# African Journal for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues

## EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

# INFLUENCE OF WORKFORCE DIVERSITY ON ORGANIZATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY IN GTBANKS, LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA

**SOLOMON OJO[1][#]**
**Adetutu Victoria, BALOGUN[1]**
**Obasanjo Sanya ADEGBITE[2]**
**Zaccheaus Olufunminiyi OLONADE[1]**
**Richard Akinjide ADU[2]**
**Omowumi Abeke ILORI[2]**

[1] *Department of Employment Relations & Human Resource Management,*
*Faculty of Management Sciences, Osun State University, Osogbo,*
*Okuku Campus, Osun State, Nigeria.*
*[2]Department of Psychology*
*Faculty of Social Sciences, Osun State University, Osogbo,*
*Okuku Campus, Osun State, Nigeria*

[#]**solomon.ojo@uniosun.edu.ng** (corresponding author)

## ABSTRACT

*This study investigated influence of workforce diversity on Organizational Sustainability in GT banks, Lagos state. Essentially, Organizational sustainability has been identified as essential ingredient that drives organizational continuity, effective performance and organizational survival. However, in this study efforts were made to investigate the following: Influence of gender diversity on organizational sustainability in Lagos state: Influence of the religious diversity on organizational sustainability in Lagos state: Influence of age diversity on organizational sustainability in Lagos state: Influence of group diversity on organizational sustainability in Lagos state. Base on this, 4 hypothesis were generated and tested using T- test and one way analysis or variance. Questionnaire format was used for data collection. The collected data were analyzed by T-test for independence measures and 1-way analysis of variance. The findings revealed that gender diversity had no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state [t (148) = 1.13, p >.05]. Also the findings showed that religious diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state. [F (2.147) = 4.240, P< 05]. Further, the findings revealed that ethnic diversity had no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT bank in Lagos state [F (2.147) = 683, P> 05]. Also this stated that the age group diversity as no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state [F (5,144) = 3.778, P< 05]. Therefore, it is concluded that work diversity in terms of gender ethnic diversity had no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state. However religious and age-group diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State.*

## INTRODUCTION

Organizational sustainability has emerged as a critical factor in contemporary business Organizational sustainability has become a central focus in modern business management, ensuring that companies balance profitability with social responsibility and environmental stewardship (Elkington, 2017). Businesses now operate under heightened global competition, resource limitations, and stakeholder expectations, making sustainability a strategic requirement for long-term success (Dyllick & Hockerts, 2022). Rooted in the Brundtland Report's definition of sustainable development, corporate sustainability is framed through the "triple bottom line" model, which integrates economic, social, and environmental performance (Elkington, 2017). This approach calls on organizations to look beyond financial outcomes and assess their broader impact on society and the planet.

The urgency of issues such as climate change, resource depletion, and social inequalities has driven firms to adopt sustainable practices. Examples include reducing carbon emissions, promoting ethical governance, and ensuring fair labor standards (Bansal & DesJardine, 2014). Companies like Tesla and Unilever have embedded sustainability into their core strategies, demonstrating that aligning profit with social and environmental goals can yield competitive

advantages (Epstein & Buhovac, 2014). Despite its benefits, sustainability adoption remains challenging due to high implementation costs, limited expertise, and resistance to organizational change (Lozano, 2015). Measurement of sustainability performance further complicates progress, as it requires balancing qualitative and quantitative indicators without standardized reporting frameworks (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2006; Eccles et al., 2014). Beyond environmental and economic concerns, sustainability also encompasses social and workforce dimensions. Workforce diversity has emerged as a critical factor in building sustainable organizations (Ozbilgin & Tatli, 2008). A diverse workforce provides organizations with varied perspectives, skills, and experiences that enhance innovation, adaptability, and competitiveness (Nwaoma, 2024). Such diversity also improves customer relations, market reach, and resilience during crises. However, effective management of diversity requires inclusive policies, cultural competence, and equity-focused workplace practices (Nwaoma, 2024).

Sustainability and workforce diversity are deeply interconnected. Companies that value inclusivity and equity not only improve employee engagement and talent retention but also strengthen corporate social responsibility initiatives. In Lagos State, industries such as banking, telecommunications, and healthcare have demonstrated the positive impacts of diversity initiatives, including stronger decision-making processes, better employee performance, and enhanced corporate reputation (Dessler, 2020; Noe et al., 2018). On the contrary, neglecting diversity leads to workplace discrimination, dissatisfaction, and high turnover rates, undermining organizational growth and sustainability (Hofstede, 1998).

Managing workforce diversity in Nigeria poses unique challenges due to socio-cultural issues such as ethnic bias, nepotism, and religious discrimination (Lozano, 2015). These practices limit the potential of diverse talent pools and create barriers to organizational effectiveness (Nwaoma, 2024). To address these problems, organizations must develop inclusive strategies, adopt cultural competence, and establish fair employment systems. Doing so not only promotes equity but also contributes to long-term sustainability by fostering collaboration, innovation, and ethical business practices (Ogbo et al., 2017). In conclusion, organizational sustainability encompasses economic, environmental, and social dimensions, with workforce diversity playing a pivotal role in driving innovation, equity, and resilience. For Nigerian organizations, particularly in Lagos State, effectively managing diversity is essential for achieving long-term growth and competitive advantage. This study therefore aims to investigate how workforce diversity influences organizational sustainability, focusing on the challenges, opportunities, and strategies for fostering inclusive and sustainable business practices.

**Statement of the problems**
Despite increasing global discourse on organizational sustainability, many businesses still struggle to integrate sustainable practices effectively (Gao & Bansal, 2013). A major challenge is the perception that sustainability initiatives are costly and provide limited immediate benefits, leading to resistance from key stakeholders. In addition, organizations often lack the expertise and strategic capacity to embed sustainability into long-term planning, resulting in fragmented or ineffective programs (Lozano, 2015). Measuring sustainability performance further complicates implementation, as indicators are often qualitative, multidimensional, and lack standardized reporting frameworks (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2006; Eccles et al., 2014).

These challenges highlight the need for a clearer understanding of the drivers, barriers, and contextual practices that shape sustainability adoption (Bansal & DesJardine, 2014). Multinational corporations face further difficulties due to varying regional policies, while weak regulatory systems encourage practices like greenwashing—creating the appearance of sustainability without real progress (Delmas & Burbano, 2011).

In Nigeria, workplace diversity offers great potential given the country's large and varied population, but issues such as ethnic bias, nepotism, and religious discrimination undermine organizational effectiveness (Lozano, 2015; Nwaoma, 2024). Consequently, this study investigates the impact of workforce diversity on organizational sustainability in GBank, Lagos State, focusing on challenges, employee performance, organizational growth, and strategies for fostering inclusivity and equity.

## Literature Review

### Concept of Workplace Diversity
Workplace diversity is a broad concept. In a simple term, it refers to similarities and differences that exist among employees in term of age, cultural background, physical abilities and disabilities, race, religion, gender and sexual orientation (Farmanesh et al., 2020; Gomez and Bernet, 2019; Hossain et al., 2020). However, many researchers have considered it a one-dimensional concept or studied just one perspective of workplace diversity while linking it with organizational performance, (Farmanesh et al., 2020; Gomez and Bernet, 2019; Hossain et al., 2020). Many existing organizations today have a diverse workforce, which has led to new opportunities and challenges as well as rising complexity in recent years (Farmanesh 2020). According to Spanos (2022), managing diversity is now essential for reducing the difficulties associated with workplace diversity. Workplace diversity is a concept that is political, nebulous and cloudy in nature Jansen and Searle (2020). The concept of diversity covers acceptance and respect for one another in an organizational setting Jansen and Searle (2020). It entails the understanding that everyone within the organization is different and unique Jansen and Searle (2020). The term diversity is most used these days especially in an organizational setting partly because it is a concept that has a wide meaning and scope of definition (Jansen and Searle, 2020).

### Workforce Diversity
The classification of most of these scholars who choose narrow perspectives to the definition of the concept contend that the concept of workforce diversity should be restricted to specific cultural categories, such as race and gender (Cross, Katz, Miller & Seashore, 1994). Hence, Esty, Griffin and Hirsch, (1995), defined the concept of diversity in the workplace as acknowledging, understanding, accepting, and valuing differences among people with respect to age, class, race, ethnicity, gender, disabilities, etc. Nevertheless, some argued that diversity based on race, ethnicity and gender cannot be understood in the same way as diversity based on organizational functions, abilities or cognitive orientations (Nkomo, 1995). Moreover, the key issues of diversity are those that arise because of discrimination and exclusion of a given cultural groups from conventional organizations such as the Nigeria Public Service (Littrell, Billingsley & Cross, 1994). Consequently, if diversity is a concept that is inclusive of all individuals, it may become very difficult to identify discriminatory practices in a given situation (Cross, Katz, Miller & Seashore, 1994). Hence, Esty, Griffin and Hirsch, (1995). The main concern of this perspective is that a broad definition of the concept may suggest that all differences among people are the same (Cross, Katz, Miller & Seashore, 1994). Hence, Esty, Griffin and Hirsch, (1995).

### Gender Diversity
Gender diversity is a notion that revolves around recognising and embracing the variations between people depending on their gender identity, whether they identify as male, or female, or fall within the non-binary or gender non-conforming spectrum (Scarborough, 2019). It entails including persons of diverse gender origins and orientations in numerous sectors of life, including the workplace (Scarborough, 2019). Gender frequently plays a defining role in shaping the roles, responsibilities, limitations, opportunities, and privileges of individuals, be they women, girls, men, or boys, within a given setting (Scarborough, 2019). According to Nwaoma, (2022), gender

diversity pertains to the emotional distinctions and the culturally embedded experiences associated with men and women within any organisation Nwaoma, (2022). Gender diversity among employees in a university setting is a critical aspect that significantly influences the overall academic environment (Chin & Trimble, 2020). The composition of faculty, staff, and administrative professionals from diverse gender backgrounds contributes to a richer and more inclusive university community (Chin & Trimble, 2020). One aspect of gender diversity is the equal representation of both men and women in various roles within the university (Chin & Trimble, 2020). Achieving gender balance in leadership positions, academic departments, and administrative roles is crucial for fostering an environment that values the contributions of all individuals, regardless of gender (Chin & Trimble, 2020).

## Age Diversity

Farmanesh, (2020) investigate the intricate relationship between workforce diversity and organisational performance in the educational sector of Cyprus, with a specific focus on the moderating effect of diversity fatigue (Farmanesh, 2020). The research employs a Mixed Method approach, combining survey data from university academic staff with semi-structured senior-level interviews(Farmanesh, 2020). The findings emphasize the need for organisations to proactively address diversity fatigue, recognizing its potential to hinder the positive impact of diversity on performance (Farmanesh, 2020). Strategies aimed at fostering a supportive and inclusive work environment are crucial for mitigating emotional challenges and maintaining the positive contributions of a diverse workforce (Farmanesh, 2020).

## Religious Diversity

Religion is regarded as a very important element of cultural diversity which has great influence on the lifestyles, values and attitudes of the people (Ahmed, Shaft & Afta, 2014). It is believed that religious values and beliefs have serious effects on the way workers perform in the workplace (Heliot, Gleibs, Rousseau & Rojon, 2016). Gebert, Boerner, Kearne, Kim, Zhang, and Song (2014), observed that religious identity is mostly glossed over in the workplace thereby escalating conflicts Song (2014). It is suggested that firms operating in countries characterized by religious diversity should adjust to bring in what the religion of their workers and customers require Song (2014). The organisations which ignore this might be exposed to different forms of negative outcomes such as workers' absenteeism, low morale, and low turnover (Gebert, Boerner, Kearne, Kim, Zhang, and Song, 2014).

## Ethnic Diversity

Ethnic diversity relates to diversity in language, religions, races and cultures while state of origin diversity relates to differences arising from peoples' state of origin (Edewor, Aluko & Folarin ,2014). It has been opined that relationships in ethnically diverse societies are inevitably characterized by conflicts (Edewor, Aluko & Folarin ,2014). This manifests in form of competition for scarce resources (Edewor, Aluko & Folarin ,2014). Most often, it is not easy to draw a distinction between ethnic manifestation and state of origin syndrome in Nigerian work organisations (Edewor, 2014). This made Ojo (2019) to regard Nigeria polity as one of the most ethnically diverse societies in the World. Division and cleavages are created by individual employees especially in public sector organisations (Ojo, 2019). The negative manifestations include communication problems, crises, injustice, inequality and religious and political instability (Odeyemi, 2014). It is, therefore, believed that ethnicity and state of origin have become a clog to the political and economic development of Nigeria while at the organisational level, it might degenerate from organisational clashes to personal and emotional conflicts (Odeyemi, 2014). These will in turn affect employees' performance, morale and give rise to poor employee and organisational performance (Kathimba & Ayieni, 2018). Evidently, among the worrisome problems created by both ethnicity and state of origin in the workplace in Nigeria include being very loyal to one's ethnic group, antagonistic relations across cultures, hostilities and aggressive behaviour,

bitterness, hatefulness, and lack of trust (Kathimba & Ayieni, 2018). According to them, the basic character of social relations is such that people may be accepted or reject based on their language and culture; discriminate against others in employment and show discrimination in areas like getting admitted into schools and universities as well as inter-ethnic marriages, social and business activities (Kathimba & Ayieni, 2018).

## Concept of Organisational Sustainability

Organisation sustainability has been a topic of intense academic research, especially in the Western countries (Halme, Laurila 2009). The evolution of the organisation sustainability construct began in the 1950s, which marks the modern era of corporate sustainability (Halme, Laurila 2009). Organisation sustainability has piqued interest towards the possibilities that sustainable business actions have to offer (Halme, Laurila 2009). Problems, such as pollution, progressive climate change and child labour abuse plague especially large organizations (Guarnieri, Kao 2008). Sustainability actions are necessary and any company that considers operating at the expense of a society, quickly finds out to have chosen a rocky road (Haanaes, Michael, Jurgens & Rangan, 2013, Porter & Kramer 2006).

The possibility of raising organisation sustainability to a very new level by utilizing it as a competitive advantage has recently gained attention in academic business research (Nwagbara, Reid 2013, Porter, Kramer 2006, and Quisenberry 2012). Social and economic goals are not any longer conflicting (Porter, Kramer 2002). organisation sustainability is seen nowadays as a strategic investment that truly pays off, rather than as a voluntary expense or a necessity to brighten a brand image (Orlitzky, Schmidt & Rynes 2003). Indeed, the focus has shifted from studying the definitions of organisation sustainability to specifying different company attitudes towards responsibility, in order to appreciate and understand organisation sustainability outcomes. Recent literature has paid attention to different action-orientation types of CSR, which has helped to understand that not every type of organisation sustainability activity can increase the firm competitiveness (Halme, Laurila 2009).

Companies have started to realize that a strategic performance in organisation sustainability have also notable implications on the company's financial performance (Becchetti, Ciciretti, Hasan, & Kobeissi, 2012, Lee 2008, Orlitzky, Schmidt & Rynes 2003). There is evidence that investments in corporate sustainability sections, for example employee relations or environmental risk management contribute noticeably to reducing companies' cost of capital (El Ghoul, Guedhami, Kwok & Mishra, 2011, Sharfman, & Fernando 2008). Thus, the reason for interest in sustainability is economic outcome in nature (Martin &Schouten 2012). Furthermore, in organisation sustainability reporting, focus includes internal benefits for increased understanding of risks, opportunities, emphasis on the link between financial and non-financial performance, influence long-term management strategy and policy, and business plans (Martin &Schouten 2012). It also reduces costs and improve efficiency, benchmarking and assessing sustainability performance with respect to laws, norms, codes, performance standards, and voluntary initiatives (Martin &Schouten 2012).

## Theoretical Review
## Social Categorization Theory (SCT)

Social categorization theory, by (Tuner, 1987) suggests that people belong to many different social groups (e.g. nation, employer, or school). It predicts that individuals sort themselves into identity groups based upon salient characteristics and that they act in concert with their categories and favor contexts that affirm group identity (Hogg & Terry, 2000). In consequence, dissimilar individuals are less likely to collaborate with one another compared to similar individuals (Hogg & Terry, 2000). In this way, social categorization may disrupt elaboration of task-relevant information because of possible biases towards in-group members and negative biases towards out-group members. (Knippenberg, Kleef& De-Dreu, 2007). This is a theory of the self, group processes, and social cognition (Turner et al., 1987) which emerged from research on social identity theory.

It is concerned with variation in self-categorization (in the level, content, and meaning of self-categories. It focuses on the distinction between personal and social identity (Turner, 1987). Social-categorization theory seeks to show how the emergent, higher-order processes of group behavior can be explained in terms of a shift in self-perception from self-categorization in terms of personal identity to self-categorization in terms of social identity (Hogg & Terry, 2000).

**Resource Based View**
The Resource-Based View (RBV) of the company, focuses on how organisations can obtain a sustainable competitive edge by strategically managing precious, scarce, distinctive, and non-substitutable resources (Wright & Mcmahan, 1992). RBV provides a framework for analysing how diversity-related resources contribute to organisational performance in the context of workplace diversity (Hermansyah et al., 2022). According to RBV, for a corporation to gain a competitive edge, it must possess and exploit resources that are both valued and scarce (Hermansyah, 2022). Workplace diversity, which includes a wide range of skills, viewpoints, and experiences, can be regarded as a unique and significant resource (Hermansyah, 2022). Organisations that properly manage diversity can use it to boost innovation, adaptability, and problem-solving abilities. The Resource-Based View offers an insightful view of how workplace diversity can be used to gain a sustainable competitive advantage (Shet, 2020). Organisations that recognise diversity as a strategic resource, foster an inclusive culture and include diversity in their strategy processes are more likely to achieve positive results in terms of employee performance, creativity, and overall organisational success (Shet, 2020). Diversity not only aligns with societal expectations, but it may also significantly contribute to gaining and retaining a competitive edge in today's volatile business environment (Shet, 2020).

**Institutional Theory**
Institutional theory broadly states that their institutional environment, context or field governs the behaviour of organizations (Doshi & Khokle, 2012). The constituents of the field include the organization's social context, the scope of its activities, and its network of social relationships (Doshi & Khokle, 2012). In reviewing and analysing institutional theory, the theory of symbolic interactionism comes to limelight in order to explain vividly, the concept and theory of human existence, diversity and its cultural reality (Doshi & Khokle, 2012). According to Ritzer (2012) in Linstead, (2006), ethnomethodology is the study of the body of common sense, knowledge and range of procedures by which members of a society make sense as symbolic. Therefore, institutional context tends to bring uniformity in business practice and organizational actions through three mechanisms: coercive, mimetic and normative. Coercive mechanisms refer to pressure techniques that aim to bring business practice in line with societal expectations Linstead, (2006). Mimetic practices refer to peers' pressure on firms to conform to certain behaviours. Normative practices refer to internalization of beliefs about the suitability of certain behaviour (DiMaggio & Powell, 2000). Broadly speaking, the institutional forces drive agent's behaviour by aligning agent's beliefs with societal norms, with the alignment being caused by either internalization of norms or external pressure.

**METHODOLOGY**
**Research Design**

The study was a survey, which was employed Ex-post Facto design. The independent variable is workforce diversity. The dependent variable was organisational sustainability

**Population of the Study**

The target population for the study comprises of all employees who work with GTbanks in Lagos, Nigeria. The total number of employees working in selected shall be consider, Guaranty Trust Bank Plc with 5, 361 (gtbank.com)

**Sample and Sampling Techniques**

Sampling procedure refers to the method used to select participants or study subjects from a target population to obtain relevant data for research. It was a crucial aspect of research methodology as it ensures that the selected sample accurately represents the entire population, thereby enhancing the validity and reliability of the study findings. For this research, a random sampling technique was employed to determine the sample population. Specifically, the study shall utilize simple random sampling, which was a probability sampling method where each individual in the target population had an equal chance of being selected. This approach eliminates bias and ensures that the sample represents the characteristics of the broader population.

The sample size was determined using a sample percentage formula, which involves selecting a specific proportion of the total population to participate in the study. This method ensures that the sample is neither too was undermine the reliability of results nor too large to make data collection unmanageable. The choice of simple random sampling is justified because it promotes fairness and objectivity in selecting employees from the organizations under study. By allowing all employees an equal opportunity to be chosen, this technique helps to capture diverse perspectives, making the research findings more generalizable and applicable to a wider organizational.

The sample size was determined using **Yamane's (1967) formula** for sample size calculation:

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

Where:

- $n$ = Sample size
- $N$ = Estimated population (large and indefinite)
- $e$ = Margin of error (5% or 0.05)

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} = \frac{5,361}{1+5,361(0.05)^2} = \frac{5,361}{1+13.4025} = \frac{5,361}{14.4025} = 372$$

**Methods of Data Collection**
Questionnaire format was used for data collection in this study. Specifically, the questionnaire adopted data collection tool. The questionnaire was semi-structured that contained open and closed ended questions. Questionnaires is considered to be appropriate data collection tool in this study because they allow a large population of people to be reached with ease and was also economical.

**Method of Data Analysis**
The study was utilized both the Descriptive and Inferential Statistics for data analysis. The descriptive statistics was provide some summary information on the data collected, particularly the personal and work-related information associated with the respondents of the study which include frequency, percentage, etc. The inferential statistics was the postulated hypotheses. Specifically, the study was utilized linear Regression analysis. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 was used to run the analysis at 0.05 significance level.

## RESULTS
### Hypothesis One
Gender diversity has no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State. The hypothesis was tested by T-test for Independent measures. The result is shown in table 4.9 below:

**Table 1: A Summary Table of T-Test For Independent Measures Showing the Influence of Gender Diversity on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State,**

| Gender Diversity | N | X̄ | SD | df | t | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Employees | 69 | 8.34 | 3.23 | | 1.13 | |
| Female Employees | 81 | 7.51 | 2.65 | 148 | | >.05 |

Source: Author's Fieldwork, 2025

The result in table1 above revealed that gender diversity had no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State [ t (148) = 1.13, p>.05]. Based on the result above, it is therefore stated the hypothesis one was supported by the result of the study. With this, it is then stated that the null hypothesis was accepted while the alternative

### Hypothesis Two
Religious diversity has no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State. The hypothesis was tested by One -Way Analysis of Variance. The result is shown in table 2 below:

**Table 2a: A Summary Table of One-Way Analysis of Variance Showing the Influence of Religious Diversity on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State**

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6.233 | 2 | 3.117 | 4.240 | .016 |
| Within Groups | 108.060 | 147 | .735 | | |
| Total | 114.293 | 149 | | | |

Source: Author's Field Work, 2025

The result in Table 2a above revealed that Religious diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State [F (2. 147)=4.240, p<.05].
Therefore, the hypothesis two was not supported by the result of the study. With this, it is then stated that the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted. However, in order to know where the differences came a post Hoc test was conducted and the result is shown in Table 2a below:

**Table 2b: Post -Hoc Tests showing multiple comparisons of differences across the Three Ethnic Groups on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State, Nigeria**

| (I) RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY | (J) RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CHRISTAINITY | ISLAM | .104 | .146 | .476 | -.18 | .39 |
| | OTHERS | .877* | .301 | .004 | .28 | 1.47 |
| ISLAM | CHRISTAINITY | -.104 | .146 | .476 | -.39 | .18 |
| | OTHERS | .772* | .306 | .013 | .17 | 1.38 |
| OTHERS | CHRISTAINITY | -.877* | .301 | .004 | -1.47 | -.28 |
| | ISLAM | -.772* | .306 | .013 | -1.38 | -.17 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Author's Fieldwork, 2025

Based on the Post Hoc tests in Table 2b above, it was revealed that a significant difference between Christians and employees of other religions (Mean Difference = .877*, p < .05). In a similar vein, a significant difference was equally obtained between Muslims and employees of other religions on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = .772*, p < .05). A significant difference was also obtained between employees practicing other religions and Christianity on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = -877*, p < .05).

## Hypothesis Three

This stated that ethnic diversity has no significant influence on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State. The hypothesis was tested by One- way Analysis of Variance. The result is shown in table 3a below:

**Table 3a: A Summary Table of One-way Analysis of Variance Showing the Influence of Ethnic Diversity on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State**

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1.582 | 3 | .527 | .683 | .564 |
| Within Groups | 112.712 | 146 | .772 | | |
| Total | 114.293 | 149 | | | |

Source: Author's Field Work, 2025

The result in Table 3a above revealed that ethnic diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State [F (2. 147)=4.240, p<.05].
Therefore, the hypothesis two was supported by the result of the study. With this, it is then stated that the null hypothesis was accepted while the alternative hypothesis was rejected. However, in order to know where the differences came a post Hoc test was conducted and the result is shown in Table 3a below:

**Table 3b: Post -Hoc Tests showing multiple comparisons of differences across the Three Ethnic Groups on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State, Nigeria**

| (I) ETHNIIC DIVERSITY | (J) ETHNIIC DIVERSITY | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| YORUBA | HAUSA | -.257 | .181 | .159 | -.62 | .10 |
| | FULANI | -.152 | .218 | .488 | -.58 | .28 |

| | | -.117 | .197 | .555 | -.51 | .27 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | IGBO | | | | | |
| | YORUBA | .257 | .181 | .159 | -.10 | .62 |
| HAUSA | FULANI | .105 | .229 | .647 | -.35 | .56 |
| | IGBO | .140 | .209 | .504 | -.27 | .55 |
| | YORUBA | .152 | .218 | .488 | -.28 | .58 |
| FULANI | HAUSA | -.105 | .229 | .647 | -.56 | .35 |
| | IGBO | .035 | .242 | .885 | -.44 | .51 |
| | YORUBA | .117 | .197 | .555 | -.27 | .51 |
| IGBO | HAUSA | -.140 | .209 | .504 | -.55 | .27 |
| | FULANI | -.035 | .242 | .885 | -.51 | .44 |

Source: Author's Fieldwork, 2025

Based on the Post Hoc tests in Table 3b above, it was revealed that no significant difference between Yoruba Employees and Hausa Employees (Mean Difference =- .257, p > .05). In a similar vein, there was no significant difference obtained between Hausa Employees and Fulani employees on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference= .105, p > .05). There was no significant difference between Igbo employees and Hausa Employees on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = .140, p > .05)

**Hypothesis Four**
This stated that age group diversity has no significant influence on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State. The hypothesis was tested by One- way Analysis of Variance. The result is shown in table 4a below:

**Table 4a A Summary Table of One-way Analysis of Variance Showing the Influence of Age Group on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State**

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 13.255 | 5 | 2.651 | 3.778 | .003 |
| Within Groups | 101.039 | 144 | .702 | | |
| Total | 114.293 | 149 | | | |

Source: Author's Field work, 2025

The result in Table 4a above revealed that age group diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State [F (5, 144) = 3.778, p<.05]. Therefore, the hypothesis four was supported by the result of the study. With this, it is then stated that the null hypothesis was accepted while the alternative hypothesis was rejected. However, in order to know where the differences came from a post Hoc test was conducted and the result is shown in Table 4b below:

**Table 4b: Post -Hoc Tests Showing Multiple Comparisons of Differences across the Three Ethnic Groups on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State, Nigeria**

| (I) AGE GROUP | (J) AGE GROUP | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 20-24YRS | 25-29YRS | -.008 | .197 | .967 | -.40 | .38 |
| | 30-34YRS | .087 | .215 | .685 | -.34 | .51 |
| | 35-39YRS | .244 | .237 | .304 | -.22 | .71 |
| | 40-44YRS | 1.187* | .305 | .000 | .58 | 1.79 |
| | 45YRS AND ABOVE | .320 | .263 | .226 | -.20 | .84 |
| 25-29YRS | 20-24YRS | .008 | .197 | .967 | -.38 | .40 |
| | 30-34YRS | .095 | .199 | .633 | -.30 | .49 |
| | 35-39YRS | .252 | .223 | .259 | -.19 | .69 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 40-44YRS | 1.195* | .294 | .000 | .61 | 1.78 |
| | 45YRS AND ABOVE | .329 | .251 | .193 | -.17 | .83 |
| | 20-24YRS | -.087 | .215 | .685 | -.51 | .34 |
| | 25-29YRS | -.095 | .199 | .633 | -.49 | .30 |
| 30-34YRS | 35-39YRS | .157 | .238 | .511 | -.31 | .63 |
| | 40-44YRS | 1.100* | .306 | .000 | .50 | 1.70 |
| | 45YRS AND ABOVE | .233 | .265 | .380 | -.29 | .76 |
| | 20-24YRS | -.244 | .237 | .304 | -.71 | .22 |
| | 25-29YRS | -.252 | .223 | .259 | -.69 | .19 |
| 35-39YRS | 30-34YRS | -.157 | .238 | .511 | -.63 | .31 |
| | 40-44YRS | .943* | .322 | .004 | .31 | 1.58 |
| | 45YRS AND ABOVE | .076 | .283 | .788 | -.48 | .64 |
| | 20-24YRS | -1.187* | .305 | .000 | -1.79 | -.58 |
| | 25-29YRS | -1.195* | .294 | .000 | -1.78 | -.61 |
| 40-44YRS | 30-34YRS | -1.100* | .306 | .000 | -1.70 | -.50 |
| | 35-39YRS | -.943* | .322 | .004 | -1.58 | -.31 |
| | 45YRS AND ABOVE | -.867* | .342 | .012 | -1.54 | -.19 |
| | 20-24YRS | -.320 | .263 | .226 | -.84 | .20 |
| | 25-29YRS | -.329 | .251 | .193 | -.83 | .17 |
| 45YRS AND ABOVE | 30-34YRS | -.233 | .265 | .380 | -.76 | .29 |
| | 35-39YRS | -.076 | .283 | .788 | -.64 | .48 |
| | 40-44YRS | .867* | .342 | .012 | .19 | 1.54 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Author's Fieldwork, 2025

Based on the Post Hoc tests in Table 4b above, it was revealed that a significant difference between Employees within age group 20-24yrs and Employees within age group 40-44yrs (Mean Difference =1 .187*, p < .05). In a similar vein, there was a significant difference obtained between Employees within age bracket 25-29yrs and employees within age bracket 40-44yrs on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = 1 .195*, p < .05). There was a significant difference between Employees within age bracket 35-39yrs and Employees within age bracket 40-44yrs on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = .943*, p < .05).

## DISCUSSION

This study investigated the influence of workforce diversity on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks, Lagos State. The study stated and tested four hypotheses which were as thus: The hypothesis one which stated gender diversity has no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State was tested by T-test for Independent measures. The result revealed that gender diversity had no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State [ t (148) = 1.13, p>.05]. Based on the result above, it is therefore stated the hypothesis one was supported by the result of the study. With this, it is then stated that the null hypothesis was accepted while the alternative hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis two stated which that religious diversity has no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State was tested by One -Way Analysis of Variance. It was revealed that Religious diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State [F (2. 147)=4.240, p<.05]. Therefore, the hypothesis two was not supported by the result of the study. With this, it is then stated that the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted. However, in order to know where the differences came a post Hoc test was conducted and it was revealed that there was a significant difference between Christians and employees of other religions (Mean Difference = .877*, p < .05). In a similar vein, a significant difference was equally obtained between Muslims and employees of other religions on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = .772*, p < .05). A significant difference was also obtained between employees practicing other religions and Christianity on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = -877*, p < .05). The hypothesis three which stated that ethnic

diversity has no significant influence on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State was tested by One- way Analysis of Variance. The result revealed that ethnic diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State [$F_{(2, 147)}=4.240$, $p<.05$]. Therefore, the hypothesis two was supported by the result of the study. With this, it is then stated that the null hypothesis was accepted while the alternative hypothesis was rejected. However, in order to know where the differences came from a post Hoc test was conducted and the result revealed that there was no significant difference between Yoruba Employees and Hausa Employees (Mean Difference =- .257, $p > .05$). In a similar vein, there was no significant difference obtained between Hausa Employees and Fulani employees on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference= .105, $p > .05$). There was no significant difference between Igbo employees and Hausa Employees on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = .140, $p > .05$). The hypothesis four which stated that age group diversity has no significant influence on Organizational Sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State was tested by One- way Analysis of Variance. The result revealed that age group diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT Banks in Lagos State [$F_{(5, 144)} = 3.778$, $p<.05$]. Therefore, the hypothesis four was supported by the result of the study. With this, it is then stated that the null hypothesis was accepted while the alternative hypothesis was rejected. However, in order to know where the differences came from a post Hoc test was conducted and the result revealed that there was a significant difference between Employees within age group 20-24yrs and Employees within age group 40-44yrs (Mean Difference =1 .187$^{*}$, $p < .05$). In a similar vein, there was a significant difference obtained between Employees within age bracket 25-29yrs and employees within age bracket 40-44yrs on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = 1 .195$^{*}$, $p < .05$). Further, there was a significant difference between Employees within age bracket 35-39yrs and Employees within age bracket 40-44yrs on organizational sustainability (Mean Difference = .943$^{*}$, $p < .05$).

**Conclusion and Recommendations**
This study investigated the influence of workforce diversity on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state.  Four (4) hypotheses were stated and tested in the study, the obtain findings were found highly    revealing. However, it is concluded thus: -Gender diversity had no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state.  -Religious diversity had significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state. -Ethnic diversity have no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state.  -Age group diversity had no significant influence on organizational sustainability in GT banks in Lagos state. Based on the conclusion stated above, it is hereby recommended that: - Promotion of Inclusive Leadership: Develop leadership programs that emphasize the importance of diversity and inclusion, encouraging leaders to champion diverse teams and foster an inclusive culture.- Implementation of Diversity Training: Regularly conduct training sessions to raise awareness about unconscious biases, cultural competence, and the benefits of diversity, ensuring all employees understand its value.-  Need for the Development of Diverse Recruitment Strategies: Broaden recruitment channels to attract candidates from diverse backgrounds, ensuring a wide talent pool that reflects societal diversity.-  Foster an Inclusive Work Environment: Create policies and practices that promote respect, equity, and belonging, such as flexible work arrangements, employee resource groups, and recognition programs.-   Aligning Diversity Goals with Sustainability Objectives: Integrate diversity and inclusion into the organization's sustainability strategy, recognizing that diverse perspectives contribute to innovative solutions and long-term resilience.-   Monitoring and Measuring5 Diversity Outcomes: Establish metrics to assess the impact of diversity initiatives on organizational performance, innovation, and sustainability goals, adjusting as needed.- Encourage Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Promote teamwork across diverse groups to leverage different perspectives, enhancing creativity and problem-solving capabilities vital for sustainable growth.-   Engage Stakeholders and Community*: Build

partnerships with diverse community groups and stakeholders to foster social responsibility and reinforce the organization's commitment to sustainability.- Support Employee Development: Offer mentorship and development programs targeted at underrepresented groups to ensure equitable growth opportunities and retention.- Communicate Transparency and Progress: Regularly share diversity and sustainability progress with stakeholders to build trust and demonstrate commitment to organizational values.- Implementing these recommendations can enhance organizational sustainability by leveraging the benefits of workforce diversity, such as innovation, adaptability, and improved stakeholder engagement.

## REFERENCES

Ahmed, A., Shaft, R., & Afta, A. (2014). Religion and its impact on organizational behavior. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 6(2), 88–99.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior.* Prentice-Hall.

Andersen, T. B., Bentzen, J., Dalgaard, C.-J., & Sharp, P. (2017). Pre-reformation roots of the protestant ethic. *The Economic Journal*, 127(604), 1756–1793. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecoj.12385

Ashikali, T., Groeneveld, S., & Kuipers, B. (2021). Diversity management: Inclusion and inclusive practices. *Public Administration Review*, 81(3), 457–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13361

Ayega, E. N., & Muathe, S. M. A. (2018). *Critical review of literature on workforce diversity and organizational Performance International Journal of Business and Management*, 13(12), 114–126. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v13n12p114

Banono, G. (2023). *Workforce diversity and team performance: A dual impact analysis*. Journal of Organizational Behavior Studies, 45(3), 209–225.

Bansal, P., & DesJardine, M. R. (2014). *Business sustainability: It is about time*. Strategic Organization, 12(1), 70–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127013520265

Bansal, P., & DesJardine, M. R. (2014). Business sustainability: It is about time. *Strategic Organization*, 12(1), 70–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127013520265

Becchetti, L., Ciciretti, R., Hasan, I., & Kobeissi, N. (2012). Corporate social responsibility and shareholder's value. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(11), 1628–1635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.022

Benefiel, M., Fry, L. W., & Geigle, D. (2014). Spirituality and religion in the workplace: History, theory, and research. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 6(3), 175–187. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036597

Bolli, T., Renold, U., Wörter, M., & Zenker, C. (2018). Vertical educational diversity and innovation performance. *Industry and Innovation*, 25(3), 271–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2017.1294774

Bramwell, B., & Alletorp, L. (2001). Attitudes in the Danish tourism industry to the roles of business and government in sustainable tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(2), 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.244

Brown, K., Smith, R., & Thomas, J. (2020). Rethinking diversity: The importance of multidimensional identity. *Journal of Organizational Diversity*, 20(4), 25–40.

Cadrain, D. (2008). Diversity training programs: Help or hindrance? *HR Magazine*, 53(2), 117–122.

Campbell, J. L. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 946–967. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.25275684

Cetinkaya, B., Cuthbertson, R., Ewer, G., Klaas-Wissing, T., Tarkan, M., & Tyssen, C. (2011). *Sustainable supply chain management: Practical ideas for moving towards best practice*. Springer.

Chin, J. L., & Trimble, J. E. (2020). *Diversity and leadership*. SAGE Publications.

Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review*, 54(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64

Deng, J., Ryan, C., & Moutinho, L. (1992). The impact of scale on tourism employment. *Tourism Management*, 13(4), 386–393. https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(92)90064-W

Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). Pearson.

Dewhurst, H., & Thomas, R. (2003). Encouraging sustainable business practices in a non-regulatory environment: A case study of small tourism firms in a UK National Park. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(5), 383–403. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580308667217

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (2000). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. In *Economy and Society* (2(143–166). Stanford University Press.

Doshi, S., & Khokle, P. (2012). *Exploring the institutional environment of organizations: A theoretical perspective*. *Journal of Management and Organization Studies, 29(2)*, 75–89.

Drissen, E. (2023). *The paradox of diversity: Exploring contradictory effects on performance and cohesion*. Journal of *Social Psychology and Organizations, 51(2),* 181–195.

Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2022). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. In S. Schaltegger, M. Bennett, & R. L. Burritt (Eds.), *Sustainability accounting and reporting* (pp. 301–327). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2842-5_13

Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*, *60(11*), 2835–2857. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2014.1984

Edewor, P. A. (2014). Ethnic and state of origin issues in the workplace: Implications for productivity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 21(2), 45–59.

Edewor, P. A., Aluko, Y. A., & Folarin, S. F. (2014). Managing ethnic and cultural diversity for national integration in Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies*, 4(6), 70–76.

El Ghoul, S., Guedhami, O., Kwok, C. C. Y., & Mishra, D. R. (2011). Does corporate social responsibility affect the cost of capital? *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 35(9), 2388–2406. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2011.02.007

Elkington, J. (2017). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business* (New ed.). Capstone.

Epstein, M. J., & Buhovac, A. R. (2014). *Making sustainability work: Best practices in managing and measuring corporate social, environmental, and economic impacts* (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Epstein, M. J., & Buhovac, A. R. (2014). *Making sustainability work: Best practices in managing and measuring corporate social, environmental, and economic impacts* (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Esty, K., Griffin, R., & Hirsch, M. (1995). *Workplace diversity: A manager's guide to solving problems and turning diversity into a competitive advantage*. Adams Media Corporation.

Farmanesh, P. (2020). Workforce diversity and organizational performance in Cyprus: The role of diversity fatigue. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 20(2), 22–36. https://doi.org/10.33423/jbd.v20i2.3082

Fry, L. W., Hannah, S. T., Noel, M., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). Impact of spiritual leadership on unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 259–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.002

Gao, J., & Bansal, P. (2013). Instrumental and integrative logics in business sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 112(2), 241–255. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1245-2

Gao, J., & Bansal, P. (2013). Instrumental and integrative logics in business sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 112(2), 241–255. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1245-2

Gebert, D., Boerner, S., Kearney, E., Kim, Y. J., Zhang, K., & Song, L. J. (2014). Expressing religious identities in the workplace: Analyzing a neglected diversity dimension. *Human Relations*, 67(5), 543–567. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713496830

Gebert, D., Boerner, S., Kearney, E., King, J. E., Zhang, K., & Song, L. J. (2014). Expressing religious identities in the workplace: Analyzing a neglected diversity dimension. *Human Relations*, 67(5), 543–563. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713496836

Gomez, L. E., & Bernet, P. (2019). Diversity improves performance and outcomes. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 111(4), 383–392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnma.2019.01.006

Greene, A. M., & Kirton, G. (2023). *Diversity management: Theoretical perspectives and contemporary challenges* (4th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Guarnieri, P., & Kao, C.-Y. (2008). Leadership and sustainable business development: The role of HRM. *Human Resource Management*, 47(4), 785–797.

Haanaes, K., Michael, D., Jurgens, J., & Rangan, S. (2013). Making sustainability profitable. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(3), 110–115.

Halme, M., & Laurila, J. (2009). Philanthropy, integration or innovation? Exploring the financial and societal outcomes of different types of corporate responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(3), 325–339. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9712-5

Hart, S. L., & Milstein, M. B. (2013). Creating sustainable value. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(2), 56–69. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2003.10025194

Heliot, Y., Gleibs, I. H., Rousseau, D. M., & Rojon, C. (2016). Religious identity in the workplace: A systematic review, research agenda, and practical implications. *Human Resource Management*, 59(1), 153–173. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21983

Hobson, K., & Essex, S. (2001). Sustainable tourism: A view from accommodation businesses. *The Service Industries Journal*, 21(4), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/714005050

Hofstede, G. (1998). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Horobin, H., & Long, J. (1996). Sustainable tourism: The role of the small firm. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 8(5), 15–19. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596119610127140

Hossain, M. U., Saleh, M. A., & Alam, M. (2020). Workplace diversity and employee performance: Evidence from service sectors in Bangladesh. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 8(1), 123–138. https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2020.81008

Iheme, C. C., Okoro, C. E., & Nnaji, H. C. (2023). Workforce diversity and employee performance in ECOWAS Commission, Abuja. *African Journal of Management Studies*, 15(2), 98–115.

Isiaka, A., & Ibitomi, S. O. (2019). Workforce diversity and innovation in Nigerian manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(3), 35–50. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v9i3.15235

Jackson, G., & Apostolakou, A. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in Western Europe: An institutional mirror or substitute? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(3), 371–394. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0269-8

Jackson, S. E., May, K. E., & Whitney, K. (1995). Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision-making teams. In R. A. Guzzo & E. Salas (Eds.), *Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations* (pp. 204–261). Jossey-Bass.

Jansen, W., & Searle, R. (2020). Navigating the ambiguity of diversity: Perceptions in practice. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 39(4), 409–424. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-04-2019-0111

Kallgren, C. A., Reno, R. R., & Cialdini, R. B. (2000). A focus theory of normative conduct: When norms do and do not affect behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(8), 1002–1012. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672002610009

Kathimba, H., & Ayieni, R. (2018). Effect of ethnic diversity on employee performance in Kenyan public sector. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6(5), 177–184. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jhrm.20180605.13

Kaur, P., & Arora, S. (2020). Workforce diversity and its impact on organizational profitability: A study of Indian companies. *Journal of Management Research and Analysis*, 7(2), 45–52.

Lee, D. D. (2008). Corporate sustainability performance and idiosyncratic risk: A global perspective. *Financial Review*, 43(4), 571–597.

Linstead, S. (2006). *Organization Theory and Postmodern Thought*. SAGE Publications.

Littrell, R. F., Billingsley, S., & Cross, E. (1994). Managing diversity in public service: An African perspective. *Public Personnel Management*, 23(3), 325–341.
.
Loden, M., & Rosener, J. B. (1991). *Workforce America! Managing employee diversity as a vital resource*. McGraw-Hill.

Lozano, R. (2015). A holistic perspective on corporate sustainability drivers. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 22(1), 32–44. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1325

Lozano, R. (2015). A holistic perspective on corporate sustainability drivers. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 22(1), 32–44. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1325

Martin, D. M., & Schouten, J. W. (2012). *Sustainable marketing*. Pearson.

Martinez, M. A., Zouaghi, F., & Marco, T. G. (2017). Gender diversity and innovation performance in business. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 118, 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.02.009

Mazur, B., Białostocka, P., & Zawadzki, M. (2020). The management of primary and secondary dimensions of diversity: A theoretical overview. *Cultural Management: Science and Education*, 4(1), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.2478/cz-2020-0002

Messarra, L. C. (2014). Religious diversity at work: Mediating role of employee performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(23), 13–23.

Michaela, S., Deanne, D., Paul, L., & Janique, S. (2003). Multidimensional diversity and its effects on team dynamics. *International Journal of Diversity in Organizations*, 3(2), 55–69.

Moon, T. W., Youn, N., Hur, W.-M., & Kim, M. (2018). Spiritual leadership, organizational learning, and employee creative behavior. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(7), 886–901.

Mor-Barak, M. E. (2015). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Mushtaq, R., Ismail, M., & Jamil, R. A. (2015). Workforce diversity and innovation in telecom sector in Pakistan. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 12(2), 412–419.

Nkomo, S. M. (1995). Identities and the complexity of diversity. In M. M. Chemers, S. Oskamp, & M. A. Costanzo (Eds.), *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace* (pp. 247–275). SAGE Publications.

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2018). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage* (11th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Nwagbara, U., & Reid, P. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and management trends: Changing times and changing strategies. *Economic Insights – Trends and Challenges*, 65(2), 1–11.

Nwaoma, C. (2022). *Gender diversity and inclusive leadership in Nigerian organizations*. Unpublished manuscript.

Nwaoma, C. (2024). *Workforce diversity and organizational sustainability in Nigerian corporations. International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation*, 3(1), 1–19

Nwaoma, C. (2024). *Workforce diversity and organizational sustainability in Nigerian corporations*. Unpublished manuscript.

Odeyemi, T. (2014). Ethnic and state identity challenges in Nigerian civil service. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 8(5), 150–160. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPSIR2013.0635

Ogbo, A., Eneh, O., Agbaeze, E., Chukwu, B., & Isijiola, A. (2017). Towards a sustainable economy in Nigeria: The role of corporate social responsibility in business. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i2/2652

Ojo, J. D. (2019). Ethnic pluralism and public sector performance in Nigeria. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 11(4), 34–42. https://doi.org/10.5897/JASD2019.0531

Olowookere, E. I. (2021). Gender equity and institutional reforms in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 5(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5114421

Omotayo, F. O. (2020). Gender inclusion strategies in Nigerian higher institutions. *African Journal of Gender and Development*, 10(1), 77–89.

Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies*, 24(3), 403–441. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840603024003910

Østergaard, C. R., Timmermans, B., & Kristinsson, K. (2011). Does a different view create something new? The effect of employee diversity on innovation. *Research Policy*, 40(3), 500–509. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.11.004

Ozbilgin, M., & Tatli, A. (2008). *Global diversity management: An evidence-based approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Page, S. E. (2007). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton University Press.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002). The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(12), 56–68.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78–92.

Prasad, M. (2017). *The effect of workforce diversity on organizational effectiveness: A study of banks in Ethiopia*. African Journal of Business and Economic Research, 12(1), 111–125.

Quisenberry, W. L. (2012). Corporate social responsibility and its impact on firm performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 106(1), 85–97.

Rasticova, M., & Ogg, A. (2019). Workforce diversity as a driver of innovation: Evidence from multinational corporations. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(3), 67–80. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v9i3.15014

Reskin, B. F. (2003). Including mechanisms in our models of ascriptive inequality: 2002 presidential address. *American Sociological Review*, 68(1), 1–21.

Ritzer, G. (2012). *Sociological theory* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (15th ed.). Pearson.

Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Vohra, N. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (15th ed.). Pearson Education India.

Roundy, P. T. (2009). Work and spirituality: The integration of personal values with organizational culture. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 13(2), 105–114.

Scarborough, W. J. (2019). Gender diversity in the workplace and performance outcomes: A review. *Sociology Compass*, 13(9), e12728. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12728

Schaltegger, S., & Wagner, M. (2006). Integrative management of sustainability performance, measurement and reporting. *International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation*, 3(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJAAPE.2006.010098

Schaltegger, S., & Wagner, M. (2006). Integrative management of sustainability performance, measurement and reporting. *International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation*, 3(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJAAPE.2006.010098

Scott, K. D., & Byrd, M. Y. (2012). *Theoretical foundations of diversity education*. Stylus Publishing.

Sharfman, M. P., & Fernando, C. S. (2008). Environmental risk management and the cost of capital. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(6), 569–592. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.678

Somiartha, I. G. P., Putu, A. S., & Putra, I. G. A. M. (2024). Organizational performance and workforce development. *Journal of Business and Management*, 26(3), 98–109.

Spanos, M. (2022). Managing the complexity of workplace diversity. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 35(4), 612–628.

Steiner, G. A. (2008). *Strategic planning: What every manager must know* (2nd ed.). *International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation*, 3(1), 1–19

Sun, Y., Cui, L., Zhang, C., & Li, Y. (2017). Organizational innovation: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 2(3), 115–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2017.02.001

Telyani, S., Zargar, T., & Negarandeh, R. (2022). The impact of age diversity on innovation and job satisfaction in organizational teams. *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, 18(1), 98–115.

Terry, D. J., & Hogg, M. A. (1996). Group norms and the attitude–behavior relationship: A role for group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(8), 776–793. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167296228002

Van Vuuren, L. J., Visser, D., & Botha, M. (2016). Diversity competence: A strategic advantage. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v14i1.749

Vieira, D. R., Garcia, C., & Tavares, L. (2023). Workforce diversity and innovation in global enterprises: A systematic review. *Journal of Global Business and Management*, 15(1), 30–47.

Zouaghi, I., Sánchez, M., & Martínez-Ros, E. (2020). R&D, innovation and exporting: A double source of diversity in firms. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 32(3), 345–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2019.1651560.