DIVERSITY WITHIN DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

ADVANCED SERIES IN MANAGEMENT

SERIES EDITORS: MIGUEL R. OLIVAS-LUJÁN AND TANYA BONDAROUK

This page intentionally left blank

DIVERSITY WITHIN DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT: TYPES OF DIVERSITY IN ORGANIZATIONS

EDITED BY

ANDRI GEORGIADOU
UCLan Cyprus, School of Business, Cyprus

MARIA ALEJANDRA GONZALEZ-PEREZ
Universidad EAFIT, Colombia

MIGUEL R. OLIVAS-LUJÁN
Clarion University of Pennsylvania, USA

Reprints and permissions service
Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

ISOQAR
REGISTERED

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Contents

About the Authors

Toyin Adisa is Lecturer in Organizational Behavior at the University of East London, UK, where he teaches and conducts research in the area of organizational behavior and human resources. Email: tadisa@uel.ac.uk

Irene Campos-García (PhD) graduated in Economics and Journalism from Carlos III University (Spain) and holds a PhD degree in Management from the Rey Juan Carlos University (Spain). She is currently a Visiting Professor at Rey Juan Carlos University. She is also member of the research team "Iberoamerican Project of Management and CSR". Email: irene.campos@urjc.es

Julio C. Canedo (PhD) is an Assistant Professor of Management at the Marilyn Davies College of Business of the University of Houston Downtown. He earned his PhD degree from the University of Texas at San Antonio. His research focuses on HRM, e-HRM, leadership, and cross-cultural issues. Some of his work has been published in *Research in Human Resource Management*, the *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, and *Organizational Dynamics*. Email: canedosotoj@uhd.edu.

Holly Chiu (PhD) obtained her PhD from Rutgers Business School and is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Business Management at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York. Her research interests include influence tactics, innovation implementation, and knowledge sharing. Her works can be found in journals such as the *British Journal of Management* and *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Email: haochiu@brooklyn.cuny.edu

Dianna Contreras Krueger, PhD, The University of Texas at San Antonio, is an Assistant Professor at Tarleton State University. Her research focuses on selection and diversity in organizations. Results of her research have been published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* and *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of the Internet at Work*. Email: Krueger@Tarleton.Edu

Dov Fischer (PhD, CPA) is Associate Professor of Accounting at Brooklyn College. He has published in the *Journal of Business Ethics*, *CPA Journal*, *Journal of Corporate Accounting and Finance*, and other leading academic and practitioner journals in accounting and ethics. Email: dfischer@brooklyn.cuny.edu

Hershey H. Friedman (PhD) is Professor of Business at Brooklyn College's Murray Koppelman School of Business. Dr. Friedman received his PhD from the Graduate Center of CUNY. He has held both the Bernard H. Stern Chair of Humor and the Murray Koppelman Professorship. Email: Hersheyf@brooklyn.cuny.edu

Andri Georgiadou (FHEA, PhD, MSc, MBA, PgC, BSc) is a Fulbright Visiting Professor at the Pennsylvania State University, United States of America, and an Adjunct Professor at the Department of Hotel and Tourism Management at Cyprus University of Technology. In 2018, she established and since then manages the Equality, Inclusion and Diversity Center in Cyprus. Email: andri.georgiadou@cut.ac.cy

Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez (PhD, MBS, Psy) is Full Professor of Management at Universidad EAFIT (Colombia). Prof. Gonzalez-Perez was the Vice President of Administration at the Academy of International Business (AIB) (2015−2018), and she is the current regional chapter chair for Latin America and the Caribbean (2018−2021). Email: mgonza40@eafit.edu.co

Isis Gutiérrez-Martínez (PhD) is Professor at Universidad de las Américas Puebla (UDLAP) in Mexico. She holds a PhD in Management Science from CNAM in Paris, France. Her research interests focus on human resource management, diversity in organizations, and information technology management. She is an active contributor at leading international journals and conferences, and her research has been funded by several international grants. Email: isis.gutierrez@udlap.mx

Carolina Herrera-Cano holds a master's in International Business (Universidad EAFIT, Colombia). She is an Associate Professor at Universidad Autónoma Latinoamericana (UNAULA) − Business-Administration Faculty, and a lecturer at Universidad EAFIT and Universidad de Antioquia in Colombia. She has worked in CSR, sustainable development, and gender projects. She is a member at the UNAULA Gender Observatory. Email: carolina.herreraca@unaula.edu.co

Karsten Jonsen is a Research Professor at IMD Business School, Lausanne, Switzerland. His research interests and publications include cross-cultural management, workforce diversity and inclusion, team performance, virtual teams, organizational values, cosmopolitanism, career mobility, as well as research methodology. His most recent work on research methodology and cosmopolitanism was published in *Organizational Research Methods*, *International Studies of Management & Organization*, and *Journal of Management*. Email: karsten.jonsen@imd.org

Ilias Kapareliotis (PhD) has been a member of the Deree faculty since 2014. He has taught courses in the areas of Marketing Management and Marketing Communications. His current teaching involves such courses as Fundamentals of Marketing, and Business Research Methods. His research interests include luxury branding, brand management, brand valuation systems, ethnographic methods in luxury branding, corporate branding for higher education, and SMEs branding. He currently serves as Head of the Marketing Department. Email: ikapareliotis@acg.edu

Jacob Lauring (PhD) is a Professor at Department of Management, Aarhus University. Jakob Lauring's research interests are focused on different themes

within international management. More specifically, expatriate management and multicultural teams (co-located and virtual). Jakob Lauring has published more than 100 international articles in outlets such as Journal of World Business, British Journal of Management, Human Resource Management Journal, and International Business Review. Email: jala@mgmt.au.dk

Anaid Loredo is a Research Assistant at CIECAS in the Instituto Politécnico Nacional of Mexico. She is a communications and electronics engineer from ESIME-IPN in Mexico City. Recently she graduated from the master's program in Technology Policy Management from CIECAS. Her professional interests go from technology management to social innovation, and she is currently working with a community association in topics related to social inclusion and diversity. Email: anaidlosa@hotmail.com

Kimberly M. Lukaszewski received her PhD from the University at Albany, State University of New York. She is currently an Associate Professor of Management at Wright State University. Her research focuses on diversity issues and human resource technology. Results of her research have been published in *Human Resource Management Review* and *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. Email: Kimberly.Lukaszewski@wright.edu

Vimbi Petrus Mahlangu (BA Ed. (Vista University); BEd; MEd; PhD (University of Pretoria)) is Associate Professor at UNISA, (DELM), responsible for teaching and research. He is a recipient of Dean's Award for Excellence in Teaching in Faculty of Education (2011) (University of Pretoria). He has published articles in accredited journals, a book, and book chapters. Email: mahlavp@unisa.ac.za

Humberto Merritt (PhD) is Full-Time Professor of Science and Technology Policy at Instituto Politécnico Nacional in Mexico (CIECAS-IPN), where he is Faculty Director of the master's program on Technology Management. He holds a PhD in Science and Technology Policy from Sussex University (SPRU), a master's degree in Economics from El Colegio de Mexico, and a BA from the Metropolitan Autonomous University of Mexico. Email: hmerritt@ipn.mx

Leslie Migliaccio (MA, PhDc) is a Doctoral Student in the Applied-Organizational Psychology program at Hofstra University. She specializes in diversity and inclusion research and is particularly interested in understanding the barriers to becoming a White ally. She is a leadership and team coach, specializing in coaching humanitarian professionals and rising minority leaders. Email: lmigliaccio1@pride.hofstra.edu

Georgia-Zozeta Miliopoulou (MA, PhD) has over 25 years of experience as a creative advertising executive. She holds an MA and PhD from Panteion University, currently teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in advertising and new media. She is a member of the Women in Business Committee in the American Hellenic Chamber of Commerce. Email: gmiliopoulou@acg.edu

Arash Najmaei (PhD) is a Business Consultant and Data Scientist in Sydney. He is also Adjunct Lecturer at the Australian Catholic University. Email: arash.najmaei@acu.edu.au

Miguel R. Olivas-Luján (PhD) is Professor at Clarion University of Pennsylvania. A chairperson (2014−2019) for the Management Education and Development (MED) division of the Academy of Management, his agenda includes Diversity, Information Technologies, Culture, Nonprofits, and related. His work has been presented in all inhabited continents and published in four languages; he serves in various editorial boards. Email: molivas@clarion.edu

Zahra Sadeghinejad (PhD) graduated from the Macquarie University in Australia in 2014. She is a consultant and lecturer based in Sydney. Email: zsadeghinejad_karkavandi@icme.edu.au

Nicholas P. Salter (PhD) is an Industrial-Organizational (I-O) Psychologist and an Associate Professor at the Ramapo College of New Jersey as well as an adjunct instructor at Hofstra University. As the primary investigator of the LGBTQ Workplace Experiences research lab, he leads a team that regularly conducts research and presents at national conferences. Email: nsalter@ramapo.edu.

Jan Selmer (PhD) is Professor, Department of Management, Aarhus University, Denmark. His research interest lies in expatriate management. He is the Founding Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Global Mobility*: *The Home of Expatriate Management Research* (Emerald). His academic production includes 10 books and numerous journal articles in international peer-reviewed academic journals. Email: selmer@mgmt.au.dk

Dianna L. Stone (PhD, Purdue University) is a Professor at the Universities of New Mexico, Albany, Virginia Tech. Her research focuses on diversity, eHRM, and privacy. She is Editor of Research in HRM and Associate Editor of HRMR. She is a Fellow of SIOP, *American Psychological Association*, and *Association of Psychological Sciences*. Email: dianna6@vt.edu

Kingsley Utam (PhD) is a Lecturer in the School of Management Sciences at National Open University of Nigeria. He is currently researching ethnic diversity and inclusion practices and policies of transnational corporations in Nigeria for his PhD at the University of Bradford, UK. His research interests include diversity and organizational behavior. Email: k.u.utam@bradford.ac.uk

Ronald Scott Wolf (MIB, PhDc) is a Researcher, Writer, and PhD Student in political science at Universidad EAFIT in Medellín, Colombia. His research focuses on the historical and complex relationship, examining both hard and soft power dynamics, between the United States and countries in Latin America. He is an active member of both the Latin American Studies Association and the Academy of International Business-Latin America Chapter (AIB-LAT). Email: rwolf@eafit.edu.co

José Ángel Zúñiga-Vicente (PhD) is a Professor of Management and Organization at the Rey Juan Carlos University in Spain. He was a visiting professor at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Warwick Business School, Copenhagen Business School, Polytechnic Institute of Coimbra and Middlesex University London. His research is currently focused on leadership, top management teams, employee downsizing, and other aspects related to human resources, innovation, internationalization, and gender diversity. Email: joseangel.zuniga@urjc.es

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)

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 that 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