**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 1: The Growing Interest in Racial Diversity in Public Administration**

Because Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 protects employees from sexual, age, racial, color, and national origin discrimination, the US workforce is becoming diversified in terms of various demographic attributes (Choi 2011). In particular, racial diversity has dramatically increased in the past 50 years, and this trend is predicted to continue in the foreseeable future (Craig, Rucker, and Richeson 2018). Indeed, the survey results about population diversity provided by Pew Research Center (2015) have revealed that although the non-Hispanic population accounted for 84% of the US population in 1965, this proportion dropped to 62% in 2015, and the projection for 2055 is less than 50%. Along with an increase in the racial composition of the US population, the workforce of the public sector has become heterogeneous with respect to race. For example, whereas minority employees made up 28.4% of the federal government workforce in 1994 (Choi 2011), the number increased to 32.3% in 2015 based on our data. In line with this, public administration scholars have called for considerable attention to how racial diversity influences organizational outcomes in the public sector (Pitts and Towne 2015; Pitts and Wise 2010; Sabharwal, Levine, and D’Agostino 2018). Therefore, this study particularly focuses on the racial diversity in US federal agencies.

**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 2: The Possibility of Nonlinear Effects of Diversity on Organizational Outcomes**

Note that nonlinear relationships between diversity and its outcomes may exist. For example, negative associations between demographic diversity and organizational outcomes (Qin, Smyrnios, and Deng 2012) may be attenuated or become insignificant because time reduces the relational conflicts caused by social categorization processes (Pitts and Jarry 2009; Harrison, Price, and Bell 1998; Harrison et al. 2002). Scholars have suggested that the salience of social categories in heterogeneous workforces can recede over time as demographically diverse employees try to re-categorize themselves as in-group members and thus achieve higher levels of familiarity with all organizational members. Scholars have also proposed that the relationships between demographic diversity and organizational outcomes are largely contingent on the level of diversity, which means that the relationships can be curvilinear (Haas 2010). In particular, as the levels of diversity steadily increase from low to moderate, demographic diversity can trigger severe relational conflicts that result in negative consequences for organizational functioning; however, such conflicts begin diminishing as the diversity increases from moderate to high levels. Thus, racial diversity could possibly have a U-shaped relationship with affective commitment climate and an inverted U-shaped relationship with race-based employment discrimination. For example, the growth of racial diversity may initially lead to low levels of affective commitment climate and high levels of race-based employment discrimination because of stereotyping and a lack of cohesion stemming from social categorization processes (Avery, McKay, and Wilson 2008; Maume, Rubin, and Brody 2014). However, if racial diversity exceeds its moderate level and becomes excessively high, the relationships between racial diversity and the two organizational outcomes weaken owing to an increase in the minority representation in the workforce.

**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 3: The Potential for the Relationship Between the Relative Power and Experience of Employment Discrimination**

One potentially important predictor of employment discrimination that we do not control because of data limitation is the relative power created by various organizational sources, such as job positions with managerial authority, education, and job security. According to Stainback, Ratliff, and Roscigno (2011), organizational members who have greater relative power vis-à-vis their coworkers and managers are not susceptible to workplace discrimination. That is, minority employees in an organization that is highly diversified in terms of race may be less likely to experience race-based employment discrimination if they have more job security, higher education, and longer job tenure than others with low levels of relative power.

**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 4: Limitation of Measuring Ethical Leadership Using FEVS**

We recognize here that other, more nuanced, moral and ethical leadership conceptualizations and measures exist. Although we are unable to fully employ these in the measures available to us, they deserve recognition not only to better contextualize the limitations of our own measures but also to illustrate the future directions that scholars might explore with the objective of better understanding the link between ethical leadership and diversity management. For example, Hassan, Wright, and Yukl’s (2014, 337) Ethical Leadership Questionnaire includes “honesty, integrity, fairness, accountability, integrity (consistency of actions with values), and ethical guidance.” Brown, Treviño, and Harrison (2005, 120) have defined ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making.” This definition highlights two dimensions of an ethical leader: the moral person and moral manager. The moral person dimension considers ethical leaders as role models for ethical conduct for employees, who personally exhibit ethical traits, including integrity, honesty, fairness, trustworthiness, concern for others, and respect for others (Brown and Treviño 2006; Brown, Treviño, and Harrison 2005). As moral managers, ethical leaders encourage employees to conduct ethical behavior by frequently discussing ethical rules and standards with them, rewarding or punishing employees who behave ethically or unethically, respectively, and making fair and balanced decisions (Brown and Treviño 2006; Brown, Treviño, and Harrison 2005).

**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 5: US Federal Sub-agencies in This Study (*N* = 65)**

Unfortunately, confirming whether respondents understand that the term *organization* or *work unit* in survey questions means their agency or sub-agency is not possible. No specific terms capture sub-agencies in all the questions of FEVS. Thus, we do not deal with this problem. However, we believe that sub-agencies are better than agencies as units of analysis because agencies are very large in size with numerous employees and many sub-agencies. It is plausible that respondents consider that the *organization* or *work unit* is the sub-agency where they perform their task and that their immediate supervisor in the same sub-agency manages them. In response to reviewer comments, in table A in the appendix, we list all sub-agencies drawn from their own parent agencies. We believe that this will help readers better understand the units of analysis.

Table A. US Federal Sub-agencies in This Study (*N* = 65)

|  |
| --- |
| *Department of Agriculture (N = 7)* |
| Agricultural Research ServiceRural Housing ServiceForeign Agricultural ServiceForest Service | Natural Resources Conservation ServiceFood Safety and Inspection ServiceFarm Service Agency |
| *Department of* *Commerce (N = 4)* |
| National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Bureau of the Census | International Trade Administration  |
| *Department of Defense (N = 7)* |
| Defense Information Services AgencyDefense Logistics AgencyDefense Contract Audit AgencyDepartment of Defense Education Activity | Defense Commissary AgencyDefense Finance and Accounting ServiceDefense Contract Management Agency |
| *Department of Justice (N = 7)* |
| Federal Bureau of InvestigationBureau of PrisonsDrug Enforcement AdministrationUnited States Marshals Service | Executive Office for United States Attorneys Executive Office for Immigration Review Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives |
| *Department of Labor (N = 5)* |
| Employment & Training AdministrationBureau of Labor StatisticsMine Safety & Health Administration | Occupational Safety & Health AdministrationWage and Hour Division |
| *Department of Health and Human Services (N = 7)* |
| Health Resources and Services AdministrationFood and Drug AdministrationIndian Health ServiceNational Institutes of Health | Centers for Disease Control and PreventionCenters for Medicare & Medicaid ServicesAdministration for Children and Families |
| *Department of Homeland Security (N = 7)* |
| Citizenship and Immigration ServicesCoast GuardSecret ServiceImmigration and Customs Enforcement | Customs and Border ProtectionFederal Law Enforcement Training CenterFederal Emergency Management Agency |
| *Department of the Interior (N = 6)* |  |
| Bureau of Land ManagementBureau of Indian AffairsBureau of Reclamation | US Geological SurveyNational Park ServiceUS Fish and Wildlife Service |
| *Department of Transportation (N = 2)* |
| Federal Aviation Administration | Federal Highway Administration |
| *Department of Treasury (N = 4)* |
| Departmental OfficesInternal Revenue Service | Bureau of Engraving and PrintingTreasury Inspector General for Tax Administration |
| *Department of* *Veterans Affairs (N = 3)* |
| Veterans Benefits AdministrationNational Cemetery Administration | Veterans Health Administration |
| *National Aeronautics and Space Administration (N = 7)* |
| Ames Research CenterJohn Glenn Research CenterLangley Research CenterGoddard Space Flight Center | George C. Marshall Space Flight CenterLyndon B. Johnson Space CenterJohn F. Kennedy Space Center |

**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 6: Aggregating FEVS Using Survey Weights**

In each FEVS, OPM offers the weights of survey respondents. This information is generated using information about demographic characteristics, such as gender, race, supervisory status, age, and organization size. The use of weights ensures that the full population of federal employees is considered by allowing each employee to have the same probability of being selected (Fernandez et al. 2015). Therefore, the analysis of the data with weights could improve the precision and accuracy of our survey estimates.

**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 7: ICC(1), ICC(2), and *F* values**

We used two forms of interclass correlation (ICC) values to check the reliability of group responses: the intraclass coefficient ICC(1) and the group mean reliability ICC(2). ICC(1) indicates the proportion of the total variance that can be explained by group membership, whereas ICC(2) represents an estimate of the reliability of the group means. According to Bliese (2000), ICC(1) values that are different from zero are desirable. Glick (1985) has suggested that the recommended criterion of ICC(2) is greater than .60. The results of ICC(1) for the independent variables created from FEVS 2010 to FEVS 2015 range from .02 to .03. In addition, the results of ICC(2) for the independent variables created from FEVS 2010 to FEVS 2015 range from .95 to .96. Finally, we performed an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test to examine between-group variation, and all *F* values were significant at the .01 level. Therefore, the analyses confirmed that the ICC(1) and ICC(2) values were above the recommended levels proposed for sub-agency variables with significant *F*-tests, which suggests that the aggregated variables validly captured employees’ shared perception or experience at the sub-agency level.

Table B. ICC(1), ICC(2), and *F* values

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Variable | ICC(1) | ICC(2) | F |
| 2010 | Collective affective commitment | .03 | .96 | 24.82\*\*\* |
|  | Ethical leadership | .02 | .95 | 21.93\*\*\* |
|  | Diversity management | .03 | .96 | 26.92\*\*\* |
|  | Whistle-blowing attitude | .02 | .96 | 23.29\*\*\* |
|  | Fair evaluation for performance | .02 | .95 | 19.67\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Collective affective commitment | .03 | .96 | 24.62\*\*\* |
|  | Ethical leadership | .02 | .97 | 22.90\*\*\* |
|  | Diversity management | .03 | .96 | 26.24\*\*\* |
|  | Whistle-blowing attitude | .02 | .95 | 21.70\*\*\* |
|  | Fair evaluation for performance | .02 | .95 | 21.65\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | Collective affective commitment | .02 | .99 | 86.99\*\*\* |
|  | Ethical leadership | .02 | .99 | 82.09\*\*\* |
|  | Diversity management | .03 | .99 | 95.44\*\*\* |
|  | Whistle-blowing attitude | .02 | .99 | 78.17\*\*\* |
|  | Fair evaluation for performance | .02 | .99 | 78.17\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | Collective affective commitment | .03 | .98 | 61.93\*\*\* |
|  | Ethical leadership | .03 | .98 | 54.17\*\*\* |
|  | Diversity management | .03 | .98 | 62.75\*\*\* |
|  | Whistle-blowing attitude | .02 | .98 | 47.39\*\*\* |
|  | Fair evaluation for performance | .02 | .98 | 43.84\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Collective affective commitment | .04 | .99 | 98.39\*\*\* |
|  | Ethical leadership | .03 | .99 | 79.94\*\*\* |
|  | Diversity management | .04 | .99 | 85.12\*\*\* |
|  | Whistle-blowing attitude | .03 | .98 | 65.66\*\*\* |
|  | Fair evaluation for performance | .02 | .98 | 64.37\*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Collective affective commitment | .05 | .99 | 137.09\*\*\* |
|  | Ethical leadership | .03 | .99 | 91.96\*\*\* |
|  | Diversity management | .04 | .99 | 99.34\*\*\* |
|  | Whistle-blowing attitude | .03 | .99 | 81.14\*\*\* |
|  | Fair evaluation for performance | .03 | .99 | 83.63\*\*\* |

\*\*\**p* < .01.

**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 8: Employees’ Trust in Leaders as an Aspect of Ethical Leadership**

As an anonymous reviewer pointed out, confidence and trust in leadership are often regarded as employee outcomes of leadership rather than personal traits of leaders in the field of public management. This point is true and acknowledged. Nevertheless, in the literature on ethical leadership, another point of view regarding trust in leadership is also feasible. For instance, according to Brown, Treviño, and Harrison (2005, 120), “normatively appropriate” represents that leaders are honest, trustworthy, sincere, and principled in their managerial behaviors and decision-making. That is, by being trustworthy and credible, ethical leaders model the importance of engaging in ethical behaviors (Resick et al. 2013). Indeed, Brown et al. (2005, 125) have used an item to measure leader trustworthiness: “[My leader] can be trusted.”

**SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 9: Distinctions Between Measurement of Ethical Leadership and Transformational Leadership Using FEVS**

Our literature review shows that some public administration scholars measured transformational leadership using four items of FEVS as follows: “My organization’s leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity” (idealized influence), “Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes” (individualized consideration), “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce” (inspirational motivation), and “I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things” (intellectual stimulation; Oberfield 2014; Caillier 2016; Caillier and Sa 2017). As discussed above, our measure of ethical leadership shares the same item that reflects the idealized influence of transformational leadership: “My organization’s leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity” (idealized influence). However, the three additional items used to create ethical leadership in this study do not share the measure of transformational leadership: “My supervisor/team leader treats me with respect” (respect), “I have trust and confidence in my supervisor” (trust), and “My supervisor/team leader listens to what I have to say” (ability to listen).
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