and men's affect, cognition and behavior through three different pathways: 1) Hormonal regulation (i.e., biological processes); 2) self-regulation (i.e., gender identities); and 3) social regulation (i.e., gender role beliefs act as social norms describing how men and women are and prescribing how men and women should be thereby creating expectations for (in)appropriate behavior of women and men)"(as cited by Eibl et al., 2020, p.574)

While there is a substantial body of research addressing gender disparities and power inequality, this study aims to provide a new perspective by investigating a specific dynamic: internal diversity communication in the context of remote work and its impact on women's feelings of inclusion and their perception of employee voice. This study seeks to explore whether women's experiences of inclusion and their perception of employee voice differ from those of their male colleagues in the remote

work setting, shedding light on a lesser-discussed aspect of gender dynamics within organizations.

H4: Men have a stronger perception of inclusion than women and thus are more likely to use their employee voice.

Internal communication is a critical indicator of the communication climate in an organization and is often studied as such (Bartels et al., 2010). Bartels et al. (2010) distinguish between two aspects of internal communication: horizontal and vertical communication. Horizontal communication is typically informal, interpersonal communication that occurs at a peer level, while vertical communication is usually formal interpersonal communication between managers and subordinates (Fay, 2011). For this research, the focus will be on internal vertical diversity communication, which refers to communication on diversity topics between managers or supervisors, and employees otherwise known as top-down communication.

The current body of research on internal diversity communication within organizations is limited. While some studies have focused on the experiences, attitudes, and behaviors of employees in the workplace, specifically those influenced by race and ethnicity, there remains a shortage of scholarship on this topic. Allen (1995) explored the intersection of communication practices and ethnic diversity in organizations in order to better understand the experiences of people of color in the workplace. In addition, some research has examined how diversity management can be practically implemented in an organization's communication practices. Suh and Lee (2016), for example, have proposed a segmentation concept for workforce diversity in internal communication that organizations and managers can use to divide different groups of internal audiences and maximize diversity, value individuals, and

integrate different tasks into their practices. Despite these efforts, there is still a lack of research on the internal communication of diversity, particularly in terms of its impact on employee voice and feelings of inclusion. Digging deeper, there is even less research on the subsection of remote work. This represents an under-researched area in need of further exploration.

Method

Procedure

To properly answer the question driving this study the best option was a quantitative approach using an online survey. This was the optimal approach for this specific study because it allowed participants to quickly and anonymously provide their experiences and feelings. The questionnaire was created on SoSci Survey using 7-point Likert-type scales from Mor Barak's (2017) Inclusion-Exclusion Scale (MBIE), which were used to measure feelings of inclusion. There are existing scales that address gender specifically such as the Gender-Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) introduced in 1986 by James M. O'Neil, Barbara J. Helms, Robert K. Gable, Laurence David & Lawrence S. Wrightsman. Though this scale could have been considered relevant for this topic, the questionnaire was created without the use of gender specific scales to ensure that the questionnaire remains unbiased and provides an accurate and representative result.

An adaptation of Bartels, et al.'s (2010) scale on internal communication of organizations was used to rate statements about horizontal and vertical organizational communication using a 7 point Likert-type scale. Finally, because there is no definitive scale for employee voice, adaptations of two scales, combined to create a new scale for measuring employee voice were used. Detert & Treviño's (2010) study

on the influence of supervisors and managers on employee voice, whose original survey measured employee voice with open-ended questions was utilized and incorporated into the employee voice section of the questionnaire. Questions from The Speak-Up-Culture-Assessment survey, created by a group of researchers designed to probe settings in which employees are most comfortable or most reluctant to contribute ideas or criticism, were used to help build the final section regarding employee voice (Ethical Systems).

Measurements

The final survey consisted of 42 questions not including the “other” input box option provided on page five of the survey for format of internal diversity communication. The first question informs the participants of their rights and asks for their consent before continuing with the questionnaire. The next section contains three filter questions that filter for remote employment, company size and gender identity. After successfully completing the filter questions participants move on to find a brief explanation of both formal and informal communication. In this portion of the survey, perceived inclusion of internal diversity communication is measured, using 7-point Likert-type scales participants address the format (informally = 1, formally = 7) and frequency (never = 1, very often = 7) with which their company delivers internal diversity communication. They are then asked to rate on a 7-point Likert type scale how much each statement regarding diversity applies to their company (does not apply at all = 1, fully applies = 7).

Moving forward participants encounter a section that measures their perceived inclusion within their digital workplace. The question provides instructions to express how much certain scenarios apply to them in their workplace and they are asked to answer with a 7-point Likert-type scale (does not apply at all = 1, fully applies = 7).

The participants move on to the Employee voice section that measures their feeling of having a say within their organization. Similar to the previous section, they are asked to use a 7-point Likert-type scale (does not apply at all = 1, fully applies = 7) to express how much the statements apply to their workplace if they were to voice their opinion. Remaining in the Employee voice construct participants come to a section that asks them to imagine themselves in different situations and to rate their comfortability level with voicing their opinion or criticism using a 7-point Likert-type scale (very uncomfortable = 1, very comfortable = 7). Finally, the survey ends with a sociodemographic question asking participants which country they are employed in.

Sample

The objective of the sampling process was to gather a representative sample of approximately 200 employees, with the goal of achieving a balanced representation of both genders by including 100 men and 100 women. Various methods were employed to recruit participants, including personal contacts, online forums, survey swaps, and social media platforms. The inclusion criteria for this study targeted individuals who identified as either men or women, had experience working remotely for a duration of at least 6 months within the past 3 years, and were employed at companies with a current workforce of 50 or more individuals. This criterion was crucial in order to examine the dynamics of internal diversity communication within organizations where top-down diversity communication was present, as indicated by the filter question regarding company size.

Regrettably, despite receiving over 400 clicks on the survey link, the number of participants who actively took part in the study was only 55, with a final sample size of 40 participants after applying the filtering criteria. Of these participants, 24

were women, accounting for 60% of the sample, while the remaining 16 were men, representing 40% of the sample. Geographically, 70% of the participants were based in the United States, while the remaining 30% were from Europe. In terms of company size, the smallest portion of participants (7.5%) were employed at companies with a workforce ranging from 500 to 999 employees, while those working at companies with 250 to 499 employees comprised 22.5% of the sample. Participants employed at companies with over 1000 employees constituted 32.5% of the sample. The majority of participants (37.5%) worked at companies with a size of 50 to 249 employees.

Results

Preparatory-Analysis

Table 1.

<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>				
Scales	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	α
1. Perceived Inclusion of Internal				
Diversity Communication	4.8611	0.81795	40	0.902
2. Employee Voice	3.6213	1.17555	40	0.918
3. Perception of Inclusion	4.6286	1.46539	40	0.779

Due to the small number of participants, factor analysis could not be performed because it may result in unstable factor solutions. Though exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were unable to be completed in this study, in the vein of

simplifying the analyses going forward, index scales are created. To do this, reliability tests were performed for each construct and descriptive statistics were run. the index scales consist of the three main variables within the experiment: Employee Voice, Perception of Inclusion, and Perceived inclusiveness of Internal Diversity Communication.

The first scale tested for reliability was "Perceived Inclusion of Internal Diversity Communication". Two items were found to increase the Cronbach's alpha, the reliability coefficient, if removed: "Suggestions regarding our diversity policy that I make to top management will be seriously considered" and "My colleagues and I are encouraged to participate in making decisions about diversity topics". After removing said items the reliability coefficient increased from ($\alpha = .900$) to ($\alpha = .902$) indicating a high level of internal reliability. The first scale also yielded a mean score of ($M = 4.8611$) ($SD = 0.81795$) based on a sample size of 40 participants. The standard deviation suggests the responses are generally consistent and clustered around the mean.

For the scale, Employee Voice, the item, "I'm concerned about negative outcomes when sharing wrongdoings with my supervisor(s)" was removed, increasing the reliability coefficient to a high level of reliability from ($\alpha = .841$) to ($\alpha = .918$). The average score for this scale is ($M = 3.6213$). The standard deviation ($SD = 1.17555$) indicates a relatively wide dispersion around the mean.

Lastly, the "Perception of Inclusion" scale obtained a mean score of ($M = 4.6286$). The standard deviation suggests a relatively wide variation in responses ($SD = 1.46539$) based on the responses of the 40 participants. The internal consistency of this scale was acceptable, with an α coefficient of 0.779. These descriptive statistics provide an overview of the central tendency and variability observed within each

scale, while also considering the sample size and internal consistency of the measurements (see Table 1).

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

Table 2.

<i>Correlations</i>			PI	PIIDC
Kendall's tau_b	Perception of Inclusion	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.258*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.022
		N	40	40
	Perceived Inclusion of Internal Diversity Communication	Correlation Coefficient	.258*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.022	.
		N	40	40
Spearman's rho	Perception of Inclusion	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.374*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.017
		N	40	40
	Perceived Inclusion of Internal Diversity Communication	Correlation Coefficient	.374*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.
		N	40	40

*, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). PI refers to the variable Perception of Inclusion. PIIDC refers to the variable Perceived Inclusion of Diversity Communication

An examination of the relationship between the perceived inclusion of internal diversity communication and the perception of inclusion was conducted utilizing Kendall's tau b correlation analysis. This analytical approach was chosen due to its suitability for the smaller sample size and its ability to provide an accurate estimation of the p-value. The obtained results, as displayed in the table above, reveal a

significant correlation ($N = 40$) between the perceived inclusion of internal diversity communication and the perception of inclusion ($\tau_b = .258, p = .022$) ($p < .05$). Thus, hypothesis 1 is accepted, indicating support for the notion that a positive correlation exists between the perceived inclusion of internal diversity communication and the perception of inclusion.

Hypothesis 2

Table 3.

Correlations

			Perception of Inclusion	Employee Voice
Kendall's tau_b	Perception of Inclusion	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.281*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.013
		N	40	40
	Employee Voice	Correlation Coefficient	.281*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.
		N	40	40
Spearman's rho	Perception of Inclusion	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.340*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.032
		N	40	40
	Employee Voice	Correlation Coefficient	.340*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.032	.
		N	40	40

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

To test the relationship between employees' perception of inclusion and employee voice a Kendall's tau b rank correlation was performed. As shown in the

table above, the analysis shows that there is a significant correlation ($N = 40$) between employee voice and employees' perception of inclusion ($\tau_b = .281, p = .013$) ($p < .05$). This finding supports hypothesis 2, suggesting that there is a meaningful relationship between employees' perception of inclusion and their employee voice.

Hypothesis 3

Table 4.

<i>Correlations</i>			Employee Voice	PIIDC
Kendall's Tau_b	Employee Voice	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.209
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.062
		N	40	40
	Perceived Inclusion of Internal Diversity Communication	Correlation Coefficient	.209	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.062	.
		N	40	40
Spearman's rho	Employee Voice	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.286
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.074
		N	40	40
	Perceived Inclusion of Internal Diversity Communication	Correlation Coefficient	.286	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.074	.
		N	40	40

PIIDC refers to the variable Perceived Inclusion of Internal Diversity

Communication.

To investigate the relationship between perceived inclusion of internal diversity communication and employee voice a Kendall's tau b non-parametric correlation analysis was performed. As shown in the table above, the analysis shows that there is not a significant correlation ($N = 40$) between employee voice and

employees' perception of inclusion ($r_b = .209$, $p = .062$) ($p > .05$). Consequently, hypothesis 3 is rejected.

Hypothesis 4

Table 5.

Descriptive Statistics

Gender		Perception of Inclusion	Employee Voice
Women	Mean	4.9352	4.7738
	N	24	24
	Std.	.89306	1.34271
	Deviation		
Men	Mean	4.7500	4.4107
	N	16	16
	Std.	.70331	1.65359
	Deviation		
Total	Mean	4.8611	4.6286
	N	40	40
	Std.	.81795	1.46539
	Deviation		

In order to investigate the relationship between gender, perception of inclusion, and employee voice, a thorough analysis was conducted by comparing the means of the variables. Table 6 provides an overview of the means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for the variables "Perception of Inclusion" and "Employee Voice" based on gender. For the "Perception of Inclusion" variable, women ($N = 24$) exhibited a mean score of 4.93 ($SD = 0.89$), while men ($N = 16$) had a mean score of 4.77 ($SD = 0.70$). Regarding the "Employee Voice" variable, women had a mean score of 4.77 ($SD = 1.34$), and men had a mean score of 4.41 ($SD = 1.65$). It is worth noting that the

means for both perception of inclusion and employee voice were slightly higher for women compared to men. This observation suggests that women engaging in remote work may experience stronger feelings of inclusion and voice in the remote workplace compared to their male counterparts. However, due to the uneven case group distribution and small sample size, caution must be exercised in generalizing these findings.

To further explore Hypothesis 4, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine the differences in perception of inclusion and employee voice between men and women, as displayed in the table below. The ANOVA results indicated that there were no significant differences in perception of inclusion between men ($N = 16$) and women ($N = 24$) ($F(1, 38) = 0.486, p = .490$). Similarly, no significant differences were found in employee voice between men and women ($F(1, 38) = 0.583, p = .450$). Therefore, hypothesis 4 is rejected, suggesting that the perception of inclusion and employee voice did not significantly differ between genders based on the results of the variance analysis (ANOVA).

It is important to interpret these findings with caution, considering the small sample size and the uneven distribution between the male and female participants. Further research with a more balanced sample size and a larger number of participants would be beneficial for a more comprehensive understanding of the gender differences in perception of inclusion and employee voice in the context of remote work.

Table 6.*ANOVA*

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Perception of Inclusion * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	.329	1	.329	.486	.490
	Within Groups		25.763	38	.678		
	Total		26.093	39			
Employee Voice * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	1.266	1	1.266	.583	.450
	Within Groups		82.481	38	2.171		
	Total		83.747	39			

Discussion

This study aimed to investigate various aspects related to internal diversity communication, perception of inclusion, employee voice, and gender within the context of remote work. By utilizing a quantitative approach and administering a 7-point Likert-type scale survey, this study contributes to the existing body of literature and provides comprehensive insights into the implications of these constructs for organizations operating in remote work settings.

Consistent with Hypothesis 1, the findings reveal a significant positive correlation between the perceived inclusion of internal diversity communication and employees' perception of inclusion. This result aligns with the research conducted by Ahmad, Rizvi, and Bokhari (2017), who emphasized the importance of effective internal communication practices in fostering an inclusive work environment. The

findings of this study further support the idea that when employees perceive internal communication as inclusive, it enhances their sense of belonging, acceptance, and shared purpose within the organization (Ashikali et al., 2020; Bartels et al., 2010). These findings emphasize the need for organizations to prioritize inclusive internal communication strategies that promote transparency, openness, and the active involvement of employees from diverse backgrounds.

In line with Hypothesis 2, this study demonstrates a significant positive correlation between employees' perception of inclusion and their use of employee voice. The findings are consistent with previous research by Detert and Treviño (2010) and LePine and Van Dyne (1998), which highlight the relationship between inclusion and employee voice. The results suggest that when employees feel included, valued, and respected within the organization, they are more likely to engage in voice behaviors, such as sharing ideas, suggestions, and concerns related to organizational matters. This positive relationship between inclusion and employee voice can be attributed to employees' increased psychological safety, motivation, and confidence to express their opinions and contribute to organizational decision-making processes (Morrison, 2011; Jolly & Lee, 2020). Organizations should foster an inclusive climate that promotes active employee participation and provides opportunities for employees to contribute their voice.

Regarding Hypothesis 3, the results of this study did not provide support for a significant positive correlation between the perceived inclusion of internal diversity communication and the likelihood of using employee voice. While previous research has highlighted the role of inclusive internal communication practices in facilitating employee voice (Long et al., 2015; Suh & Lee, 2016), the findings of this study did

not reveal a significant relationship between these constructs. Several factors may have contributed to these non-significant findings.

Moving to Hypothesis 4, the analysis did not reveal any significant gender differences in terms of perception of inclusion or use of employee voice. This finding is consistent with the research by Eibl et al. (2020) and suggests that within the context of remote work and based on the variables measured in this study, gender does not significantly impact employees' perception of inclusion or their engagement in employee voice behaviors. However, it is important to acknowledge that gender dynamics in the workplace are complex and can be influenced by various contextual factors, organizational culture, and individual experiences (Eibl et al., 2020; Fine et al., 2019). Future research should further explore the role of gender in relation to these constructs and consider additional factors that may influence gender dynamics in remote work settings.

The findings of this study have important implications for organizations aiming to foster inclusive work environments and promote employee voice. Inclusive leaders actively promote and facilitate participation, collaboration, and the expression of diverse perspectives, creating an environment where employees feel valued and empowered to contribute their voice (Jolly & Lee, 2020). Additionally, organizations should prioritize inclusive internal communication practices that facilitate information sharing, active listening, and transparency (Long et al., 2015; Suh & Lee, 2016). This creates opportunities for employees to engage in meaningful dialogue, exchange ideas, and provide input into organizational processes, thereby enhancing employee engagement, satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness.

This study focused specifically on the remote working environment which introduces unique challenges and opportunities for creating inclusive work

environments. The study by Byrd (2022) highlights the importance of fostering a culture of inclusion and belongingness in remote work environments, emphasizing the role of meaningful work in promoting employees' well-being and engagement. Additionally, the research by Gifford (2022) acknowledges the unprecedented increase in remote work and calls for further research to understand its implications on various aspects of organizational dynamics. Future research should explore the dynamic nature of remote work and its impact on inclusion, employee voice, and other organizational factors.

Ethical Considerations

As the student who conducted this study, I am aware of the ethical responsibilities inherent in conducting research and acknowledge the potential influence of my own biases on the research process. Recognizing the significance of the topics explored in this study, including feelings of inclusion, diversity, and voice in the workplace, I have taken steps to ensure ethical conduct and consider the implications of this research. I acknowledge that, as a woman, I bring my own perspective and experiences to this research. It is important for me to recognize and account for these biases to ensure the fairness and objectivity of the study. I have taken measures to be mindful of my own biases throughout the research process.

Given the sensitive nature of the topic and the impact it may have on individuals, I recognize my duty to advocate for inclusion in all its forms. I am committed to ensuring that this study promotes inclusivity, respect, and equal treatment for all individuals, irrespective of their background or viewpoints.

Participants were provided with detailed information about their rights as research participants and the nature of the questionnaire. To ensure transparency and

informed consent, participants were presented with a section outlining their rights, and a filter question was included to confirm their understanding and acceptance. This was done to uphold the principles of informed consent and ensure participants are fully aware of their involvement in the study.

While this study focuses on only two genders, men and women, I acknowledge the importance of investigating other gender identities. However, due to the complex and multifaceted nature of gender identity, a comprehensive exploration of other gender identities is beyond the scope of this study. Future research should explore these identities to provide a more inclusive understanding of workplace experiences.

This research aims to contribute to the advancement of inclusive and diverse work environments, whether in digital or physical settings. It is essential to emphasize that the findings should not hinder the progress being made by marginalized communities but rather support organizations in their journey toward fostering inclusive and diverse workplaces.

By addressing these ethical considerations, I have striven to conduct this study with the utmost respect for all participants, ensuring transparency, fairness, and sensitivity to the impact of the research topic.

Limitations and Further Research

While this study provides valuable insights, it is important to consider its limitations. As a master's level student, I am limited in the resources that are available to me to gather participants, so, unfortunately, the data was shared to the best of my abilities but I was unable to reach my goal sample size. The timeline for this project was limited as well which also added to the difficulty of gathering participants.

Because this study is focused on a very specific subcategory of employed individuals, it created added difficulty when filtering out participants. Because the sample size is so small there is a large margin for error meaning the results of the statistical analyses are not a successful representation of the larger population that was the focus of this study. Future research with larger and more diverse samples would enhance the external validity of the results. Second, the study focused specifically on the context of remote work, and the findings may not fully capture the complexities of other work settings.

Though this study encountered many limitations, continuation of the research with this topic could prove beneficial to companies looking to improve vertical internal communication and inclusion within their workforce. Future studies could focus on different gender identities providing a more diverse perspective on the research focus of this study and by utilizing different methods such as focus group interviews could explore more deeply the effects of internal diversity communication on employees.

Companies moving forward could use this study to spur expanded studies that will help aid in their understanding of inclusion in a digital workplace and help them to better connect with their employees. As was discovered in this study, perception of inclusion has an effect on employee voice meaning companies could continue with research within their own organizations. Doing so could prove beneficial seeing as it was discovered that employee voice has a positive effect on not only employee motivation but engagement and commitment as well (Ahmad, et al., 2017). As the world moves forward with many companies turning towards the remote workplace as an alternative for their employees, this research topic is becoming increasingly relevant and practical.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study contributes to the existing literature by examining the relationships between internal diversity communication, perception of inclusion, employee voice, and gender within the context of remote work. The findings highlight the importance of inclusive internal diversity communication practices and a culture that values and encourages employee voice. By prioritizing these aspects, organizations can foster inclusive work environments that empower employees and drive organizational success in the dynamic landscape of remote work.

References

- Ahmad, N., Rizvi, A., & Bokhari, S. N. (2017). impact of Employees' Voice on Employees' Effectiveness. *Journal of Business Strategies*, 11(1), 79–98.
[https://doi.org/10.29270/jbs.11.1\(17\).005](https://doi.org/10.29270/jbs.11.1(17).005)
- Ashikali, T., Groeneveld, S., & Kuipers, B. (2020). The role of inclusive leadership in supporting an inclusive climate in diverse public sector teams. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 41(3), 497-519.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X19899722>
- Allen, B.J. (1995). "Diversity"; and organizational communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 23(2), 143-155.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00909889509365420>
- Bartels, J., Peters, O., de Jong, M., Pruyn, A., & van der Molen, M. (2010). Horizontal and vertical communication as determinants of professional and organizational identification. *Personnel Review*, 39(2), 210-226.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481011017426>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.
- Byrd, M. (2022) Creating a culture of inclusion and belongingness in remote work environments that sustains meaningful work. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(2), 145-162, [DOI: 10.1080/13678868.2022.2047252](https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2047252)
- Cook, Karen & Cheshire, Coye & Rice, Eric & Nakagawa, Sandra. (2013). Social Exchange Theory. *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 61-88. [DOI: 10.1007/978-94-007-6772-0_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6772-0_3).

Detert, J.R., & Treviño, L.K. (2010). Speaking Up to Higher-Ups: How Supervisors and Skip-Level Leaders Influence Employee Voice. *Organization Science*, 21(1), 249-270. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0405>

Eibl, B., Lang, F. R., & Niessen, C. (2020). Employee voice at work: the role of employees' gender, self-efficacy beliefs, and leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(4), 570–585.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2020.1733979>

Take Our Survey: Speak Up Culture Assessment. (2017, September 27). Ethical Systems. <https://www.ethicalsystems.org/take-our-survey-speak-up-culture-assessment/>

Fay, M.J. (2011). Informal Communication of Co-Workers: A Thematic Analysis of Messages. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 6, 212-229.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/17465641111188394>

Fine, C., Sojo, V., & Lawford-Smith, H. (2019). Why Does Workplace Gender Diversity Matter? Justice, Organizational Benefits, and Policy. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 14(1), 36–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12064>

Fuchs, V. R. (1989). Women's Quest for Economic Equality. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 3(1), 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.3.1.25>

Gifford, J. (2022). Remote working: unprecedented increase and a developing research agenda. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(2), 105–113.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2049108>

- Jolly, P. M., & Lee, L. (2020). Silence is not Golden: Motivating Employee Voice through Inclusive Leadership. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 45(6), 1092–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348020963699>
- Kılıç, M. & Kuzey, C. (2016). The effect of board gender diversity on firm performance: evidence from Turkey, *Gender in Management*, 31(7), 434-455. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-10-2015-0088>
- Kunze, F., Boehm, S., & Bruch, H. (2013). Age Diversity and Company Performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50, 413-442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12016>
- LePine, J.A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 853–868. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.853>
- Leiner, D. J. (2019). SoSci Survey (Version 3.1.06) [Computer software]. Available at <https://www.soscisurvey.de>
- Long, S.D., Doerer, S., & Stewart, O.J. (2015). Virtual ethnography: Corporate virtual diversity communication. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 10(2), 175-200. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-03-2014-1207>
- Mastella, M., Vancin, D., Perlin, M., & Kirch, G. (2021), Board gender diversity: performance and risk of Brazilian firms, *Gender in Management*, 36(4), 498-518. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-06-2019-0088>
- Mor Barak, M.E., & Cherin, D.A. (1998). A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity: exploring a measure of inclusion-

exclusion. *Adm. Soc. Work.*, 22, 47–64.

https://doi.org/10.1300/J147v22n01_04

Mor Barak, M.E. (2015). Inclusion is the key to diversity management, but what is inclusion?. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership and Governance*, 39(2), 83-88.

Mor Barak, M.E. (2017). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*. Sage Publications.

Morrison, E.W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *Academy of Management annals*, 5(1), 373-412. <https://doi-org.uaccess.univie.ac.at/10.5465/19416520.2011.574506>

Nord, W. R. (1980). The Study of Organizations through a Resource—Exchange Paradigm. *Social Exchange*, 119–139. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3087-5_6

Okoro, E.A., & Washington, M.C. (2012). Workforce diversity and organizational communication: analysis of human capital performance and productivity. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 7(1), pp. 57-67.

O’Neil, James,M., Helms, Barbara, J., Gable, Robert, K., David, L., & Wrightsman, Lawrence,S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men’s fear of femininity. *Sex Roles*, 14(5-6). <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00287583>

Raub, S.P. (2016). Perceived Insider Status and Job Design Predict Job Attitudes and Work Performance of Restaurant Employees. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 42(6), 880–903.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348016654974>

Reimagine Gender. (2023). *Gender and Forms*. Reimaginegender.org.

https://reimaginegender.org/insights/gender-and-forms?gclid=Cj0KCQjwla-hBhD7ARIsAM9tQKv_v7ur2xrtlNjkAfEbkaH1XsRK-y3QGFsID1ZE_gOjiWTXrhmlYgEaAvwqEALw_wcB

Roberson, Q., Ryan, A.M., & Ragins, B.R. (2017). The evolution and future of diversity at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 483-499.

Scholtz, H., & Kieviet, S. (2018). The Influence Of Board Diversity On Company Performance Of South African Companies. *Journal of African Business*, 19(1), 105-123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2017.1356065>

Shore, L.M., Randel, A.E., Chung, B.G., Dean, M.A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of management*, 37(4), 1262–1289.

Singal, M. (2014). The business case for diversity management in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 40, 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2014.02.009>

Suh, T., & Lee, J. (2016). Internal audience segmentation and diversity in internal communication. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 21(4), 450-464. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-05-2015-0024>

Urick, M. (2020). Generational Differences and COVID-19: Positive Interactions in Virtual Workplaces. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 18(4), 379–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2020.1818662>

USAID. (2023). Delivering Gender Equality: A Best Practices Framework for Male-Dominated Industries- Presented by Engendering Industries.

<https://www.usaid.gov/engendering-industries/gender-equality-best-practices-framework>

US Census Bureau. (2022, September 17). The Number of People Primarily Working From Home Tripled Between 2019 and 2021. Retrieved February 14, 2023, from Census.gov website: <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2022/people-working-from-home.html>

Wolfgruber, D., Stürmer, L., & Einwiller, S. (2022). Talking inclusion into being: communication as a facilitator and obstructor of an inclusive work environment. *Personnel Review*, 51(7), 1841-1860.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2021-0013>

Yousuf, M., Raisi, A., Suod, B., Rawahi, A., Harib, N., Omrani, A., Khamis, N., Hooti, A., & Porkodi, S. (2019). The Effect of Cultural Diversity on Employees' Performance and Productivity in Shell Oman Marketing Company S.A.O.G. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, 1(9), 14-17.

Appendix

7/4/23, 1:42 PM

Γένεση-προφίλ 03 (μ. αερεπισα2023αγ) 04.07.2023, 13:11



Page 01

IS

Thank you for your interest in participating in this study, carried out as a part of thesis research for my Master's degree in **"Communication Science" at the University of Vienna**. This study takes a closer look at gender and diversity communication within organizations.

In the following survey, you will be asked questions concerning

- a) your perceptions as well as actual and intended behavior with regard to diversity communication in the workplace;
- b) the work and communication climate in the company you are currently employed in;
- c) your person.

This survey is intended for participants who are currently **employed remotely** or were **previously employed remotely** for at least **6 continuous months(or more)** within the last 3 years. It is completely **anonymous**, takes approximately **7 minutes**, and **can only be completed once**.

There are **no wrong answers in this survey**

If you have any further comments or suggestions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the following email address:

a12107182@unet.univie.ac.at

Page 02

PC

Before beginning with the questionnaire, please take the time to carefully read the following information about your rights as a participant.

Once again,

1. Your participation is voluntary. You can refuse to participate at any time, without having to give a reason, or also withdraw your agreement to participate once the study has already started. There will be no negative consequences for you if you refuse to participate or if you withdraw from this study.
2. Your participation is completely anonymous.
 - 2.1. No questions will be asked regarding your name or the name of your employer.
 - 2.2. It is impossible to associate any of the collected data with your person.
3. Your answers will be treated confidentially and will be only used for scientific purposes.
4. Your participation starts when you give your informed consent below and ends with the completion of the questionnaire. Please answer the questions honestly and to the best of your knowledge.

I was informed about my participant rights and want to continue with the survey.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Are you currently employed and working remotely or have you been previously employed remotely (at the same company) for 6 continuous months (or more) within the last 3 years?

- ☐ Yes, I am currently working remotely for 6 continuous months (or more).
- ☐ No, I am currently not working remotely, but within the last 3 years I have worked remotely for 6 continuous months (or more) at the same company I am still working at.
- ☐ No, I have not worked remotely for at least 6 continuous months at the same company.
- ☐ No, I am unemployed

Please indicate the number of employees at your company/organization

- ☐ < 50
- ☐ $50 - 249$
- ☐ $250 - 499$
- ☐ $500 - 999$
- ☐ > 1000

Which most closely describes your gender?

- ☐ Woman
- ☐ Man
- ☐ Transgender Woman
- ☐ Transgender Man
- ☐ Non-Binary
- ☐ Agender/ I don't identify with any gender
- ☐ Gender not listed
- ☐ Prefer not to state



Informal Communication refers to unofficial conversations (small talk, humor, discussions amongst coworkers) or informal information exchange and decision-making (lunch meetings).

Formal Communication refers to the exchange of exclusively work-related information in an official context (meetings, e-mails, workshops or events).

Please think back when to you worked remotely...

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very often

How often are/were demographic differences between employees (age, gender, race, sexual orientation, ethnic heritage and mental/physical impairments) formally or informally addressed in your organization?

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Please indicate whether demographic differences (age, gender, race, sexual orientation, ethnic heritage, mental/physical impairments) are/were communicated more often formally or informally in your organization.

Informally							Formally	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		Not at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐

Please think back to when you worked remotely...

How often are/were demographic differences (age, gender, race, sexual orientation, ethnic heritage, mental/physical impairment) communicated formally in your organization in the following ways?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 Very often 6 7

Employee newsletter or magazine

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

E-mail

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Workshops

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Bulletin board

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Meetings (official)

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Company-wide leadership address

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Other:

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

7/4/23, 1:43 PM

Γάβριελ-προοφ Φινά03 (μ.σ.ε.ρη:α2023αγ) 04.07.2023, 13:11

Page 06

ID3

Please think back to when you worked remotely...

Differences in demographics are often referred to as "diversity". Please indicate how much the following statements about diversity (age, gender, race, ethnic heritage, sexual orientation, mental/physical impairments) apply to the organization you work for.

	Does not apply at all							Fully applies	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
I often see suggestions regarding our diversity policy that I or colleagues make to top management translated into concrete actions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
Generally speaking, I think the information I receive from top management around the topic of diversity is reliable.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
The information I receive about my organization's diversity measures or initiatives is generally useful.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
I am consulted before top management makes any major decisions that fall under the topic of diversity.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
My opinion makes a difference in the top management's decisions about their diversity policy in my organization.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
I know who to contact if I want to voice my criticism on diversity issues within my organization or my organization's diversity policy.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
I receive ample information around my organization's diversity initiatives/measures.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
In general, I am satisfied with the explanations given by top management on decisions and policies regarding diversity.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
In general, I think the members of top management tell the truth, when they address diversity issues.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
I receive information about my organization's diversity communication in a timely fashion.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
Suggestions regarding our diversity policy that I make to top management will be seriously considered.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
My colleagues and I are encouraged to participate in making decisions about diversity topics.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		

Please think back to when you worked remotely...

Please indicate how much the following statements apply to you in your workplace.

[illegible]

Please think back to when you worked remotely...

Please indicate to what extent the following statements apply to you if you were to voice your opinion in your organization.

[illegible]

Please think back to when you worked remotely...

Please imagine that you experience the following situations and indicate how comfortable you would be voicing your opinion or criticism within your organization.

[illegible]

Within which country/countries were/are you located during your time of remote employment?

Thank you for your participation!

In completing this survey, you have contributed to research analyzing diversity communication within the remote working dynamic and how it affects employees' feelings of inclusion and comfort voicing opinions.

If you have any questions, suggestions or would like to request more information about the study, please contact via the following email: a12107182@unet.univie.ac.at.

Your answers have been successfully submitted and you may close the browser window or tab now.

B.A. Sarah Griffin, Universität Wien – 2023

*The online questionnaire was generated using SoSci Survey (Leiner, 2016) and was made available to users via www.soscisurvey.de.

Abstract

The emergence of remote work and steady demand has presented organizations with additional obstacles in establishing inclusive and diverse working communities within an increasingly digitalized world. This challenge prompts inquiries into how women navigate inclusion and voice in the digital workplace, as well as how their experiences may differ from those of their male counterparts. With a quantitative survey driven approach, remote working men and women from both the United States and Europe were asked to answer a collection of 7-point Likert-type scale questions addressing three constructs: Perceived Inclusion of Internal Diversity Communication, Perception of Inclusion and Employee Voice. The results show a significant correlation between the perceived inclusion of internal diversity communication and perception of inclusion. Employees' perception of inclusion and employee voice also had a significant correlation but no significant correlation was found between perceived internal diversity communication and employee voice. This study also found that men did not have higher levels of inclusion or employee voice compared to women. Due to a small sample size of 40, this study is limited in its representativeness and generalizability but can serve as preliminary findings for further research regarding gender, the evolving workplace, inclusion and internal communication within organizations.

Keywords: Internal Communication, Diversity, Inclusion, Employee Voice, Gender

Abstrakt

Das Aufkommen der Telearbeit und die stetige Nachfrage haben Unternehmen vor zusätzliche Hindernisse gestellt, wenn es darum geht, integrative und vielfältige Arbeitsgemeinschaften in einer zunehmend digitalisierten Welt aufzubauen. Diese Herausforderung veranlasst dazu, zu untersuchen, wie Frauen mit Inklusion und Mitsprache am digitalen Arbeitsplatz umgehen und wie sich ihre Erfahrungen von denen ihrer männlichen Kollegen unterscheiden. Mit einem quantitativen, umfragebasierten Ansatz wurden remote arbeitende Männer und Frauen aus den Vereinigten Staaten und Europa gebeten, eine Reihe von Fragen auf einer 7-Punkte-Likert-Skala zu beantworten, die sich auf drei Konstrukte beziehen: Wahrgenommene Einbeziehung von interner Diversant-Kommunikation, Wahrnehmung der Einbeziehung und Mitspracherecht der Mitarbeiter. Die Ergebnisse zeigen eine signifikante Korrelation zwischen der wahrgenommenen Einbeziehung der internen Kommunikation zur Vielfalt und der Wahrnehmung der Einbeziehung. Die Wahrnehmung der Einbeziehung durch die Mitarbeiter und die Stimme der Mitarbeiter wiesen ebenfalls eine signifikante Korrelation auf, aber es wurde keine signifikante Korrelation zwischen der wahrgenommenen internen Diversant-Kommunikation und der Stimme der Mitarbeiter festgestellt. In dieser Studie wurde auch festgestellt, dass Männer im Vergleich zu Frauen kein höheres Maß an Einbeziehung oder Mitspracherecht der Mitarbeiter aufweisen. Aufgrund der kleinen Stichprobengröße von 40 Personen ist diese Studie in ihrer Repräsentativität und Verallgemeinerbarkeit begrenzt, kann aber als vorläufige Ergebnisse für weitere Forschungen zu den Themen Geschlecht, Arbeitsplatzentwicklung, Integration und interne Kommunikation in Unternehmen dienen.

Schlüsselwörter: Interne Kommunikation, Vielfalt, Einbindung,
Arbeitnehmerbeteiligung, Geschlecht