



received: 22 March 2024
accepted: 15 November 2024

pages: 15-25

© 2025 M. Juchnowicz and H. Kinowska

This work is published under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 License.

EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ORGANISATIONAL DIVERSITY: THE PECULIARITIES OF A MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISE

MARTA JUCHNOWICZ 
HANNA KINOWSKA 

ABSTRACT

The article explores the impact of attitudes towards diversity on employee proactivity, considering job satisfaction as a mediating variable and the specific characteristics of manufacturing enterprises in contrast to those with other activities. A conceptual model for the relationship between inclusivity, employee proactivity, and job satisfaction was formulated following the literature review. The proposed model underwent empirical testing through confirmatory analysis using structural equation modelling (SEM CFA) on a sample of 1,000 employees. The data were collected in December 2023, focusing on exploring the impact of employee inclusivity on proactivity mediated by job satisfaction. This study compared manufacturing company employees to those working in other types of enterprises. Quantitative research was used to test the model of the relationship between inclusivity and employee proactivity. The results confirmed a positive direct relationship between inclusivity, proactivity, and job satisfaction. Additionally, the study demonstrated the role of job satisfaction as a mediator between inclusivity and proactivity. While no greater impact of inclusivity was affirmed in manufacturing enterprises compared to other types of firms, some differences were observed in this context. The study fills a gap in the links between employee inclusivity and proactivity with the mediation of job satisfaction. Subsequent research would need to further explore the impact of the specific components of the study constructs on employee proactivity and extend to other mediators and moderators of the relationship between the studied variables. For enterprises, the findings indicate the need to implement practices supporting inclusivity and creating work environments that foster satisfied employees. The differences in the magnitude of the impact of inclusivity depending on the type of activity suggest that human resource management practices should be adapted to the organisational context.

KEY WORDS

workplace diversity, employee inclusivity, employee proactivity, job satisfaction, manufacturing employees

10.2478/emj-2025-0002

Hanna Kinowska
SGH Warsaw School of Economics,
al. Niepodległości 16,
02-554 Warszawa, Poland
ORCID 0000-0002-7936-9737

Corresponding author:
e-mail: hanna.kinowska@sgh.waw.pl

Marta Juchnowicz
WSB Merito University in Poznań,
ul. Ratajczaka 5/7 61-814 Poznań, Poland,
ORCID 0000-0002-7506-5576
e-mail: marta.juchnowicz@wsb.warszawa.pl

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary organisations are challenged by the rapidly changing business environment that requires flexibility, innovation, and adaptation (Chen et al., 2019). In the era of globalisation, organisations

have been dealing with increasingly more culturally and demographically diverse teams of employees. Attitudes regarding this diversity can strongly impact organisational performance and, particularly, employee proactivity (Li et al., 2020).

While a body of literature explores attitudes towards diversity and their impact on various facets

Juchnowicz, M., & Kinowska, H. (2025). Employee attitudes towards organisational diversity: the peculiarities of a manufacturing enterprise. *Engineering Management in Production and Services*, 17(1), 15-25. doi: 10.2478/emj-2025-0002

of organisational performance (Kulik, 2014; Roberson, 2019), some gaps in findings remain. They pertain to the distinctive characteristics of manufacturing companies when compared to other types of organisations. Manufacturing companies tend to operate in more complex working environments, where factors such as technology, production processes, and occupational safety dominate. These unique operational aspects influence employee attitudes and behaviours, making it essential to study diversity and inclusivity specifically within this context.

Manufacturing companies often involve work on production lines, characterised by repetitive tasks, stringent quality control, and automated systems (Aldossari & Zin, 2019; Ismail, 1998). These environments require specific skills and present unique challenges, such as physical demands and the need for precise task execution under tight deadlines. Furthermore, workplace safety is paramount in manufacturing settings, with proactive measures crucial to maintaining a safe work environment (Mutegi, Joshua & Kinyua, 2023).

Research insufficiently focuses on manufacturing operations and their correlation with attitudes towards diversity and employee proactivity. Addressing this literature gap can offer valuable insights into the theory and practices of human resource management in manufacturing companies.

This article aims to explore the direct and indirect impact of employee inclusivity on their proactivity through job satisfaction. This examination considers the unique characteristics of manufacturing companies compared to organisations in other business sectors. The analysis of this issue aims to enhance the understanding of the mechanisms underlying employee proactivity concerning their attitudes towards diversity and the organisational context. This study focuses on the peculiarities of manufacturing enterprises and contributes to the broader understanding of diversity management and its impact on employee behaviour in varied organisational contexts.

The article is divided into three parts: (1) a theoretical background encompassing the nature of workplace diversity, inclusivity, proactivity, their relationship with job satisfaction, and the distinctive operational aspects of manufacturing companies; (2) a section detailing the empirical research methodology, including the purpose, assumptions, research sample, and the results of statistical analyses; and (3) a section presenting the study findings in alignment with the existing literature.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. DETERMINANTS OF EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES TOWARDS DIVERSITY

Workplace diversity spans many dimensions, including variations in culture and ethnicity, gender, age, skills, sexual orientation, and professional experience and education (Kostrzewa et al., 2023). Employees may come from diverse cultures, nationalities, or ethnic groups. An integral aspect of diversity is gender equality, incorporating the representation of women and men across all organisational levels. Additionally, diversity extends to equality for LGBTQ+ individuals, encompassing acceptance and support for employees with different sexual orientations. Age diversity pertains to generational differences within a team, involving employees from various age groups like Generations X, Y, Z, or BB (baby boomers). Diversity emerges from diverse employee skills, education, experience, and professional backgrounds (Przytuła, 2019).

Diversity in the workplace contributes to innovation through creativity, increased flexibility, and problem-solving capabilities (Cook, 2016; Gross-Golacka, 2018; Khairi, 2024). For this reason, employee perceptions of diversity and employee evaluations of diversity management practices should be the subject of systematic research (Mor Barak, 2022).

Diversity-promoting organisations aim to establish an open and inclusive work environment, enhancing employee satisfaction and improving organisational performance (Downey et al., 2015).

Workplace inclusivity aims to cultivate an environment where all employees feel accepted, respected, and valued, irrespective of their differences (Bourke & Titus, 2022). This involves implementing measures to eliminate barriers that may lead to exclusion or injustice. Inclusivity fosters full employee engagement, cooperation, and self-development (Ely & Thomas, 2020). It guarantees that all employees are included, listened to, and can actively contribute to the organisation's activities.

In an organisational context, inclusivity means the removal of physical and psychological barriers that may prevent or hinder the full participation of diverse employee groups (Nishii & Leroy, 2022). Pursuing inclusivity necessitates intentionally designing structures, policies, and practices to cater to diverse needs. The value of inclusivity is to respect

and appreciate differences in a fair and open workplace (Randel et al., 2018).

Inclusivity has the potential to enhance organisational performance. It drives greater innovation and creativity (Veli Korkmaz et al., 2022). It responds to the dynamics of environmental changes, such as the increase in the number of neuroatypical individuals or shifts in demographic structures (the increase in the proportion of seniors). A lack of inclusivity may result in a staffing gap and lead to unnecessary friction and conflicts.

Inclusivity is likely a feature of an organisation committed to values and practices promoting an open and participatory environment for a diverse workforce (Pai, 2021). For an organisation to be inclusive, it is essential for its employees to exhibit an inclusive attitude at an individual level. Organisations and employees create a work environment that is not only diverse but also open, friendly, and supportive for everyone. Individual inclusivity pertains to the readiness and ability of employees to accept, respect, and acknowledge diversity among their colleagues. Those who adopt an inclusive mindset in the workplace attempt to create an atmosphere where everyone feels accepted and valued and has the opportunity to fully contribute, irrespective of their differences (van Knippenberg & van Ginkel, 2021). They demonstrate respect and acceptance towards diversity. They also take measures to support colleagues, eliminate barriers, and engage in practices that foster inclusive participation among all employees (Nishii & Leroy, 2022). Inclusive employees are willing to engage in open dialogue, listen to the views of others and make efforts to understand and incorporate the perspectives of differing individuals. Inclusive individuals are poised for open dialogue, consider diverse opinions, and take proactive steps to understand and incorporate various perspectives.

1.2. INTERPLAY OF INCLUSIVITY AND PROACTIVITY

The inclusivity of employees depends on a range of factors, encompassing organisational aspects and individual values, attitudes, and experiences. At the organisational level, inclusivity is shaped by policies and procedures supporting diversity in the workplace, as well as the attitudes of leaders who demonstrate openness, respect, and acceptance of diversity as well as the attitudes of leaders who demonstrate openness, respect, and acceptance of diversity (Randel et al., 2018).

At the individual level, inclusivity is shaped by employees' values and attitudes. Employees who embody openness, respect, and cooperativeness are more likely to create an inclusive environment (Nishii, 2013). Inclusive attitudes are nurtured through life experiences (Maddux & Galinsky, 2009), including exposure to diverse cultures, social groups, or individuals with different sexual orientations. Diverse experiences foster inclusive attitudes and support employee proactivity, contributing to a workplace culture that encourages innovation (Hunt et al., 2015).

Proactive employees take the initiative to drive impactful changes within the organisation. Their proactive efforts, whether initiating or participating in projects, are crucial in cultivating relationships that yield professional and social benefits (Bindl & Parker, 2010). By actively engaging in tasks that involve interaction with others, proactive employees develop and enhance their interpersonal skills. Consequently, this fosters more positive relationships with colleagues, superiors, and clients alike.

The following hypothesis is formulated by drawing insights from an overview of the literature on employee inclusivity and proactivity:

H1: Inclusivity of employees has a positive impact on their proactivity.

1.3. ROLE OF JOB SATISFACTION AND ITS IMPACT ON PROACTIVITY IN THE CONTEXT OF INCLUSIVITY

Proactive employees engage in activities such as volunteering for challenging tasks or undertaking initiatives, which leads to the development of their competences. These efforts positively influence engagement and motivation, contributing to overall job satisfaction and a profound sense of professional fulfilment (Bakker & Albrecht, 2018).

Satisfied employees may be more inclined to solve problems and take proactive measures, including those related to promoting inclusivity. They are also more prone to sharing ideas, suggestions, and opinions (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). This state of play, in turn, fosters the exchange of diverse perspectives stemming from an inclusive mindset.

Job satisfaction facilitates a positive workplace atmosphere, a notion further supported by team diversity within teams (Novianti et al., 2022). Satisfied employees exhibit a greater willingness to collaborate. Also, they are more open to building positive relationships with their colleagues. Strong employee

relationships can contribute to job satisfaction by influencing mutual respect and understanding (Juchnowicz, 2014).

The following hypotheses are formulated drawing on the literature review on the relationship between proactivity, job satisfaction and employee inclusivity:

H2: Employee inclusivity has a positive impact on job satisfaction.

H2a: Employee inclusivity fosters job satisfaction and positively impacts employee proactivity.

1.4. UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS OF MANUFACTURING COMPANIES AND THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SATISFACTION ON EMPLOYEE PROACTIVITY IN THE CONTEXT OF INCLUSIVITY

Manufacturing companies differ from other types of companies by the specifics of their operations. Employee attitudes are shaped by the unique aspects of manufacturing operations (Bulut et al., 2019), encompassing tasks such as working on the production line, job security or production flexibility.

Work on the production line is more focused on specific activities. It relies on task division and specialisation. Each employee performs specific, often repetitive activities. Work is organised in cycles, following a defined production pace. The repetitive nature of tasks is a distinctive feature of the production line work, contributing to its perception as monotonous. Additionally, some tasks may be physically demanding, resulting in employee fatigue.

Work on the production line often follows strict quality standards (Ismail, 1998). Employees undergo frequent observation and are pressured to meet deadlines. Each stage of the production process must be executed precisely and within a specified time-frame. Even minor deviations from the norm can significantly affect the quality and efficiency of production.

Modern production lines often rely on automated systems, where numerous activities are performed by machines and equipment, with workers responsible for overseeing and maintaining these processes (Aldossari & Zin, 2019). Simultaneously, teamwork and coordination are often essential in production line roles. Employee satisfaction may depend on effective collaboration skills, and workers' proactivity is manifested in initiatives to improve communication and team integration.

Workplace safety stands as a major facet in the operations of manufacturing companies (Mutegei et al., 2023; Sarwar et al., 2019). The satisfaction of employees can stem from the organisation's commitment to ensuring a secure working environment, and the proactive engagement of workers may be demonstrated through initiatives aimed at enhancing safety procedures.

The following hypotheses were formulated based on the literature review on the nuances of manufacturing companies:

H3: Employee inclusivity has a stronger effect on job satisfaction in manufacturing enterprises than in other types of businesses.

H3a: By boosting job satisfaction, employee inclusivity influences proactivity with greater force in manufacturing enterprises than in other types of businesses.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

2.1. RESEARCH SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

In December 2023, a quantitative survey was conducted to examine the model of the relationship between inclusivity, proactivity, and job satisfaction. The survey targeted a sample of economically active Poles (N=1000). It employed the CAWI method, utilising a nationwide accredited survey panel. The representativeness of the sample was ensured through random sampling. Notably, nearly 20 % of the respondents were production workers (198 people), while the remaining participants (802 people) were employed in non-manufacturing organisations.

The acquired sample was balanced in terms of age and organisation size. Production workers predominantly had secondary education (52 %), while in the overall sample and other non-manufacturing enterprises, those with higher education prevailed (56 % and 61 %, respectively). Over 80 % of respondents were employed on full-time employment contracts, and more than 70 % held non-managerial positions. The majority were employed in the private sector (92 % of production workers). Within the production sector, the sample was gender balanced (53 % women and 47 % men). In the entire sample and across other industry sectors, the majority comprised women (68 % and 71 %, respectively). Table 1 presents the comprehensive breakdown of the research sample and its segmentation into production and other industry sectors.

Tab. 1. Research sample structure

CRITERION	SPECIFICATION	ENTIRE SAMPLE	MANUFACTURING	OTHER FORMS OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY
Gender	Female	68 %	53 %	71 %
	Male	32 %	47 %	29 %
Generation	Z	30 %	25 %	31 %
	Y	30 %	30 %	30 %
	X	30 %	35 %	29 %
	BB	10 %	10 %	10 %
Education	Primary	1 %	2 %	1 %
	Vocational	6 %	10 %	5 %
	Secondary	37 %	52 %	33 %
	Higher	56 %	37 %	61 %
Job level	Non-managerial	74 %	74 %	73 %
	Managerial	20 %	23 %	20 %
	Owner	6 %	3 %	7 %
Working Hours	Full time	87 %	95 %	85 %
	Part-time	13 %	5 %	15 %
Employment Type	Employment contract	83 %	93 %	80 %
	Civil law contract	11 %	5 %	12 %
	Proprietorship	7 %	2 %	8 %
Company Size	micro (up to 9 employees)	15 %	5 %	18 %
	small (from 10 to 49 employees)	23 %	22 %	24 %
	medium (from 50 to 249 employees)	25 %	28 %	25 %
	large (from 250 to 500 employees)	14 %	19 %	13 %
	very large (above 500 employees)	23 %	27 %	22 %
Sector	Public	22 %	8 %	26 %
	Private	75 %	92 %	70 %
	foundations, associations, and others	3 %	-	4 %

2.2. VARIABLES

The survey used a questionnaire to measure employee inclusivity (3 items), proactivity (3 items), and job satisfaction (3 items). Respondents rated the items on the 5-point Likert scale, where 1 means “strongly disagree” and 5 means “strongly agree”.

The analyses were conducted using SPSS AMOS software (version 29).

The dependent variable in the model was “Proactivity”. The explanatory variables were “Inclusivity” and “Job satisfaction”.

“Proactivity” was measured using three statements that explored declarations of creating ideas for improvements, affecting how work is performed, and undertaking new tasks to improve work.

“Inclusivity” was measured using three survey items that described having no difficulty in cooperat-

ing with different people, supporting others in achieving their professional goals, and adapting communication to the diversity of co-workers.

“Job satisfaction” was assessed using three items: job enjoyment, pride and a sense of purpose in one’s work.

All the variables were constructed reflectively.

2.3. ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

The research aimed to assess the quality of the conceptual model assuming the relationship between inclusivity, proactivity, and job satisfaction while considering the impact of specific manufacturing work. In the model, latent variables were employed, i.e., variables that cannot be observed directly but can be detected through other observable variables. The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to

verify the structure of the variables, and the path analysis was applied to assess the relationships between the identified latent variables. A three-step approach was employed. First, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to assess the measurement model fit indices (χ^2 test, RMSEA, CFI, TLI, SRMR) and path coefficients. Then, the measurement scales used in the research were assessed for their reliability as well as convergent and discriminant validity. Finally, the hypotheses were verified using three structural models.

3. RESEARCH RESULTS

3.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The descriptive statistics and the correlations between the variables are presented in Table 2. The respondents rated “Inclusivity” at the highest level (mean = 3.96) and “Proactivity” at the lowest level (mean = 3.57). The obtained mean values for manufacturing enterprises were slightly lower than those for non-manufacturing organisations. The correlations between the variables were statistically significant, ranging from 0.472 (for “Job satisfaction” and “Inclusivity”) to 0.528 (for “Job satisfaction” and “Proactivity”) for the entire sample. In the case of manufacturing enterprises, the correlation of “Proactivity” with “Inclusivity” and “Job satisfaction” was

slightly higher than that for organisations with other activities, while the correlation of “Inclusivity” with “Job satisfaction” was slightly lower.

3.2. MEASUREMENT MODEL

The CFA was used to validate the measurement model. The values of the fit indices GFI = 0.981 and AGFI = 0.964, NFI = 0.976 and CFI = 0.982 were above the threshold value of 0.9. SRMR (0.03) and RMSEA (0.051) were at the right level and did not exceed the value of 0.08, which is considered the threshold for acceptable models, and the confidence interval for RMSEA did not contain a value of 0.1 that would disqualify the model (Table 3).

The standardised estimates for path coefficients between the statements and each construct were significant and exceeded the 0.5 coefficient value (Table 4).

The construct validity was assessed using composite reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity. The reliability was tested with Cronbach's α coefficient and CR index. All Cronbach's α values approached or exceeded 0.70, with CR values ranging from 0.678 to 0.879, i.e. near and above the threshold value of 0.7, thus confirming internal consistency. The convergent validity was assessed using the AVE coefficient, which ranged from 0.414 to 0.707, exceeding for two of the three constructs the standard threshold of 0.5 for conver-

Tab. 2. Descriptive statistics and correlations

ENTIRE SAMPLE					
VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	1	2	3
1. Proactivity	3.569	0.848	1		
2. Inclusivity	3.959	0.844	0.507**	1	
3. Job satisfaction	3.646	1.008	0.528**	0.472**	1
MANUFACTURING					
VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	1	2	3
1. Proactivity	3.539	0.861	1		
2. Inclusivity	3.916	0.868	0.539**	1	
3. Job satisfaction	3.517	1.007	0.537**	0.453**	1
OTHER TYPES OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY					
VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	1	2	3
1. Proactivity	3.577	0.845	1		
2. Inclusivity	3.970	0.838	0.499**	1	
3. Job satisfaction	3.678	1.007	0.525**	0.476**	1

** . Significant correlation at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)

Tab. 3. Fitting the measurement model to the data

STATISTICS	VALUE	THRESHOLD VALUE
Chi-square and df	86.530, df=24	-
GFI	0.981	> 0.9
AGFI	0.964	> 0.9
NFI	0.976	> 0.9
CFI	0.982	> 0.9
SRMR	0.030	< 0.08
RMSEA	0.051	< 0.08

Tab. 4. Model variables

VARIABLE	ITEM	PATH COEFFICIENT
Proactivity	I am creative and have lots of ideas for improving my work.	0.682
	I have a say in how I do my work.	0.552
	I often pick up new tasks at work, not as part of duty, but just to make something better or more efficient.	0.688
Inclusivity	I don't find it difficult to work with people who differ from me in terms of background, age, gender or some other way.	0.667
	I actively support all my colleagues in reaching their professional goals, no matter their age, gender, background.	0.770
	I adapt the way I communicate depending on the diversity of colleagues in my team in terms of their age, gender, or background.	0.715
Job Satisfaction	I enjoy my job; I tend to go to work with pleasure.	0.806
	I believe that my work serves a purpose.	0.858
	I take pride in my work.	0.858

Tab. 5. Psychometric property assessment of scales

VARIABLE	CR	AVE	α	CORRELATIONS / SQUARE ROOT OF AVE *		
				1	2	3
1. Proactivity	0.678	0.414	0.672	0.644		
2. Inclusivity	0.761	0.516	0.761	0.720	0.719	
3. Job satisfaction	0.879	0.707	0.878	0.662	0.576	0.841

CR — Composite Reliability, AVE — Average Variance Extracted, α — Cronbach's α

* The AVE square root appears on the diagonal.

gent validity. The discriminant validity was verified using the Fornell-Larcker criterion (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). According to this criterion, the AVE square root should be greater than the correlation between the constructs. The condition was met, excluding two correlations (Table 5).

3.3. ESTIMATION OF STRUCTURAL MODELS

The path coefficients were estimated to examine the relationships between “Inclusivity”, “Proactivity”, and “Job satisfaction” across the sample (Table 6).

The variables in the model under study explained more than 60.9 % ($R^2=0.609$) of the variance in “Proactivity” and 33.2 % ($R^2 = 0.332$) of the variance in “Job satisfaction”.

The findings supported the hypotheses of a positive direct effect of “Inclusivity” on “Proactivity” (H1) ($\beta = 0.507$, $p < 0.001$) and on “Job satisfaction” (H2) ($\beta = 0.576$, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, they also supported the hypothesis that “Job Satisfaction” enhanced the impact of “Inclusivity” on “Proactivity” (H2b) (indirect effect $\beta = 0.213$, $p < 0.001$).

Tab. 6. Path coefficients for the studied variable relationships

STRUCTURAL PATHS	PATH COEFFICIENTS
Inclusivity -> Proactivity (direct effect)	0.507*
Inclusivity -> Job satisfaction (direct effect)	0.576*
Inclusivity -> Job satisfaction -> Proactivity (indirect effect/total effect)	0.213*/ 0.720*

*p<0,001;

Tab. 7. Path coefficients and fitting of structural models for manufacturing and other activities

STRUCTURAL PATH	MANUFACTURING	OTHER ACTIVITIES
Inclusivity -> Proactivity (direct effect)	0.493*	0.524*
Inclusivity -> Job satisfaction (direct effect)	0.549*	0.586*
Inclusivity -> Job satisfaction -> Proactivity (indirect effect/total effect)	0.215*/ 0.708*	0.204*/ 0.728*
Chi-square and df	34.598. df=24	78.391. df=24
GFI	0.964	0.978
AGFI	0.933	0.959
NFI	0.957	0.972
CFI	0.986	0.981
SRMR	0.034	0.034
RMSEA	0.047	0.053

*p<0.001

3.4. MANUFACTURING VERSUS NON-MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISES

Two separate SEM models were estimated to examine the impact of specific manufacturing activities on the relationships between “Inclusivity”, “Proactivity”, and “Job satisfaction” (Table 7).

The values in Table 7 indicate a good fit of both models to the data.

The variables in the model under study explained more than 60 % ($R^2=0.609$) for manufacturing and 61 % ($R^2=0.610$) for other activities of the variance in “Proactivity” and more than 30 % ($R^2=0.301$) for manufacturing and 34 % ($R^2=0.344$) for other activities of the variance in “Job satisfaction”.

The findings did not support the two hypotheses about the greater impact of “Inclusivity” on the “Proactivity” of employees in manufacturing enterprises as compared to the other activities (H3 and H3a). In manufacturing, “Inclusivity” had a slightly less powerful effect on “Proactivity” directly (for manufacturing $\beta=0.493$, $p<0.001$, for others $\beta=0.524$, $p<0.001$) and indirectly through “Job Satisfaction” (total effect for manufacturing $\beta=0.708$, $p<0.001$, for others $\beta=0.729$, $p<0.001$). Meanwhile, the indirect effect of

the impact of “Job Satisfaction” on the relationship between “Inclusivity” and “Proactivity” was slightly higher in manufacturing enterprises (for manufacturing $\beta=0.215$, $p<0.001$, for others $\beta=0.204$, $p<0.001$).

4. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The study findings extend the knowledge of the interplay between inclusivity, proactivity and job satisfaction.

The results support several studies suggesting a positive direct relationship between inclusivity and positive outcomes in terms of employee job satisfaction and proactivity (Cox, 1993; Shore et al., 2011). Workplace inclusivity fosters a sense of belonging and acceptance, as well as the opportunity to voice thoughts and ideas, which in turn boosts the employees’ efforts to take initiative when dealing with problems (Cox, 1993).

This research adds further evidence that job satisfaction is a significant mediator between employee inclusivity and proactivity. As such, it aligns with previously published research indicating that job sat-

isfaction may be one of the mechanisms through which an inclusive work environment contributes to improved work performance (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006; Shore et al., 2018).

The lack of support for the hypothesis that the effect of inclusivity on proactivity is more powerful in manufacturing firms compared to other types of enterprises aligns with some previous research suggesting that the effect of inclusivity on work performance is universal and independent from the industry sector (Shore et al., 2011).

However, this research did reveal some differences in the magnitude of the impact of inclusivity on proactivity depending on the type of organisation. This suggests that the organisational context is likely to influence the relationship between employee inclusivity and proactivity, which may have implications for personnel management practice across a range of sectors (Shore et al., 2011).

The study's comparative analysis between manufacturing and non-manufacturing organisations revealed sector-specific nuances. In manufacturing enterprises, inclusivity had a slightly less powerful direct effect on proactivity compared to non-manufacturing organisations. This suggests that while inclusivity promotes proactive behaviours in both sectors, the structured and often repetitive nature of manufacturing work might moderate this relationship. The direct effect of inclusivity on job satisfaction in manufacturing enterprises was also slightly lower than in non-manufacturing sectors. The stringent operational demands and focus on safety and precision in manufacturing might influence how inclusivity translates into job satisfaction. Additionally, the mediation effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between inclusivity and proactivity was more significant in manufacturing enterprises compared to non-manufacturing organisations. This highlights the critical role of job satisfaction in translating inclusive practices into proactive behaviours in manufacturing settings, where job roles and expectations are more rigidly defined.

The findings have implications for both the theory and practice of diversity management. To leverage the benefits of inclusivity, manufacturing firms should focus on enhancing job satisfaction as a mediator. This could involve implementing inclusive practices that address the unique operational challenges of the sector, such as improving workplace safety and ergonomics and fostering a supportive work environment that values each employee's contributions. In non-manufacturing settings, inclusive practices can have a more direct impact on proactiv-

ity. Strategies could include promoting flexible work arrangements, encouraging diverse team collaborations, and providing opportunities for creative and proactive problem-solving.

The positive relationship between inclusivity, job satisfaction, and proactivity is consistent across both sectors, emphasising the universal value of inclusive practices. Organisations, regardless of their sector, should prioritise inclusivity to foster a more proactive and satisfied workforce.

CONCLUSIONS

The conducted research has broadened the view on the relationship between inclusivity, proactivity, and job satisfaction. Its findings confirmed a positive direct effect of inclusivity on proactivity and job satisfaction and revealed the role of job satisfaction as a mediator between inclusivity and proactivity. This proves the importance of employee attitudes towards diversity in the workplace (Mor Barak, 2022). The research did not confirm the greater magnitude of the impact of inclusivity in manufacturing enterprises compared to those with other activities. Nevertheless, some differences have been observed in this context, which supports the view that "diversity has many faces", and therefore, no universal and single approach exists to analysing this issue (Przytuła, 2019). The research indicates that inclusivity affects employee proactivity in different organisational contexts, which holds major implications for both the theory and practice of human resource management. These findings may be of value to those organisations that seek to create more inclusive workplaces and to those scholars who are interested in the mechanisms through which inclusivity influences the actions of employees.

Although the research has made an important contribution to the understanding of the relationships between inclusivity, proactivity, and job satisfaction, some constraints need to be recognised when it comes to interpreting the results.

The research was based on the data collected at a single time point, which prevents conclusions about the directionality of the relationship between the studied variables. Any future research could focus on analysing data collected at different time points to understand the long-term effects of inclusivity on proactivity and job satisfaction.

In fact, it is possible that some other variables not included in the model may also act as mediating vari-

ables in the relationships between inclusivity, proactivity, and job satisfaction. The focus of future research could be on identifying the mechanisms through which inclusivity affects proactivity as well as on the moderating and mediating factors that influence these relationships.

Despite care in the design of measurements, there is a risk of errors associated with the type of scales used, which may affect the accuracy of the results. Future research should consider the design of increasingly accurate scales.

It is possible that other contextual factors, beyond the analysed types of activities, might influence the examined variable relationships. Future research could integrate various organisational contexts to understand how inclusivity affects proactivity and job satisfaction across different sectors and types of organisations.

In the future, some follow-up research is advisable to gain a better understanding of the causality of the relationship between inclusivity, proactivity and job satisfaction, as well as research that considers such dimensions of inclusivity as gender equality, cultural diversity or integration of disabled people to clarify how they affect proactivity and job satisfaction.

LITERATURE

- Aldossari, M., & Zin, A. M. (2019). The use of automation and robotic innovations in the transformational companies: Systematic literature review. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 97(13), 3661-3690.
- Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 4-11. doi: 10.1108/CDI-11-2017-0207
- Bindl, U. K., & Parker, S. K. (2010). Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change-oriented action in organizations. In *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol 2: Selecting and developing members for the organization* (pp. 567-598). doi: 10.1037/12170-019
- Bourke, J., & Titus, A. (2022). The Key to Inclusive Leadership. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2020/03/the-key-to-inclusive-leadership>
- Bulut, C., Gencturk, S., Aydin, E., Nazli, M., & Kahraman, S. (2019). The relationship between employee attitudes and innovation types: A managerial perspective. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 19(2), 89-100. doi: 10.17512/pjms.2019.19.2.07
- Chen, J., Viardot, E., & Brem, A. (2019). Innovation and Innovation Management. In J. Chen, A. Brem, E. Viardot & P. K. Wong (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Innovation Management* (pp. 15-27). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Cook, P. (2016). *Leading Innovation, Creativity and Enterprise*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Information.
- Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Oakland, USA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Downey, S. N., van der Werff, L., Thomas, K. M., & Plaut, V. C. (2015). The Role of Diversity Practices and Inclusion in Promoting Trust and Employee Engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 45(1), 35-44. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12273
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2020). Getting Serious About Diversity: Enough Already with the Business Case. *Harvard Business Review*, 98(6), 119-128. doi: 10.4324/9781003247272-9
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50. doi: 10.2307/3151312
- Gross-Golacka, E. (2018). *Zarządzanie różnorodnością. W kierunku zróżnicowanych zasobów ludzkich w organizacji [Managing diversity. Towards diverse human resources in organizations]*. Warszawa, Poland: Difin.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268
- Hunt, V., Prince, D., & Layton, S. (2015). *Diversity Matters*. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/business-functions/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/why-diversity-matters/diversity-matters.pdf>
- Ismail, Y. (1998). *Implementation of Quality Management in the Manufacturing Industry*. Retrieved from https://doras.dcu.ie/19546/1/MD_Yusof_Ismail_20130520132417.pdf
- Juchnowicz, M. (2014). *Satysfakcja zawodowa pracowników - kreator kapitału ludzkiego [Employee job satisfaction - the creator of human capital]*. Warszawa, Poland: PWE.
- Khairi, A. (2024). The impact of age and cultural diversity on working teams in visegrad group countries: a hofstede's dimensions perspective. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 29(2), 293-310. doi: 10.17512/pjms.2024.29.2.15.
- Kostrzewa, A., Wasilewski, J., & Leszczyńska, Z. (2023). *W drodze do DEI [On the way to DEI]*. Retrieved from <https://ungc.org.pl/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/Raport-22W-drozdze-do-DEI22.pdf>
- Kulik, C. T. (2014). Working below and above the line: the research-practice gap in diversity management. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(2), 129-144. doi: 10.1111/1748-8583.12038
- Li, W., Wang, X., Haque, M. J., Shafique, M. N., & Nawaz, M. Z. (2020). Impact of Workforce Diversity Management on Employees' Outcomes: Testing the Mediating Role of a person's Job Match. *SAGE Open*, 10(1). doi: 10.1177/2158244020903402
- Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Cultural Borders and Mental Barriers: The Relationship Between Living Abroad and Creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5), 1047-1061. doi: 10.1037/a0014861
- Mor Barak, M. (2022). *Managing Diversity: Toward a Globally Inclusive Workplace*. Thousand Oaks, USA: SAGE Publications.

- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1321-1339. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321
- Mutegi, T. M., Joshua, P. M., & Kinyua, J. M. (2023). Workplace Safety and Employee Productivity of Manufacturing Firms in Kenya. *Cogent Business and Management*, 10(2). doi: 10.1080/23311975.2023.2215569
- Nishii, L. H., & Leroy, H. (2022). A Multi-Level Framework of Inclusive Leadership in Organizations. *Group and Organization Management*, 47(4), 683-722. doi: 10.1177/10596011221111505
- Nishii, L. H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(6), 1754-1774. doi: 10.5465/amj.2009.0823
- Novianti, E. K., Sopiha, & Bernardes, O. (2022). Job satisfaction as the mediating variable in the correlation between quality of work life and work engagement. *Urbanizing the Regional Sector to Strengthen Economy and Business to Recover from Recession*, 130-139. doi: 10.1201/9781003303336-15
- Pai, R. (2021). A Review on Diversity and Inclusion in the Workforce for Organizational Competitiveness. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 9(7), 2320-2882.
- Przytuła, S. (2019). *Zarządzanie różnorodnością pracowników [Managing workforce diversity]*. Warszawa, Poland: PWN.
- Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., & Kedharnath, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 190-203. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.002
- Roberson, Q. M. (2019). Diversity in the Workplace: A Review, Synthesis, and Future Research Agenda. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 69-88. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015243
- Sarwar, A., Abdullah, M. I., Sarfraz, M., & Imran, M. K. (2019). Collaborative effect of workplace ostracism and self-efficacy versus job stress. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 15(4). doi: 10.7341/20191544
- Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 176-189. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.003
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1262-1289. doi: 10.1177/0149206310385943
- van Knippenberg, D., & van Ginkel, W. P. (2021). A Diversity Mindset Perspective on Inclusive Leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 47(4), 779-797. doi: 10.1177/1059601121997229
- Veli Korkmaz, A., van Engen, M. L., Knappert, L., & Schalk, R. (2022). About and beyond leading uniqueness and belongingness: A systematic review of inclusive leadership research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(4). doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100894