

Diversity within Diversity: Equality and Managing Diversity

Andri Georgiadou, Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez and Miguel R. Olivas-Luján

Abstract

Purpose — The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the research presented in this edited volume.

Design/Methodology — This report is based on 13 chapters, which vary in terms of research approach, design, and method, yet aims to present different types of diversity in organizations.

Findings — The chapters shed light on existing practices promulgating the value of diversity, while opening the road toward diverse definitions of diversity. Contributors provide a critical reflection of the current discourse on different types of diversity around the world. Findings indicate that multinational organizations are regularly confronted with the absence of the necessary sensitivity on behalf of their top management team and spokespeople. Empirical studies advocate strategies that could potentially facilitate both organizations and immigrants to overcome a plethora of challenges.

Originality — The report summarizes and integrates novel insights on how organizations approach, view, and manage different types of diversity.

Keywords: Diversity management; discrimination; equality; equal opportunities; globalization; multicultural issues; immigrants; human rights

All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others. (George Orwell in *Animal Farm*, 1945)

Diversity within Diversity Management: Types of Diversity in Organizations

Advanced Series in Management, Volume 22, 1–16

Copyright © 2019 by Emerald Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 1877-6361/doi:10.1108/S1877-636120190000022001

Introduction

Globalization describes the processes which characterize the growing interconnectivity and interdependence in the world; it has three readily identifiable dimensions (Gonzalez-Perez, 2013a). The primary economic dimension involves those changes associated with the expansion and restructuring of international economic relations. The second dimension of globalization involves the development of a homogeneous worldwide culture, promoted by the extensive and rapid innovations in telecommunications and the increasing ease, speed, and affordability of international travel, cultural products, and forms which now can be disseminated globally with great effectiveness. The third, the political dimension, is a product of the economic and cultural dimensions. It involves a perception that the autonomy and policymaking capability of the state is being undermined by the moves to economic and cultural internationalization.

While an emphasis on the integrating and cultural homogenizing effect of globalization suggests a positive contribution toward overcoming conflict between ethnic groups, there are many indications that this is outweighed by more negative developments involving the breakdown of the older nexus between nation, state, societal community, and territory (Gonzalez-Perez, 2013a; Waters, 1994).

Implicit in much of the writing about the replacement of “class” by “identity” or “cultural” politics is the belief that these new movements have a strong irrational component. While this contributes to their potency, it also makes them less susceptible to political compromise and to the acceptance of the rights of other cultural groups (Gonzalez-Perez, 2013b). Such a view predisposes critics to classify as highly dangerous to the stability of the state many different forms of ethnic mobilization, extending from fundamentalist religious groups and militant nationalists to those working to achieve much more limited objectives, including access to education, health, or other institutions for their co-ethnics. Just as the earlier acceptance of simple theories of modern society led to an overly unquestioning acceptance of the decline of ethnicity, their replacement may equally inappropriately see ethnic minorities, and what has been referred to as the politics of recognition associated with “multiculturalism” (Taylor et al., 1994), as inevitably producing ethnic conflict and the disruption of society and the state.

Whereas much consideration of globalization’s effects has addressed its impact on ethnic minorities, a somewhat different perspective considers its impact on the development of racism (Gonzalez-Perez, 2013b).

This edited volume consisting of an introduction and 13 contributed chapters is a collective attempt at examining the increased relevance of studying various sources of diversity in the workplace and the challenges before the management team aiming to establish effective diversity management approaches.

Equality Theories and Diversity Approaches

Miller (1996) identifies four types of equality: ontological equality, equality of condition, equality of opportunity, and equality of outcome. Ontological equality

relates to a belief in the fundamental sameness of human beings. The equality of condition relates to the extension of ontological equality into the social and economic sphere, seeking to level the playing field by attempting to equalize conditions of those who are disadvantaged in society (Kirton & Greene, 2000).

In the employment sphere, equal opportunity has become the most common descriptor.

The liberal approach to equal opportunity derives essentially from the political ideals of classical liberalism and liberal democracy and is based around the view of the rights of the individual to universally applicable standards of justice and citizenship (Jewson & Mason, 1986). The model is predicated on a philosophy of “sameness”: that people should have access to and be assessed within the workplace as individuals, regardless of social category. The model is based on the assumption that people are required to deny or attempt to minimize differences and compete solely on grounds of individual merit (Liff & Wajcman, 1996).

Within a free market philosophy, policies based on the neutral individual are seen as the most efficient means of achieving a fair distribution of resources in the workplace. This has grounding in theories of free market competition and thus refers back to neo-classical explanations of occupational segregation. Within a neo-classical view, discrimination is not an inherent or intrinsic feature of the capitalist labor market but is a distortion of an otherwise rational market. Notions of the free market, central to the liberal approach, are focused on what Jewson and Mason (1986) call “positive action,” where efforts are made to remove obstacles to the operation of the free labor market and meritocratic competition (Kirton & Greene, 2000). This should not be confused with “affirmative actions” derived in the United States, which reflect a more radicalized approach and, some would say, more akin to “positive discrimination.” The liberal approach to equal opportunity underlies the campaigns for anti-discrimination legislation in Britain in the 1970s, leading to the Equal Pay Act (1970), Sex Discrimination Act (1975), and the Race Relations Act (1976). Webb (1997) analyzes the emphasis of these on encouraging employers to develop procedures which formalize fair and meritocratic methods of access to jobs, training, and promotion and lead to the development of a “metaphorical level playing field.” Thus, the liberal approach to equal opportunities (EO) is based on bureaucratization and formalization of procedures within organizations (Jewson & Mason, 1986).

In contrast to the liberal approach, the radical view emphasizes direct intervention in order to achieve not only equality of opportunity but also equality of outcome. Thus, the point is to achieve not only fair procedures but also fair distribution of rewards. In this aim the focus is not on individuals, recognizing that while discrimination affects individuals, it is at a group level that this discrimination can be identified. The philosophy that all people are equal regardless of social group membership should be actively reflected in the distribution of rewards in the workplace. Discrimination is not, therefore, simply a distortion of the free labor market but is a socially constructed part of the market process. This approach recognizes the differential treatment received by members of certain social groups

and the social construction of the differential abilities possessed by members of different social groups (Kirton & Greene, 2000).

While the liberal approach emphasizes the need to formalize procedures, the radical approach emphasizes the need to politicize the processes of decision-making. Policies could involve the imposition of quotas or the necessity to employ a minimum percentage of a certain group of workers (Kirton & Greene, 2000).

Multiculturalism: The Concept

Inglis (1996) analyzes the concept of multiculturalism and the need for new policy responses to ethnic diversity, which has become a word immediately recognized by policymakers, social commentators, academics, and the general public in Western industrial countries.

The rapid adoption of the term “multiculturalism” has occurred in a situation where there is increasing international concern about the limitations of existing policies to address changing patterns of interethnic relations.

References to the term “multiculturalism” and its related adjective “multicultural” can be distinguished in public debate and discussion according to three categories: the demographic-descriptive, the ideological-normative, and the programmatic-political.

The *demographic-descriptive* usage occurs where “multicultural” is used to refer to the existence of ethnically or racially diverse segments in the population of a society or state. It represents a perception that such differences have some social significance, primarily because of perceived cultural differences though these are frequently associated with forms of structural differentiation. The precise ethnic groupings which exist in a State, the significance of ethnicity for social participation in societal institutions, and the processes through which ethnic differentiation is constructed and maintained may vary considerably between individual states and over time.

In the *programmatic-political* usage, “multiculturalism” refers to specific types of programs and policy initiatives designed to respond to and manage ethnic diversity. It was in this usage that “multiculturalism” first gained currency after it was recommended in the 1965 Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. This Report recommended that multiculturalism replace the bicultural policy based on the British and French Charter groups around whom policies for ethnic diversity in Canadian society had been organized for over a century. Since then, its usage has extended rapidly to encompass the “demographic-descriptive” and the ideological-normative usage.

The *ideological-normative* usage of multiculturalism is that which generates the greatest level of debate since it constitutes a slogan and model for political action based on sociological theorizing and ethical–philosophical consideration about the place of those with culturally distinct identities in contemporary society. Multiculturalism emphasizes that acknowledging the existence of ethnic diversity

and ensuring the rights of individuals to retain their culture should go hand in hand with enjoying full access to, participation in, and adherence to constitutional principles and commonly shared values prevailing in the society. By acknowledging the rights of individuals and groups and ensuring their equitable access to society, advocates of multiculturalism also maintain that such a policy benefits both individuals and the larger society by reducing pressures for social conflict based on disadvantage and inequality. They also argue that multiculturalism enriches society as a whole. The close parallels between this ideological-normative usage of multiculturalism and the United Nations' views on cultural diversity are clear.

Critiques of Multiculturalism

Critics argue that positive support of cultural diversity, or multiculturalism, has the potential to foster highly divisive social conflicts (Cockburn, 1989; Kirton & Greene, 2000; Rees, 1998). In support of this position they cite the international resurgence of ethnic conflict. The theoretical support for this and similar expressions of fear about the continuing threats to social cohesion posed by ethnic and cultural diversity derive from one strand of theorizing about modernity. D'Souza (2002) argues that the multicultural objective is to encourage nonwhites (in the US) to cultivate their separate identities and to teach whites (nationals from the US) to accept and even cherish these differences.

Contrary to earlier theories on the declining importance of ethnicity, it is argued that the contemporary processes of modernization and globalization are actively contributing to the growing importance of ethnicity and the increased significance of communitarian ties. What are frequently under-theorized in this type of analysis is the role of the state and the capacities of social policy to intervene in this process so as to reduce the potential for conflict. For some critics of multiculturalism, however, their critique is directed at what they perceive to be the outcome of the implementation of multicultural policies (Inglis, 1996).

A Critique of Equal Opportunities

There are weaknesses in an equal opportunity approach that are largely liberal and focused on procedures and equality of opportunity rather than outcome. Webb (1997) points out there are two main varieties of criticism. The first looks at the legislation and how it has been weakened in practice. The second type concerns where the legislation and its prescriptions have been ignored in routine practice, looking at the extent to which direct and overt discrimination continues (Kirton & Greene, 2000, p. 105). Other explanations for these weaknesses have focused on the lack of political will underlying legislation, the institutional weakness of personnel and human resources managers in organizations, the lack of support from senior management for equal opportunity initiatives, and the limited resources of national bodies (Webb, 1997).

The second variety of criticism is the main concern and critiques the model of EO rather than its effects. In particular, the criticism focuses around the fact that a model based on procedural formalization promises more than it can deliver and is no guarantee of fairness (Cockburn, 1991; Kirton & Greene, 2000; Webb, 1997).

The radical model also has its critics. Cockburn (1989, 1991) identifies how initiatives that aim to deliberately enhance the position of workers from certain social groups are viewed negatively as “special treatment.” Other criticism of the traditional EO approach is that neither the radical nor the liberal approach challenges the status quo (Kirton & Greene, 2000).

The EO measures in law focus on rights and procedures, not outcomes, and therefore they stand as attempts to treat the symptoms of disadvantage and discrimination, rather than the causes (Rees, 1998). Jewson and Mason (1986) allude to their belief that the liberal view ignores or cannot accommodate the structural sources of social capabilities and skills. Cockburn (1989) argues that the short agenda characterizes the traditional EO approach based on treating the symptoms of discrimination and disadvantage, pushing special policies to protect minority social groups or enhancing the position of certain social groups. The long agenda is a campaign and educational system to change the unequal systems and structures and to transform organizational cultures. The long agenda seeks to respond to and respect differences rather than seeking to assist people in fitting into existing organizations and cultures (Kirton & Greene, 2000, p. 108). Corporate success has demanded a good deal of conformity, and employees have voluntarily abandoned most of their ethnic distinctions at the company door (Thomas, 1990, p. 11).

The traditional approach based on “sameness” has been criticized for failing to advance the position of disadvantaged groups of workers and failing to change the unequal systems, structures, and hierarchies that exist.

Policies within the workplace are influenced by wider economic, political, and ideological trends. The literature finds a variety of points of view about the “difference” or diversity model of EO.

Kandola and Fullerton (1994) located the introduction of the term “managing diversity” (MD) in the United States in 1987 and the report *Workforce 2000* by Johnson and Packer (1987) identified the term “heterogeneity” related to the US workforce. Kandola and Fullerton (1994) state that the basic concept of managing diversity is that the workforce consists of a diverse population. The diversity consists of visible and nonvisible differences, which will include factors such as sex, age, background, race, disability, and work style. Managing diversity is founded on the premise that harnessing these differences will create a productive environment in which every person feels valued, where their talents are fully utilized, and where organizational goals are met (Kandola & Fullerton, 1994, p. 8).

The valuing diversity approach moves on from this, acknowledging that some differences are socially based and are significant in perpetuating inequality. The accommodating differences approach is seen as similar to that of the radical approach. The utilizing differences approach makes a specific case for the need to give different treatment in order to recognize the different needs of people within an organization (Kirton & Greene, 2000, p. 110).

Table 1: Managing Diversity versus Equal Opportunities Approaches.

Managing Diversity (MD)	Equal Opportunities (EO)
Seeks to ensure the maximization of potential	Focuses on discrimination
Involves a broader range of people	Covers social categories in EO legislation and policies
MD initiatives tend to be more individualistic	
Attempts to change the culture of organizations	Makes no challenge to the status quo
Focuses on the movement of people within organizations	Focuses on the problems existing in the labor market
Supposes operationalization of guidelines	Supposes commitment with policies and compliance with the law
Emphasis on individuals	Emphasis on social groups
Aims to add value within organization performance	Aims to promote rights according to humanitarian bases

Source: Based on Kirton and Greene (2000, p. 10).

There is an attempt in the ideal of MD organization within the culture to significantly change to a positive view of difference. This is one area where various terms within the “difference” literature converge in MD (Kirton & Greene, 2000).

Rees (1998) talks about “mainstreaming” equality. The mainstreaming of equality is defined as “a process which enables activities to impact on policy and practice. This process includes identifying lessons, clarifying the innovative element and approach that produced the results, their dissemination, validation and transfer. More specifically, mainstreaming also defines the phase of transfer and the way in which other actors take account of results, approaches and key elements elaborated by one or more Development Partnerships” (EQUAL, 2002). This means that equality issues are supposed to disseminate through every function of an organization. Rees (1998) states that in practice, there can be short and long-term agendas in MD.

A Critique of Diversity Model

There is lack of evidence indicating the success of the managing diversity model or proof that the model has been operationalized so that it becomes more than just a name change. As opposed to the rhetoric, actual practice tended to reflect more of a “sameness” agenda rather than recognize a “difference” agenda and approach in

the existing culture. The criticism of the traditional EO approach remains. “Difference” is only value as long as it contributes to profit or organizational objectives (Kirton & Greene, 2000).

Mainstreaming means that there is a need for organizational cultures to be “transformed,” building upon the politics of difference. Because of the pressures from competition in the market, especially during periods of recession, many organizations have policies of “tinkering” or “tailoring” existing initiatives and procedures which do not challenge the inherent inequalities within the structures, systems, and cultures. Webb (1997) claims that, overall, what MD tends to mean is a market-driven and politically nonthreatening EO, which fits within wider trends toward flexibility (Kirton & Greene, 2000, p. 113).

In addition, MD does not have the collective force of disadvantaged groups behind it because of the shift in emphasis from social groups to a focus on individuals. All differences are viewed on the same or similar terms; none are more salient than others in leading disadvantages in the workplace. Personal characteristics such as “work style” are seen as significant and independent of gender or ethnicity.

Dickens (1997) says that the model of EO practice, the role of trade unions, and other employee associations are seen as pivotal pieces in the “jigsaw” making up the campaign for equality in the workplace. It seems that the ideal model of MD could be disempowering, dissolving collective identity and strength. Kandola and Fullerton’s (1991) argument that MD can succeed where EO has failed is weakened (Kirton & Greene, 2000, p. 113).

Based on social group membership, people are not equally powerful, so the emphasis on needing to recognize the interests and differences of individuals may only serve to maintain the power of the dominant groups (Liff & Wajcman, 1996). Kandola and Fullerton (1994, p. 104) acknowledge that some of the work conducted in the name of diversity could enhance rather than reduce the effects of stereotyping.

Liff and Wajcman (1996) state that there is a weakness in a dichotomy that opposes “sameness” and “difference,” and in organizations “sameness” and “difference” continue to be judged against the dominant norm. Kandola and Fullerton (1994, p. 107) acknowledge the apparent growing danger of ignoring what is similar to emphasize difference.

Wider workplace values and fundamental human assumptions are very difficult to manage. There are dangers in the maintenance of the basic safeguards and protections set up in law and code of practice within the liberal EO approach. Dickens (1997) emphasizes the problem. If equality is left totally to the individual employers responding to the diverse labor market, business cases for equality initiatives will always be contingent on such factors as the profitability of the firm or nature of the product market.

Diversity, Equality, and Discrimination in Organizations

Newman (1995) defines organizational culture as a shared set of symbols, language, practices, and deeply embedded beliefs and values. Kirton and Greene (2000) add

that organizations are sites for the creation, reproduction, and enactment of multiple (or diverse) meanings and identities. Legge (1995) calls into question the notion of “shared values” within organizations, such as the assumption that cultural change can be manufactured or managed. The concept of “shared values” is weakened when organizations are analyzed and understood from a gendered or diversity perspective.

Organizational power-holders occupy a structural position from which to manipulate the cultural signals and messages, which causes the dominant group to be seen as those of the organization (Kirton & Greene, 2000).

Newman (1995) criticizes models of organizational culture based on spurious assumptions that underpin them. Newman (1995) found that cultures are “closed societies,” which leads to the neglect of the impact of the external environment, including discrimination and social disadvantage in the wider society. Second, Newman argued that “cultures are integrated wholes” in which a unitary concept of “corporate culture” is drawn upon. Third, “cultures are consensual.” Very little attention is paid to conflict and resistance. Fourth, “culture is objective reality” with a distinct set of uncontested and incontestable characteristics, an assumption which ignores differentiated subjective experiences of organizational culture. Fifth, “culture is static.” A culture is a phenomenon which can be managed and changed in an unproblematic fashion. Newman’s last assumption, “culture can be changed through new symbols,” suggests management intervention at a superficial level will create new values (Newman, 1995, p. 22). The study of organizational culture is concerned with investigating and exploring the qualitative and symbolic aspects of organizational life. These cannot be measured objectively, but require interpretation (Kirton & Greene, 2000).

Alvensson and Billing (1997, p. 107) refer to the “pressure for homogeneity and culturally competent behavior.” This involves individuals, consciously or unconsciously, conforming and adapting to an organization’s evident and latent norms. Within organizations there are pressures for conformity, assimilation and homogeneity, which operate to marginalize or exclude those who are “other” (Kirton & Greene, 2000, p. 76).

Minority Ethnic Workers in Organizations

Disadvantage in the labor market does not “just happen”; it is neither “natural” nor is it solely the unintended consequence of actors’ practices (Jenkins & Parker, 1987, p. 58).

Corckburn (1991) argues that racial stereotypes often inform the allocation of work and employment decisions. While sex stereotyping can result in a *preference* for women in certain occupations (especially in the service and “caring” sectors), race stereotyping rarely results in a preference for minority ethnic people, because race stereotypes almost always connote negative characteristics (Kirton & Greene, 2000, p. 82).

According to Jenkins (1985), racial stereotyping informs managers' and employers' conceptions of "acceptability," and he argues that nonspecific criteria of acceptability shape recruitment decision. Jenkins divides the criteria into three categories – primary, secondary, and tertiary – according to their apparent significance to managers (Kirton & Greene, 2000). Primary criteria include appearance, manner, attitude, and maturity. Secondary criteria include "gut feelings," speech style, age, and the ability to "fit in." Finally, tertiary criteria are English-language competence and employer preferences (Jenkins, 1985, p. 149). Jenkins shows how many of these criteria are not only highly subjective but also racialized. It is in this sense that race discrimination in employment is socially constructed (Kirton & Greene, 2000, p. 82).

Modood (1997) says that different ethnic groups have ascribed cultural traits which are praised or condemned and impact on group members' ability to "fit in." The *belief* that employers discriminate is much more widespread than the actual *experience* of discrimination.

The Policy Models of Multiethnic States

The growing international recognition of the importance of ethnic diversity ensures that states have shared concerns about the need to address diversity in their policies and programs.

Inglis (1996) proposes three abstract policy models, which are ideal types based on specific ideological-normative statements. These concern the relationship between ethnic groups in a society, another level of policy identified by Inglis (1996) – the programmatic-political – which involves actual policy initiatives and programs that have direct and indirect implications for ethnic relations.

At one extreme are policies based on an *assimilationist* model which envisages ethnic minorities incorporated fully into the society and state through a process of individual change in which individuals abandon their distinctive linguistic, cultural, and social characteristics and take on those of the dominant group (Rimbaut, 1997).

At the other extreme are policies based on a *differentialist* model whereby conflict is avoided through a process, which eliminates or minimizes contacts with ethnic minorities. An extreme version of this model involves the expulsion or "ethnic cleansing" of ethnic minorities.

A third major approach to policies accepts the potential and legitimacy of ethnic minorities' cultural and social distinctiveness. The multiculturalist model envisages that individuals and groups can be fully incorporated into the society without either losing their distinctiveness or being denied full participation.

Multiculturalism alone of these three models acknowledges the legitimacy and need for equality of ethnic groups in the expression of their diverse cultures. In doing so it comes closest to a model which has the potential to address the

aspirations contained in the various UN instruments on cultural, linguistic, and religious diversity (Inglis, 1996).

Managing Diversity

The link between managing diversity and building international business capabilities is strong (Nelson, 2001). Operating in the international arena means that businesses will face different ideologies, languages, institutions, customs, beliefs, social systems, and business practices. The interaction between people from a variety of economic, cultural, political, and social backgrounds contributes to the complexity of operating in an international business environment.

The Australian Centre for International Business promotes diversity management as a tool for capturing the diversity dividends (Inglis, 1996). Diversity management focuses on managing the difference within a workforce, capitalizing on the benefits, and minimizing workplace challenges.

Diversity management contributes significantly to the bottom line (Hubbard, 2001; Thomas, 1990). The five main ways diversity management produces the diversity dividend are as follows:

- (1) Improving the efficiency of HRM.
- (2) Fostering superior decision-making, problem-solving, creativity, and innovation key factors in the creation of knowledge firms.
- (3) Developing cross-cultural capabilities that facilitate operations in culturally complex environments abroad and at home.
- (4) Implementing new products/services developments and new sales/marketing strategies for diverse customer bases.
- (5) Avoidance of conflict, communication problems, and a lack of social integration resulting in higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which is reflected in decreased absenteeism and turnover. High levels of job satisfaction lead to increased productivity.

All organizations, whether profit or nonprofit, depend on their ability to get the best possible return on money invested (Hubbard, 2001). Companies are faced with the problem of surviving in a fiercely competitive world. Managers fear that workforce diversity causes a lowering of standards and a sense of “anything goes.” The goal is to manage diversity in such a way as to get from a diverse workforce the same productivity they once got from a homogenous workforce to perform at their full potential (Thomas, 1990).

By discriminating, employers are not tapping into the full potential of human resources available to them. Taran (2002) provides a number of economic arguments against discrimination and in favor of equal treatment.

First, by discriminating in recruitment, employers may be passing over some of the best-qualified candidates for the job, on irrelevant grounds, such as nationality

or race. If they recruit only on the basis of aptitude, where there is no place for discrimination, there need not be any sacrifice of potential productivity.

Similarly, it has also been shown that where discrimination occurs in the workplace, a more frequent disruption of teamwork tends to occur, together with higher absenteeism and reduced morale and commitment. Bad publicity, where discrimination is alleged, may also harm a firm's reputation and consumer loyalty.

On the positive side, particularly with regard to globalization of trade and investment, migrants may offer privileged insight into markets abroad and may speak the language. Migrants and ethnic minorities are also consumers and often make up large communities. The employer of a multiethnic workforce is more likely to attract talented job applicants and investors than the employer who practices discrimination. Diverse workforces add value to business activities through increased creativity and better problem-solving capacities.

Taran (2002) determines that the shared responsibility of all social partners is the action to prevent discrimination and promote equality in employment opportunity and other arenas. In employment matters these partners notably include government, employers, and their associations and workers' organizations.

The ILO argues that efforts to combat discrimination and promote equality can only hope to achieve results if the various measures are implemented by all sectors concerned: employers, workers and community organizations, government, and political and opinion leaders, in connection with international standards and programs.

Modood and Wrench (2001) establish four broad categories of measures: first, voluntary measures focusing on the roles and initiatives of employers, which include collective actions regarding roles and activities of labor and community organizations; second, legislative and legal measures implemented by judicial and extra-judicial bodies of the state; third, administrative measures, regulations, and practices taken by local and national authorities; and fourth, international standards and programs in the work of ILO, UNESCO, the Council of Europe, and other international bodies.

Rationale and Structure of the Volume

Managing diversity means enabling every member of the workforce to perform up to their full potential. Managers have the right to expect, and managers expect everything that an employee has to give to the business. Managers demand satisfactory performance from every member of their workforce.

Diversity is often viewed as a "soft" and "unclear" contributor to the organization's performance and bottom line. The lack of measurement practices for diversity sets managing and leveraging diversity apart from the rest of the organization. The real value of diversity work can only be judged by those who perform it, those who are truly committed to its purpose and value (Hubbard, 2001).

There is no single tried and tested "solution" to diversity and no easy right way to manage barriers. Diversity is often undervalued amid all the other barriers that

face any company, including potential profit, personality conflicts, community dynamics, workplace climate and culture, and the ups and down of the business itself (Thomas, 1990, p. 20).

This edited collection of case studies around the globe seeks to shed light on existing practices promulgating the value of diversity, while opening the road toward diverse definitions of diversity. Contributors provide a critical reflection of the current discourse on different types of diversity around the world.

In Chapter 1, Ronald Scott Wolf and Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez offer an overview of how the Italian multinational Barilla S.p.A. had been affected by prejudicial corporate statements directed toward LGBT persons, as well as how the company responded both internally and to the market in order to attempt to overcome the highly damaging consequences. The value of this chapter lies in the fact that it demonstrates that multinational organizations are regularly confronted with the absence of the necessary sensitivity on behalf of their top management team and spokespeople. In view of that unawareness, unfiltered communication reaches the public, often perceived as potentially harmful to the wider LGBT community.

In Chapter 2, Carolina Herrera-Cano and Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez seek to evaluate the relationship between the participation of women on executive boards of directors and its effect on the firm's financial performance. Interestingly enough, through a meta-analysis and a systematic review, they could not claim a statistically significant correlation between the number of women board members and firms' financial performance. Nevertheless, the chapter indicates how the composition ratios of men and women serving on corporate boards could be used to introduce a greater diversity of leadership approaches and perspectives.

In Chapter 3, Jacob Luring, Jan Selmer and Karsten Jonsen investigates whether individuals' perception of work group members' openness to diversity depends on their demographic groups. The chapter indicates that indeed different demographic groups perceive their peers' openness to diversity differently, thus opening new avenues for decision-making on diversity matters. This empirical study also confirms that task rather than relational conflict is less negative for interpersonal diversity attitudes.

In Chapter 4, Dianna L. Stone, Kimberly M. Lukaszewski, Dianna Contreras Krueger and Julio C. Canedo discuss the underlying factors that foment unfair discrimination toward immigrant employees within organizations through the theoretical lens of social cognition. The chapter makes a significant, unique contribution toward understanding unfair discrimination against immigrants and advocates strategies that could potentially facilitate both organizations and immigrants to overcome these challenges.

Chapter 5 questions whether diverse executives are placed in the appropriate positions that will allow them to best utilize their diverse backgrounds, experiences, and views. Holly Chiu, Dov Fischer, and Hershey Friedman argue that from perusal of literature it is indicated that board diversity has a substantial impact on organizations, disregarding however the impact of diversity in committees, especially when considering that important decisions are often taken by the committees. Reporting a case study of the Coca-Cola Company using its proxy statement in both 2016 and 2018, this chapter suggests that there is an immense need for boards

to review their recruiting and selection strategies to be more inclusive toward female candidates.

In Chapter 6, Vimbi Petrus Mahlangu seeks to provide an opportunity to advance existing knowledge of discrimination, fairness, and inclusion in Higher Education. The paradigms of ways that higher education institutions could manage and promote diversity, equality, and inclusion presented in the chapter can enhance the pedagogic experience and provide students with formative opportunities.

Chapter 7 identifies that allyship can be used as an effective diversity management tool to support reducing discrimination in the workplace. Nicholas P. Salter and Leslie Migliaccio argue that organizations should help to establish and endorse allyship programs as well as to cultivate an overall culture of allyship, in order to implement change, promote diversity, and enhance inclusion in the workplace.

In Chapter 8, Anaïd Loredó and Humberto Merritt review and assess the diversity and social inclusion benefits from a not-for-profit rural telecom initiative in Mexico. This chapter indicates that public policies, including ambiguous government objectives and weak governance, and market competition, such as deficiency of private suppliers and insufficient funds for infrastructure, hinder the promotion of diversity and inclusion among the members of the project.

In Chapter 9, Isis Gutiérrez-Martínez and Miguel R. Olivas-Luján critically outline the gaps in effectiveness of Mexico's labor legislation, as regards equality in employment. Their thorough evaluation and review of both primary and secondary data suggest that the intersectionality of different types of diversity, such as age, disability, and gender, increases discrimination at work. Martínez and Olivas-Luján's analysis indicates that older women with disabilities experience disproportionate discrimination compared to older men and people with disabilities in general.

In Chapter 10, Irene Campos-García, Miguel Olivas-Luján, and José Ángel Zúñiga-Vicente review and assess gender diversity in Spanish multinational companies. This chapter indicates an overall compliance of gender recommendations within the organizations' macro national borders, despite the voluntary character of the corresponding legislation. In fact, cases are being argued where some subsidiaries occasionally exhibit better gender proportions than the national averages in the hosting Latin American countries.

Drawing on their research on inclusive leadership, Arash Najmaei and Zahra Sadeghinejad (Chapter 11) unravel a trend advocating in favor of moving research on inclusive leadership from a humble approach to leadership on education and healthcare toward transforming into a universally desirable style of leadership aligned with the global widespread interest on equality, diversity, and inclusion.

In Chapter 12, Ilias Kapareliotis and Georgia-Zozeta Miliopoulou shed light on the challenges that women face in academia. This chapter introduces a conceptual, inter-rational framework integrating contextual and noncontextual factors that encourage gender bias in academia. The suggested theoretical model is expected to allow scholars to contemplate on policymaking that only considers one or the other.

Finally, in Chapter 13, María Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez and Andri Georgiadou turn our attention to the significant role of dogs in human working lives. Through

a purposive literature review, this chapter reviews the relationship between humans and people, centered around the conceptualization of dogs as social actors. The value of this chapter lies in the fact that it introduces dogs in the literature on diversity management, by highlighting the benefits of their presence at the workplace. Often treated as equal members of the family, pets that are enshrined in the corporate code of conduct have been reported to enhance well-being, trust, and loyalty within those organizations.

It is our hope that this collection will increase our understanding of the many ways in which diversity can be understood, leveraged, and embraced in organizations. The management field can only contribute to profitability and to long-term welfare by exploring and implementing similar practices in local contexts.

References

- Alvensson, M., & Billing, Y. (1997). *Understanding gender and organizations*. London: Sage.
- Cockburn, C. (1991). *In the way of men: Men's resistance to sex equality in organizations*. London: Macmillan.
- Cockburn, C. (1989). Equal opportunities: The long and short agenda. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 20, 213–255.
- Dickens, L. (1997). Gender, race and employment equality in Britain: Inadequate strategies and the role of industrial relations actors. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 28(4), 282–289.
- D'Souza, D. (2002). *What's so great about America*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- EQUAL. (2002). Networking for inclusion. Preparatory documents. Paper presented in Barcelona, 16–17 May.
- Gonzalez-Perez, M. A. (2013a). An eclectic review of critical perspectives on globalization and international business: Setting the context for corporate social responsibility and sustainability. *Advances in Sustainability and Environment*, 12, 1–21.
- Gonzalez-Perez, M. A. (2013b). Global civil society and international business: A review. *Advances in Sustainability and Environment*, 11, 37–63.
- Hubbard, E. (2001). *Measuring diversity results*. Pentaluma, CA: Global Insight Publishing.
- Inglis, C. (1996). *Multiculturalism: New policy responses to diversity*. MOST Policy papers 4, UNESCO, Paris.
- Jenkins, R. (1985). Black workers in the labour market: The price of recession. In P. Braham, A. Rattansi, & R. Skellington (Eds.), *Racism and anti-racism*. London: Sage.
- Jenkins, R., & Parker, G. (1987). Organizational politics and the recruitment of black workers. In G. Lee & R. Loveridge (Eds.), *The manufactured of disadvantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jewson, N., & Mason, D. (1986). The theory and practice of equal opportunities policies: Liberal and radical approaches. *Sociological Review*, 34(2), 307–334.
- Johnson, W. B., & Packer, A. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the twenty first century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.
- Kandola, R., & Fullerton, J. (1996). *Managing the mosaic: Diversity in action*. London: Institute of Personnel Management.
- Kandola, R., & Fullerton, J. (1994). *Managing the mosaic: Diversity in action*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development.

- Kirton, G., & Greene, A. M. (2000). *The dynamics of managing diversity*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Legge, K. (2005). *Human resource management: Rhetorics and realities – 10th anniversary edition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Liff, S., & Wajcman, J. (1996). ‘Sameness’ and ‘difference’ revisited: Which way forward for equal opportunity initiatives? *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(1), 79–94.
- Miller, D. (1996). Equality management: Towards a materialist approach. *Gender, Work and Organizations*, 3(4), 202–214.
- Modood, T. (1997). Qualifications and English language. In T. Modood, B. Richard, L. Jane, N. James, S. Patten, V. Satnam, & B. Sharon, (Eds.), *Ethnic minorities in Britain: Diversity and disadvantage*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Modood, T., & Wrench, J. (2001). *The effectiveness of employment equality policies in relation to immigrants and ethnic minorities in the UK*. Report commissioned by the International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Nelson, B. (2001). *Divided we stand: American workers and the struggle for black equality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Newman, J. (1995). Gender and cultural change. In C. Itzin & J. Newman (Eds.), *Gender, culture and organizational change*. London: Routledge.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996). *Immigrant America: A portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rees, T. (1998). *Mainstreaming equality in the European Union: Education, training and labour market policies*. London: Routledge.
- Taran, P. (2002). *Challenging discrimination in employment: A summary of research and typology of measures*. International Migration Programme, Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Taylor, C., Appiah, K. A., Habermas, J., Rockefeller, S. C., Walzer, M., & Wolf, S. (1994). *Multiculturalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Thomas, R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. In R. Thomas (Ed.), *Harvard business review on managing diversity* (2002). Harvard Business School Press.
- Waters, M. C. (1994). Ethnic and racial identities of second-generation black immigrants in New York City. *International Migration Review*, 28(4), 795–820.
- Webb, J. (1997). The politics of equal opportunity. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 4(3), 159–167.