

# The effect of workforce diversity and its workgroup performance on Private Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia

(The case of St. Mary University, Admas University, Unity University and Rift Valley University)

**Biru Desta Kassaye**

Lecturer, Department of Business Management  
Dean, Academic Affairs  
Email: birudesta1980@gmail.com  
CPU Business and Information Technology College  
P.O. Box: 31166 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.9.03.2019.p87108  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.9.03.2019.p87108>

**Abstract:** *The main objective of this research is to investigate the impact of workforce diversity and its workgroup performance at private higher education institutions (St. Mary University, Admas University, Unity University and Rift Valley University) by taking workgroup cohesiveness, job involvement and turn over intention as performance indicators. The data were collected through respondent administered questionnaire. Quantitative approach was employed to produce statistical figure for analysis. Data were analyzed through cross tabulations and chi-square (p) values. This study focuses on the effects of factors like age, gender; ethnic and educational level diversity and diversity management on workgroup cohesiveness, job involvement and turnover intention of employees. To test models, the study used hierarchical regression analysis methods in order to control extraneous variables. The results confirmed that the Private Higher Education Institutions management is expected to work hard in promoting diversity not just for the fulfillment of legal requirement of affirmative action and equal employment opportunity but also to be beneficiary from diversified skills and perspectives. As well the universities should introduce the diversity management initiatives like many other diversified and multicultural institutions across the world. Finally, the sample was drawn, thus this study may be limited in its generalizability of the findings to public institutions and other private colleges/institution.*

## Introduction

Effective and efficient utilization of the diversified workforce plays a significant role in enhancing the performance of workgroups and any organization by achieving its various goals and objectives (Firdous, 2010). Accordingly, this study tries to address the key issue that workforce diversity and its management have an effect on the workgroup performance of the organization.

Despite organizations investing millions in workforce diversity to boost employee morale and improve performance, they rarely achieve their expected benefits. However, heterogeneous workforce in terms of race, ethnicity, culture, language, sexual orientation, religion and conceptions; business organizations face a very complex task to safeguard society or business organizations from potentially destructive conflicts that arise easily in a radically pluralistic or diverse organization (Dass & Parker, 1996).

Yet, other studies show that organizations with well managed diversity are an effective and steering ultimately producing corporate culture that has new perspectives, pioneering capabilities and fresh ideas necessary to survive (Jackson & Fasto, 1992; Kundu, 2001;

Schulz & Kelly, 1992 and Torres, 1992). Furthermore, as stated by Horwitz (2005) although in theory it may sound easy to place diverse individuals together into work groups and await superior performance, often, in reality, many irreconcilable divisions among heterogeneous individuals lead to dysfunctional group interaction and, thus, poor performance and decreased morale.

These apparently contradicting views show that the issue of workforce diversity and enhancing its positive contributions towards organizational performance need a sound and information based management. Hence, organizations of whatever form should regularly assess the extent and healthiness of its workforce diversity so as to promote its positive contributions and minimize its negative consequences. The study was conducted on the Private Higher Education Institutions (St. Mary University, Admas University, Unity University and Rift Valley University). The Ethiopian Higher Education Proclamation 650/2009 presents the objectives of the Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions in terms of relevance and quality. In connection with, PHI takes advantage of the opportunity and envisions being one of the leading private Universities in Ethiopia with the core values of Excellence, service, integrity, professionalism and innovation parallel with the nation's developmental goals. Therefore, Private Higher Education Institutions has become a full privileged University level aimed to widen its horizon and become a shining example in establishing centre of Excellences pertaining to quality education, research and community services through its innovative academic and research programs.

In Ethiopia, Universities are places where various students and teachers with different socio-cultural and economic backgrounds get together. Due to this intention, many Ethiopians commonly referred universities as "Little Ethiopia" to describe the diversified nature of university society. To this end Private Higher Education Institutions has a heterogeneous workforce comprising of different ethnic, nationalities, culture, religious beliefs, gender composition, age structure, educational qualification, attitudes and others. A study conducted on this Universities revealed that employees have high turnover intention.

Similarly Parekh (2000) assured nowadays on the campuses it is difficult to find multicultural tolerance, mutual respect, inter-group harmony and celebrating differences compared to yesterday years. In line with this argument, Kibework (2011) stated the case of Addis Ababa University postgraduate students during his stay from 2005-2007; there were ethno-linguistic disagreements and ethnocentric attitudes which led to conflict. This hostile attitude affects peer relation which ultimately affects group performance.

Nevertheless, no previous empirical researches have assessed the soundness of workforce diversity management practices of these institutions and the effect of workforce diversity on organizational performance so far in Ethiopia. In addition, according to Margarita and Juan (2005) knowledge of implications of diversity effects on group process and performance is very limited and dispersed. But unawareness and ignorance of realities could not compromise the consequences. Initiated to fill this gap, the present study has tried to address the following basic research questions empirically.

### **Objective of the study**

The general objective of this study was to investigate the effect of workforce diversity and its workgroup performance on Private Higher Education Institutions (The case of St. Mary University, Admas University, Unity University and Rift Valley University).

### **MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGIES**

This study can be categorized a quantitative research design was employed to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena with the selected dependent and independent variables. In this research paper, both primary and secondary sources of data were used. The primary data were collected through respondent administered questionnaire. Reputable journals, books and other

related references were used as secondary source of data. The Likert scale was used whereby the respondents were asked to rate a particular issue on a scale that ranged from strongly disagrees to strongly agree. According to the quality assurance office of Universities 2016/17 academic year and registrar office, the total population academic departments are 241. Therefore, the population of the study comprises all academic and administrative workgroups on Private Higher Education Institutions (The case of St. Mary University, Admas University, Unity University and Rift Valley University).

Inclusion criteria of respondents: For academic staff- teachers who actually engaged in the teaching process. For administrative staff- staffs who actually engaged in the administrative function. Exclusion criteria of respondents: For academic staff-teachers who engaged in dual responsibility. In this case department heads, Campus deans and teachers who are charged by other responsibilities in administrative function are excluded from the study. The reason behind this exclusion is that there are some questions of the study that are concerned directly those people which may create response bias if they included. For administrative staff- staffs who are in management levels. In this case core business process directors are excluded. Similarly the reason behind this exclusion is that some questions of the study are concerned directly those people which may create response bias if they included.

**SAMPLE SIZE DETERMINATION AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE**

In this research a sample selection from each Private Higher Education Institutions (St. Mary University, Admas University, Unity University and Rift Valley University) was obtained, which is total of 241 in number.

Yamene’s formula (1967) was employed to determine the sample size.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}$$

$$n = \frac{608}{1 + 608(0.05^2)}$$

$$n = 241$$

Where n = sample size

N = population size, and e = level of precision or significance level.

There were 608 academic and administrative workgroups in the selected Private Higher Education Institutions (St. Mary University, Admas University, Unity University and Rift Valley University) in total and method of determining the sample size based on scientific approach was used followings some proportionate sample from each stratum. Therefore, a total of 241 academic and administrative workgroups were participated in the study. Stratified random sampling technique were employed to select the target respondents.

The proportionate calculation of the sample:  $\frac{241}{608} \times 100\% = 39.6\%$

**Table 3.1. Number of Samples from each Private Higher Education Institutions**

Stratum	Total number	No. of sample
Unity University	156	156 x 39.6% = <b>62</b>
Admas University	112	112 x 39.6% = <b>44</b>
Rift Valley University	203	203 x 39.6% = <b>80</b>
St. Mary University	137	137 x 39.6% = <b>55</b>

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The data were collected and entered to statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 20. The level of significance is determined as 0.05. Later the data were cleaned and coded for further analysis. After validity and reliability analyses, the factors were further tested using standard deviations and chi-square ( $p$ ) values have been applied to analyze the data. This was followed with the presentation to generate frequency tables, cross tabulations and descriptive statistical values such as mean, standard deviations, T-test and chi-square ( $p$ ) values to test for association between two categorical variables. The dependent variable only four factors of workforce diversity, age, sex, and ethnicity and education status to investigate the performance of the Universities. The boundary of the study was limited to show the direct effects of the actual or current workforce diversity of the university on its work groups' performance, not to investigate the reasons of age, sex, educational differences and ethnic based problems.

### **The Extent of workforce diversity of workgroups in Private Higher Education Institutions**

Factors of workforce diversity included in this study are age, sex, ethnicity and educational status. In the group diversity research there are two types of group diversity measures that have been widely utilized in past studies to determine the extent of workforce diversity of different groups (Jehnet al., 1999; Pelled et al., 1999 as cited in Jehn & Bezrukova, 2004) one is for categorical factors (ethnic, gender, level of education, functional background) and another is for continuous factors (age and tenure).

Therefore in line with previous studies (e.g., Michaela et.al, 2007; Stuart & Kathleen, 2002; Jehn, et.al, 1999 and Pelled, et.al 1999), the Blau (1977) index (also referred to as Herfindal-Hirschman coefficient) of heterogeneity have been used to measure the categorical factors like sex, educational status and ethnic diversity. According to Ancona and Caldwell (1992) when categorical data are used, a different form of diversity index should be applied.

On the other hand to determine the level of age diversity of workgroups (continuous variable) previous studies has been used either coefficient of variation or standard deviation or variance in different time period. But for this study the coefficient of variation (COV) is employed. The coefficient of variation is a measure of dispersion and defined as the standard deviation of a variable divided by its mean (Bantel and Jackson, 1989). Allison (1978) also asserted that (as cited by Boerner, Linkohr & Kiefer, 2011) being a scale invariant measure, this coefficient is preferable to the standard deviation or variance for interval scaled variables. Allison (1978) in his review of measures of inequality in social systems concludes that this index is the most appropriate choice for variables such as age and tenure (as cited by Margarit & Juan 2005).

### **Ethnic diversity**

To determine the range of ethnic diversity of the present study nine categories are used. The minimum value is 0 while the maximum value is  $9-1/9=0.88$ . If all employees of a particular workgroup belonging to just one ethnic category, the blue index will be 0 indicating perfect homogeneity (we can say there is no ethnic diversity) on the other side if all the nine categories contains exactly equal proportion of employees, the blue index will be 0.88 indicating perfect heterogeneity or maximum level of diversity achievable in a situation of nine categories. When come up to the actual finding, the average blue index of ethnic diversity for the Universities workgroups is 0.46 with a low of 0 and a high of 0.72.

### **Gender diversity**

The extent of gender diversity ranged from 0 to 0.5. This is because gender is involved only two categories when these two categories have equal proportion (50% male and 50% female) the maximum Blue index would be 0.5, indicating the highest level of heterogeneity achievable in a situation with two categories.

**Educational level diversity**

The blue index for Educational diversity of the universities workgroups is 0.45 with a low of .0 and a high 0.80. However, the range of educational level diversity is different for the two blocks of groups since they have different educational levels. For administrative workgroups the range is from 0 to 0.75 (k=4 educational categories) and for academic staffs from 0 to 0.85 (k= 7 education level categories).

**Age diversity**

On the other hand age diversity is measured with coefficient of variation as it is continuous data. The range extends from 0 to 1. The age diversity of the university workgroups is 0.18 with a low of 0.04 and a high of 0.47. Generally all diversity measures are different from zero (homogeneity), therefore there is workforce diversity in the university across different workgroups even though the level is different from factor to factor. The following hypothesis testing would determine the extent of diversity of workgroups across different factors.

**The workforce diversity index of the workgroups of PHEI is low**

In order to test the extent of each diversity factors index, one sample T test is employed.

**Table 4.1 One sample test**

	Test value	T	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference
Ethnic diversity	0.44	.687	37	.496	.02487
Sex diversity	0.25	-.748	37	.459	-.02256
Education level diversity	0.4	1.777	37	.084	.05282
Age diversity	0.5	-15.621	37	.000	-.32385

The test value represents the moderate value of the blue and coefficient of variation indexes. These are set as standards to determine whether the blue index value for each diversity factor is significantly different from the moderate value and also their magnitude. If the index of factors significantly different from test value (moderate value) and their mean difference is negative, it can be said the extent is low. In this aspect the sig. value for all diversity factors, except for age diversity, are not statistically significant. This means the extent of the three factors of diversity (ethnic, sex and education level diversity) did not depart away from the moderate value. It implies that the extent of age diversity of the Universities workgroups is low. Because the mean difference shows a negative sign indicate the index value of age diversity lowers by .32385 amounts from the moderate test value of 0.5.

**Diversity Management Practices of the Workgroups**

All diversity and other variable measurements were conducted at each workgroup level (department and business process level). As Harrison, Price and Bell (1998) p, 102 strongly suggested, increasing statistical power and confidence in the ability to draw conclusions, combining the data from the groups into one data set is the first task.

According to Zedatol (2008) mean of items score above 3.80 is regarded high, 3.40-3.79 regarded as moderate and below 3.39 regarded as low observations. 23 items were provided to measure the efforts of the university to manage its diversified workforce. Out of the total items, women are equally participate with males in any affaires of the department or business process shows the highest

mean value (mean=3.82, SD=1.084) followed by in the department or office staffs could communicate freely using their own ethnic languages (mean=3.63, SD=1.230) and my department or business process management is opening to suggestions from all staff (mean=3.61, SD=1.120). Women equal participation in the university could be considered as good step to create more inclusive and open environment since it is part of effective diversity management practice. This good practice of the university might be emanating from equal employment opportunity principle of the government. But promoting diversity should set out beyond ensuring equal employment opportunity. Because according to Fischer (2007) diversity in organization is an asset and/or its management will increase organizational efficiency and profitability.

On the other side the least mean score is recorded for the item there is an opportunity for staffs to spend their lunch and other breaks with diverse university employees (mean=2.34, SD=1.083). Followed by rules and regulations are flexible enough to accommodate the needs of diverse staffs (mean=2.36, SD=1.077) and every staff is treated equally (mean=2.41, SD=1.243). These results suggest that the university is at its low in providing social affairs facilities which harmonize and introduce the university community each other. In fact these might be happened due to not giving much attention to such kinds of socialization programs. But the diversity initiative programs are used to create a sense of belongingness which ultimately makes staffs to exert their full potential in achieving the institution's objectives. Again the mean score told us rules and regulations are not flexible enough to accommodate the needs of diverse staffs. But in order to get full potential of diverse employees, rules and regulations should consider diverse employees' needs and interests as much as possible. Overall the diversity management practices of the university mean score is 3.00 with SD=.403 which indicates the diversity management effort of the universities is not satisfactory.

### **Workgroup Performance**

#### **Workgroup Cohesiveness**

The workgroup cohesiveness scale indicates the mean score of 3.41 with SD=.486 which is almost moderate. The highest mean value is reported for the item I would look forward to being with members of my group for different tasks (mean=3.63, SD=1.187), followed by If it could be possible, I would not choose to leave my department/or business process and join another (mean=3.61, SD=1.252) and I feel that I am really a part of my department/or business process (mean=3.57, SD=1.217). On the other hand the lowest mean score is the members of my department/or business process get along well together (mean=3.16, SD=1.126) followed by the department/or business process to which I belong is a close one (mean=3.18, SD=1.178) and I enjoyed belonging to this department/or business process because I think I could be friends with many of its members. (Mean=3.19, SD=1.288).

#### **Job Involvement**

The average employees' job involvement at the workgroup level is to some extent good (mean=3.50, SD=.469). The largest mean score is for the item I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time (mean=3.84, SD=1.138) followed by I am very much involved personally in my job (mean=3.69, SD=1.160). The lowest score is (mean=2.88, SD=1.065) recorded for the item to me, my job is a large part of who I am.

#### **Turnover Intention**

On average Turnover intention of the overall workgroup employees is 3.46 with SD=.289. From the five turnover intention items As soon as I get the opportunity to work for another organization, I will take the chance scored the highest mean value (mean=3.86, SD=.973) followed by Since my commencement of employment I have thought occasionally about finding other work (mean=3.66,

SD=1.080) whereas the lowest score is 3.14, SD=1.166 for the item It is of no importance at all whether I spend my career in this organization. In this scale since the lowest score item is above 3.00, it indicates moderate to high turnover intention.

**Testing the effect of Workforce diversity and diversity management on the Workgroup cohesiveness, Job involvement and Turn over intention.**

As it is clearly explained in the methodology section, the effect of Workforce diversity and diversity management on workgroup performance has been tested by hierarchical regression analysis. Once the regression model assumptions were satisfied and all variables entered, the overall model was assessed in terms of its ability (model fitness) to predict the dependent variable. As table 4.6 indicated ANOVA tests were performed to check the significance of the models in explaining the variation for three indicator variables. For workgroup cohesiveness and turnover intention models, every block was statistically significant at 95% of confidence level. Therefore the model was acceptable for the analysis. But the F values of the two blocks for the model job involvement were not significant. This means diversity factors and diversity management could not significantly predict the job involvement. Because of this, the model of job involvement was not considered for further analysis. Only two variables of workgroup cohesiveness and turnover intention were analyzed as workgroup performance indicators.

To investigate the effects of workforce diversity factors and its management on work groups’ cohesiveness hierarchical multiple regressions was used. It would have two steps. The first step of hierarchical regression contains all control variables (group size and tenure) which is model1 and step two includes main predictors (sex, age, ethnic, educational level diversity and diversity management). Results of hierarchical multiple regressions for the variable workgroup cohesiveness are presented in the following table.

**ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.843	2	.922	4.640	.016 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	7.150	35	.199		
	Total	8.993	37			
2	Regression	5.604	7	.801	7.325	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3.388	30	.109		
	Total	8.993	37			

a. Predictors: (Constant), group size, tenure

b. Predictors: (Constant), group size, tenure, education status diversity, diversity management, age diversity, ethnic diversity, sex diversity

c. Dependent Variable: work group cohesiveness

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.453 <sup>a</sup>	.205	.161	.44565	.205	4.640	2	35	.016
2	.789 <sup>b</sup>	.623	.538	.33061	.418	6.882	5	30	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), group size, tenure

b. Predictors: (Constant), group size, tenure, education diversity, diversity management, age diversity, ethnic diversity, sex diversity

In the above table the column labeled R2 change would be answered this issue. In the Model 2 R2 change is indicating after controlling for average group size and tenure, four factors of diversity and diversity management predicted 41.8% variation of workgroup cohesiveness. This means four factors of diversity and diversity management significantly affected workgroup cohesiveness ( $P < 0.01$ ). This means our variables of interest (main predictors) explained an addition of 41.8% variation on the workgroup cohesiveness even the effects of control variables (group size and tenure) are statistically controlled. For this variation the F change is statistically significant (.000). Therefore the R2 for the four diversity factors and diversity management is 41.8% which indicate sex, age, education status and ethnic diversity and diversity management jointly caused 41.8% variation on the workgroup cohesiveness. On the other hand group size and tenure has explained 20.5% on the workgroup cohesiveness. Totally this model could explain 63.3% variation of the variable workgroup cohesiveness. Even if this model could explain large amount of variation, still there might be other variables which could not statistically controlled in the present study that might explain the remaining 36.7%. Once having seen the significance and overall variation of the model on the dependent variable, the next step is to evaluating individual predictor's contribution. This is indicated in the following table.

**Regression Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.868	.223		12.864	.000
	Tenure	1.737	.575	.493	3.019	.005
	Group size	-.019	.012	-.263	-1.613	.115
2	(Constant)	1.156	.717		1.612	.117
	Tenure	-.197	1.068	-.056	-.184	.855
	Group size	.000	.015	-.013	-.062	.951
	Sex diversity	-.065	.573	-.025	-.113	.911
	Age diversity	-1.094	.619	-.291	-1.766	.087
	Educational level diversity	.826	.320	.315	2.580	.015
	Ethnic diversity	-.555	.427	-.258	-1.301	.003
	Diversity management	.811	.233	.673	3.483	.001

a. Dependent Variable: workgroup cohesiveness

The above table represents the regression coefficients of each predictor for the variable of workgroup cohesiveness. Looking into the sig. column, only three variables make a statistically significant unique contribution. Namely, they are educational level diversity, ethnic diversity and diversity management. Educational level diversity has a statistically significant and positive influence ( $P < 0.05$ , after rounding) on workgroup cohesiveness. This finding is consistent with Cohen & Bailey (1997) and Jehn, et al., (1999) they asserted that the existence of diverse educational status in a group brings diverse inputs to the team and broader range of cognitive skills to group members these ultimately improves team members' cooperation and cohesiveness through information exchange. On the other side this finding is against the findings of Jackson et al., (1995); Jehn, et al., (1997) and Horwitz (2005). They stated that dissimilarity in educational level leads to increase the level of discomfort and conflict that might lead to decreased group cohesiveness and job involvement among team members.

Ethnic diversity has negative effect on workgroup cohesiveness which is statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ , after rounding). This is consistent with findings of Richard et al., (2003); Cox (1993) and White (1999). Their finding confirmed that ethnic diversity could produce negative dynamics such as ethnocentrism, stereotyping and culture clashes which results in communication difficulties; inter-

group conflict and tension and finally leads to lower cohesiveness among group members. Not only this result is consistent with previous studies but also it is in line with the basic social categorization and social identity theories. According to Milliken & Martins (1996); Williams & O'Reilly (1998) ( as cited in Sungjoo & Hai, 2010) these theories propose greater diversity is associated with less social integration, more conflict and less cohesion in groups, consequently decreasing group and organizational performance.

The other statistically significant effect on workgroup cohesiveness was the diversity management practices of the university. As indicated in the above table it has very strong contribution on the workgroup's cohesiveness ( $P < 0.01$ ). The magnitude of the effect is as expected because it is apparent that diversity management could improve the positive contributions of diversity while minimizing shortcomings. Hence, it is possible to say that even if there is ethnic and other diversity in the workgroups; diversity management could maintain workgroup cohesiveness by harmonizing wider differences.

Sex and age diversity were affect workgroup cohesiveness negatively but there were not statistically significant results ( $P > 0.05$ ). But the output of previous studies revealed significant results. For example, Harrison, Price and Bell (1998) found that age and sex diversity negatively affects group cohesion. Rhodes (1983); Tsui, Egan and O'Reilly (1992) also reported age dissimilarity created communication problems and team cohesion. Similarly O'Reilly, Caldwell and Barnett (1989) asserted Age heterogeneity was negatively associated with social integration. In addition, Tani, 1992; Richard et al., (2003) and Lewis (2000) found that being dissimilar to the group in terms of gender resulted in feelings of lower integration.

### **Recommendations for the Universities Management**

In Ethiopian case the Private Higher Education Institutions are successfully increasing diversity in the workplace via legal requirements, though they have to face the new challenge of managing the increasingly diversified workforce effectively to have it work well together and achieve institutional objectives. In this regard, the Private Higher Education Institutions management is expected to work hard in promoting diversity not just for the fulfillment of legal requirement of affirmative action and equal employment opportunity but also to be beneficiary from diversified skills and perspectives. Because many scholars argued that the formers are means to open the door and to get on board not to participate in the circles of influence in the organization. Consequently their exclusion from focal points keeps them from fully contributing and benefiting from their involvement in the workplace which ultimately leads them to observe places in other organization in which they can exert and exercise their full potential.

As well the Private Higher Education Institutions should introduce the diversity management initiatives like many other diversified and multicultural institutions across the world. But this program should start from the observation and awareness as to which specific diversity factors and degrees of diversity in which way influencing group and organizational level interaction and performance. If it is, the strategy of managing diversity will be supported by knowledge.

The implementation of diversity management strongly needs leadership commitment and the involvement of top management. According to Wrench 2007 and Schwarz (2004) (cited in Fischer, 2007) diversity management ought to initiate as a top-down process, and managing for diversity should constitute a strategic element of the long term plan of the organization. Overall, to promote diversity and add value, decisions should be made to invest resources in developing such leadership behaviors, policies, strategies and procedures.

### **Recommendation for Future Researcher**

Taken as a whole, the findings of the present study are consistent with past diversity researches given that mixed effects of the different diversity characteristics on different group performance outcomes. But to remedy the shortcomings of this inconsistency in results, further improvement has to be made. Incidentally the following suggestions are provided on the behalf of the researcher.

- The current study was cross-sectional and investigated only the effects of current level of diversity. Therefore, this study had limitation in providing additional explanation on what degree performance outcomes might be affected if the extent of diversity of each factors increases or decreases. Because the effects of diversity will also vary with degrees of diversity. In this regard future diversity studies will be better if they are longitudinal. In addition, conducting sensitivity analysis may help to confirm effects of each diversity factors.
- This study was conducted to assess the effect of workforce diversity and its workgroup performance on Private Higher Education Institutions (The case of St. Mary University, Admas University, Unity University and Rift Valley University). The sample was drawn, thus this study may be limited in its generalizability of the findings to public institutions and other private colleges/institution. So, future research should have to draw sample of respondents on more number of private and public Higher Education Institutions for the sake of generalizing the results of the study.

## References

- Allen, R., Dawson, G., Wheatley, K., & White, C.S. (2004). Diversity Practices: Learning Responses for Modern Organization, Development and Learning in Organizations: *An International Journal*, 18 (6): pp.13-15.
- Allison, P.D. (1978). Measures of inequality. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 43, pp. 865-880.
- Ancona, D. G. & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 634-665
- Arsenio, B. (2010). *The impact of workforce diversity on St. Paul University*.
- Bagshaw, M. (2004). Is diversity divisive? *Journal of industrial and commercial training*, 36 (4), pp.153-157.
- Barbara, M. (2010). Cultural Diversity in Organizational Theory and Practice. *Journal of Intercultural Management*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 5–15
- Barney, J. B. (2001). Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of Management*, 27: 643-650.
- Blackwell, A., Bowes, L., Harvey, L., Hesketh, A.J. & Knight, P.T. (2000). 'Transforming work experience in higher education', *British Educational Research Journal*, 27(3), 269-85. ISSN 0141-1926
- Buglear, J. (2005). *Quantitative methods for business. The A-Z of QM*. London. Butterworth Heinemann
- Chun, L. & Chieh, H. (2008). *Gender Diversity and Organizational Performance – Contingency Theory*
- Cox, T. & Blake, S. (1991). Managing culture diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(3), 45-56.
- Cox, T. & Blake, S. (1991). Managing culture diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(3), 45-56.
- Cox, T. (1991). *The multicultural organization. Academy of Management Executive*, 5 (2),

- Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc
- Cronin, M. A. & Weingart, L. R. (2007). Representational gaps, information processing, and conflict in functionally diverse teams. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 761-773.
- Cummings, J. N. (2004). Work groups, structural diversity, and knowledge sharing in a global organization. *Management Science*, 50, 352-364.
- Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J, Judge, T. A. & Kohn, (2005). Pay satisfaction and organizational
- David, W. P. (2002) *Diversity, Representation & Performance: Evidence about Race & Ethnicity in Public Organizations*.
- Ely, R. & Thomas, D. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273
- Firdous, R. (2010). *Work Force Diversity- A Force Multiplier in the Organizational Efficiency of Telenor Pakistan*.
- Fredrick, W. O., Omboi, B. M. & Francis, K. M. (2010). *Effects of Workplace Diversity Management on Organizational Effectiveness: a case study on Kenyan commercial banks*.
- Harrison, D. A., & Sin, H. (2005). *What is diversity and how should it be measured?* (pp. 191- 216). London: Sage.
- Hartmut, H. (2010),"How can we explain mixed effects of diversity on team performance? A review with emphasis on context", *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, Vol. 29 Iss: 5 pp. 458 – 490
- Kibrework, L. (2011). Discourses of ethno-linguistic diversity; the case of Ethiopia
- Langdon, D. S., McMenamin, T. M., & Krolik, T. J. (2002). U.S. labor market in 2001: Economy enters a recession. *Monthly Labor Review*, 125, 3-33.
- Langdon, D. S., McMenamin, T. M., & Krolik, T. J. (2002). U.S. labor market in 2001: Economy enters a recession. *Monthly Labor Review*, 125, 3-33.
- Leon, C. P., Simone, T.A. & John, K. O. (2009). Linking Workplace Diversity to Organizational Performance: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Diversity Management Fourth Quarter*, Vol. 4, No. 4
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L. & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: a meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, p. 20-52.
- Milliken, F., & Martins, L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 402-433.
- Nanda R, & Browne, J. J. (1977). Hours of work, job satisfaction and productivity. *Public Productivity Rev.*, 2. (3): 46-56
- Sabine, B., Marius, L. & Sabine, K. (2011). Top management team diversity: positive in the short run, but negative in the long run? *Team Performance Management*; 17 7/8. - pp. 328-353
- Sabine, B., Marius, L. & Sabine, K. (2011). Top management team diversity: positive in the short run, but negative in the long run? *Team Performance Management*; 17 7/8. - pp. 328-353
- Sungjoo, C. (2008). Diversity in the US Federal Government: Diversity Management and Employee Turnover in Federal Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Inc JPART 19:603–630
- Sungjoo, C., Hal, G. & Rainey, (2010). Managing Diversity in U.S. Federal Agencies: Effects of Diversity and Diversity Management on Employee Perceptions of Organizational Performance. *Public Administration Review*

- Sungjoo, C., Hal, G. & Rainey, (2010). Managing Diversity in U.S. Federal Agencies: Effects of Diversity and Diversity Management on Employee Perceptions of Organizational Performance. *Public Administration Review*
- Syed, M. A., Muhammad I. S. & Arshad, Z. (2010). The effect of workgroup heterogeneity on decision making: An empirical investigation. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4(10), pp. 2132-2139
- Yamane, Taro. (1967). *Statistics: an Introductory Analysis*. (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.