

MAKING THE PUBLIC SERVICE MILLENNIAL

Generational Diversity in Public Service



LIZA IRENI SABAN, MAYA SHERMAN, AND KEREN SHLOMI

MAKING THE
PUBLIC SERVICE
MILLENNIAL

MAKING THE PUBLIC SERVICE MILLENNIAL

Generational Diversity in Public Service

**LIZA IRENI SABAN, MAYA SHERMAN,
AND KEREN SHLOMI**

**SUNY
PRESS**

Published by State University of New York Press, Albany

© 2022 State University of New York

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission. No part of this book may be stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means including electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission in writing of the publisher.

For information, contact State University of New York Press, Albany, NY
www.sunypress.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Ireni Saban, Liza, author. | Sherman, Maya, author. | Sholmi, Keren, author.

Title: Making the public service millennial : generational diversity in public service / Liza Ireni Saban, Maya Sherman, and Keren Sholmi.

Description: Albany : State University of New York Press, [2022] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022009666 | ISBN 9781438490779 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9781438490793 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Civil service—United States. | Generation Y—United States—Attitudes. | Diversity in the workplace—United States—Management. | Intergenerational relations—United States. | Conflict of generations in the workplace—United States.

Classification: LCC JK692 .I74 2022 | DDC 352.6/30973—dc23/eng/20220810
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022009666>

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1 Diversity Management	7
CHAPTER 2 Generational Diversity—A Literature Overview	29
CHAPTER 3 Theories and Measurement of Ethical Decision-Making	85
CHAPTER 4 Antecedents of Ethical Judgments in the Public Service	111
CHAPTER 5 Generational Diversity and Public Service Ethics in Israel	125
CONCLUSION	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY	155
INDEX	203

Introduction

“Millennials are frequently written off as narcissistic, arrogant, and fickle. Although there is certainly some truth in such negative perceptions, the millennials also can be quite impressive in their ambitions and achievements. They are a generation of conflicting characteristics—self-absorbed but also civic minded.”

—Alsop, 2008, p. vii

As Generation Z (a.k.a iGen/Genzers/Genzees) gains media traction for its environmental protests and concern for the planet as a whole, the peculiarities of its predecessor—Generation Y (a.k.a Millennials/Gen Y/Generation Next)—is gradually paring down in public interest (Alsop, 2008). While such a process is expected for every generation as it reaches its apex, we assert that Generation Y has yet to entrench its generational vocation, distinctly within the workforce and precisely, within the public sector.

Researchers concur that by the end of the year 2020, Millennials are expected to be fully integrated into the labor force, just as Generation Z begins to enter it (Thompson, 2017). Interestingly, one ramification of the increase of the human lifespan is an increase in the retirement age. Therefore, the integration of Generation Z brings forth a new reality where four different generational cohorts are working side by side. Each cohort is conversant with its own habits, customs, skills, and standards, each with its own disparate needs that often contrast the others’ required accommodations. From this perspective of cohort-bound forms of aging, five categories of generational cohorts are classified in literature: (a) the Traditionalists (also termed Veterans; individuals born between 1922 and 1945); (b) the Baby Boomers (individuals born between 1946 and

1964); (c) Generation Xers (individuals born between 1965 and 1980); (d) Generation Y/Millennials (individuals born between 1979 and 1990); and (e) Generation Z (born between 1991 and 2002) (Zemke et al., 2000).

Accordingly, the amalgamation of these five generational cohorts poses new challenges, never before encountered in the Westernized labor force, requiring further scrutiny and interpretation. Even though it is too early to discern the effects of iGen's integration into the workforce, much can be discussed in relation to Generation Y, particularly in terms of the distinction in ethical perceptions, values, and morals.

While the divergences in attitude and culture are taxing to all sectors, they are particularly noticeable within the public sector, presumably on account of the sector's conservative attitude and technologically incompetent nature. In opposition to previous multi-generational cohorts, however, it would appear that Generation Y's conflicting outlook with these public institutions is not only vexing to the sector but also throwing off-course the long-accustomed, quintessential *modus-operandi*. This is especially reflected in Generation Y's lack of loyalty to the workplace, as they've shown to frequently change career paths; and in their inability to abide by certain pre-established regulations, which they believe are no longer fitted to present realities.

Millennials are unlike any other youth generation in living memory. They are more numerous, more affluent, better educated, and more ethnically diverse . . . They are beginning to manifest a wide array of positive social habits that older Americans no longer associate with youth, including a new focus on teamwork, achievement, modesty, and a good conduct. Only a few years from now, this can-do youth revolution will overwhelm the cynics and pessimists . . . This cohort wants to behave ethically (85%) with almost one-third willing to quit their job if they perceive their firm is behaving unethically . . . They also value working for more environmentally conscious companies (53%) and are willing to take less salary to do so . . . They are altruistic, care about volunteerism (85%), and believe it is important to give back to the community through unpaid service. (Strauss & Howe, 2000)

As a by-product, the Millennials' motivation to serve the public sector is steadily deteriorating. The 2011 survey conducted by the National

Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), graduate students' interest in government and/or public-sector careers has dropped significantly (Bright & Graham, 2015).

The pretext behind this decline is ambivalent and is open to many interpretations. Some believe that the lack of interest in working in the public sector is a result of poor academic curriculums; weakening of the public-sector job market; the nature of governance, and subsequently, the rise of additional employment opportunities in the third sector and/or business sector—particularly the emergence of the tech industry and other opportunities made available as a result of globalization. Nonetheless, a repeated postulation is that which claims students hold the position that government organizations are not rewarding enough, as opposed to private sector organizations (Infeld & Adams, 2011).

Instinctively, one might be tempted to pair the lack of interest in government work with the preconceived notion that Millennials are “spoiled” or “sheltered”—“trophy” kids if you will. However, we would like to offer another perspective by first examining what this unique generational cohort perceives to be “rewarding” in the first place.

By the same token, we wish to challenge the commonly held belief that it is up to members of Generation Y to adjust themselves to the public sector. We maintain that the opposite is true—the system must learn to accommodate Generation Y and pay close attention to their demands. Not because they are special and must continue to be sheltered in the workplace, just as they were at home, but because a state's fate depends on it.

It is crucial to remember that unlike those cohorts before it, this cohort has plenty of other employment opportunities, often more attractive in other sectors—many of which tend to clash with the state's principal propositions and *modus operandi* (e.g., Facebook, Google, etc.). These other institutions offer Millennials exactly what they need to be content. As a result, they bring into their lineups the most adroit of workers, thereby depriving the public sector of the people most ideal for serving the state.

Ultimately, a lack of competent employees could, in turn, hinder—or even altogether prevent—the state's ability to address internal as well as external matters as they come, and perhaps further erode the younger generation's trust in the system. Therefore, the public sector must make an effort to cater to Generation Y, both for the sake of the younger generation's confidence in the state system and for the sake of the state's growth and development.

This book takes as its basic premise that generational diversity contributes to managing ethics and leadership in the public service that meets the public interest. In the future, the public workplace will be experiencing increased mobility and technological competencies required to satisfy social needs. Generational diversity management in public organizations may affect the public sector ethos and values and, in turn, may improve managerial efficiency, policy effectiveness, public service performance, and public trust in the public sector.

However, to benefit from the advantages of a generationally diverse workforce, public managers need to use it as a strategy through which the different experiences, workforce values, and competencies of public service employees play a part in improving performance, replacing retirees, and attracting competent staff. As such, the public service will become an attractive employer for Millennials.

Therefore, this project aims to highlight innovative practices in the pursuit and management of workforce diversity in the public sector and suggest some practical guidelines to enhance and make the most of a diverse workforce in the public service. The identification of trade-offs generated by a diverse public workforce and the measures adopted to support them are core elements of this project.

Chapter 1 discusses the development of the concept of diversity in the public service and the implementation of diversity management in recruitment, hiring, retainment, and managing a diverse workforce to enhance performance in public organizations. In this chapter, we review the literature on diversity practices in the area of human resource management (HRM). We focus on the theoretical underpinning of diversity management to evaluate HRM strategies and policies to manage diversity effectively. Our framework will also help researchers identify key areas for future research and guide practitioners to formulate and implement diversity appropriately.

Chapter 2 provides a valuable and thoughtful understanding of the theoretical foundation for generational differences based on the generational cohort approach. We first introduce definitions of generational boundaries that have been adopted in academic research and an organizational context; second, we identify generational differences in work-related attitudes and values; finally, we discuss the gaps in the literature and the implications of applying a cohort-based approach in public management and ethics. By approaching this study from a cohort-based approach, we could gain a clear and compelling picture of the similarities and differences between

generational attitudes and behaviors, and their potential impact on individual and organizational decision-making and practice. In particular, it is suggested that the challenge for public-sector managers recruiting Generation Y employees, who are likely to have a distinctive set of values, beliefs, expectations, and attitudes, could affect the way this cohort approaches ethical issues and values conflicts that arise in daily practice.

Chapter 3 draws on ethical decision-making theories and models. Ethical decision-making is the process whereby individuals apply their ethical reasoning and attitudes to determine whether a given situation or issue is right or wrong. Ethical decision-making studies offer comprehensive cognitive models of ethical reasoning and examine individual and organizational variables that may facilitate or hinder ethical decision-making.

Chapter 4 aims to comprehend further why public servants engage in unethical behavior. We will briefly overview recent studies examining the antecedents and consequences of ethical judgment in public service. The scholarly discourse of public sector ethics identifies several antecedents to ethical judgment classified as organizational, environmental, and personal demographic characteristics underlying a wide array of global- and geographic-based trends.

Chapter 5 offers empirical testing of how generational diversity affects the extent to which successive generations of public service employees hold that public service ethos encourages ethical decision-making and behavior. The first objective of the research presented in the chapter is to stipulate and measure work-values differences and similarities across generations in the public service given the coming of age of a younger generation and the retirement of an older generation. It implies that understanding generational diversity in public sector values as they are inducted or socialized into normative attitudes and behaviors may facilitate the development of diversity management practices to address growing challenges spawned by age diversity. The proposed research is of special importance, given the disturbing growth of corruption and ethical misconduct in the public sector in Israel.

The second objective is to uncover the underlying mechanism of PSE (public sector ethos) by scrutinizing the effects of the three dimensions of PSE and ethical decision-making regarding ethically questionable conduct in the public service across generational cohorts. By focusing on the interaction effect between PSE and generational cohort on ethical sensitivity, rather than on the chosen variables alone, our study aims to contribute to the burgeoning exploration of the dynamic nature of the PSE

construct in predicting what forms of ethical attitudes and judgments are associated with the most recent generation to enter the public service. An examination of the sort suggested here will focus on generational differences and their possible effect on public management, providing for informed management strategies to ethical training and code enforcement placed on the agenda of administrative ethics committees. Public managers need to be more proactive than reactionary in handling diversity issues involving members of different generations, including ethical issues.

For that, we define the construct of ethical sensitivity, public service ethos, and generational cohort. Second, we offer a set of propositions about how each variable influences the perceptions of ethical sensitivity in the public service and examine the effect of the interaction between PSE and generational cohorts on ethical sensitivity among public service employees in Israel. Next, we present a scenario-based instrument to measure ethical sensitivity, examining its association with public service ethos on a sample of 674 Israeli government-agency employees. We conclude by considering the implications of our findings for developing further research on the generational cohorts' understanding of PSE and public administration ethics for improving the effectiveness of diversity-management practices in organizational ethics in the future.

Finally, this book proposes to identify innovative practices in the pursuit and management of generational workforce diversity in the public sector and to provide some practical guidelines to enhance and make the most of Millennials working in the public service. Identifying trade-offs generated by a diverse public workforce and the strategies adopted to address them are core elements of demonstrating moral entrepreneurship of the public service.

Chapter 1

Diversity Management

This chapter highlights the development of diversity in the public service and the implementation of diversity management in recruitment, hiring, and retainment, to manage a diverse workforce and enhance performance in public organizations. In this chapter, we review the literature on diversity practices in human resource management (HRM). We focus on the theoretical underpinning of diversity management to evaluate HRM strategies and policies to manage diversity effectively. Our framework will also enable scholars to identify key milestones for future research and guide practitioners to formulate and implement diversity appropriately.

1.1. Conceptualization of Diversity in the Workplace

Diversity is often defined as a multifaceted concept. Robbins et al. (2012) indicate that the construct of diversity covers a broad range of attributes and conditions that distinguish individuals from one another. Therefore, diversity is hard to define. In its simplest form, diversity is associated with the distribution of concept differences among members of a given group (Babalola & Marques, 2013; Hays-Thomas, 2004; Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Konrad, 2003). A more subjective definition of diversity is offered by Loden and Rosener (1991, p. 223) as “otherness or those human qualities that are different from our own and outside groups to which we belong, yet present in other individuals and groups.” A more in-depth definition of diversity, which encompasses different organizational variations and needs, and includes both business and ethical imperative reasoning is provided by Wise and Tschirhart (2000, p. 387):

a self-conscious, programmatic approach affecting the policies, culture, and structure of an organization that incorporates a diverse workforce as a way to enhance organizational efficiency and effectiveness . . . [with a focus] on achieving positive outcomes from the interaction of individuals who vary in their degree of heterogeneity [which is] . . . the collective (all-inclusive) mixture of human differences and similarities along a given dimension.

Dimensions of diversity among workforce members include “race, culture, religion, gender, sexual preference, age, profession, organizational or team tenure, personality type, functional background, education level, political party, and other demographic, socioeconomic, and psychographic characteristics” (Wise & Tschirhart, 2000, p. 2). For example, *ethnicity and race diversity* practices were first introduced by passing the Civil Rights Act and the Equality Act in the US. Research on earlier ethnicity and race diversity in the workplace initiated during the late 1960s focused on ethnic and racial discrimination in recruitment and training and professional development, performance evaluation, and rewards (Shore et al., 2009). The impact of ethnic and racial differences between employees was measured in terms of job satisfaction, commitment, organizational motivation, and leadership (Kamenou et al., 2013; McKay & McDaniel, 2006; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998).

Nonetheless, studies on work teams yielded inconsistent findings (Jackson et al., 2003; Mannix & Neale, 2005). While it is commonly agreed that a diverse workforce contributes to an inclusive organizational environment necessary to drive innovation and foster creativity, the results of the studies on ethnically diverse work teams in comparison to homogeneous teams are not significant (e.g., Jehn & Bezrukova, 2004; McLeod et al., 1996; Watson et al., 1993; Webber & Donahue, 2001) or diverse teams produced negative effects (e.g., Jackson & Joshi, 2004; Kirkman et al., 2004). This evidence is often supported theoretically by the similarity-attraction paradigm of team composition, which maintains that members’ perceptions of others, as frequently inferred based on similarity in demographic attributes, lead to attraction among team members (O’Reilly et al., 1989; Smith et al., 1994; Wiersema & Bantel, 1992). Cultural diversity engages with the effects of workforce diversity and organizational outcomes (Gelfand et al., 2007). Cultural diversity has been linked to the influence of positive organizational outcomes such as information processing, learning,

and development of problem-solving competencies (Cox et al., 1991; Ely & Thomas, 2001). However, research on the implementation of cultural diversity practices in the workforce has also yielded negative stereotyping and social categorization regarding the behavior and perceptions among members of organizations (Dahlin et al., 2005). According to research, measuring the effects of cultural diversity in the workforce is challenging, especially in facilitating or restraining inter-professional collaboration in teams (; Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; Gelfand et al., 2007; Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1992; Milliken & Martins, 1996).

The topic of gender diversity has resulted in a substantive body of literature on measuring the effects of gender differences on organizational outcomes across organizational functions, including attitudes to diversity, group efficacy and performance, organizational commitment to diversity, and a pro-diversity culture of female inclusionary policies (e.g., Bilimoria, 2006; Ely, 2004; Karakowsky et al., 2004; Lee & Farh, 2004; Mannix & Neale, 2005; Mavin et al., 2014; Rau & Hyland, 2003; Sawyerr et al., 2005). Prior research on the role of gender diversity in organizational performance has demonstrated two potentially problematic domains, namely, wage discrimination and inequality. While some efforts have been made to decrease the gender wage gap (e.g., by corrective pay measures such as merit pay awards), it remains extensive (Blau & Khan, 2006). Gender differences are assumed to play a moderating factor through the employee orientation process and subsequently to job satisfaction levels.

Disability diversity has been recently considered one of the important dimensions of diversity management in the workplace (Bell, 2012; Ren et al., 2008). Scholars have found different effects across the variety of types of disability, but as a whole, disability diversity raises negative perceptions such as prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination, and stigma in the workplace (Malo & Pagán, 2012; Schur et al., 2009). A potentially positive effect is found when the organization's management addresses disability diversity in the daily practices, with appropriate workplace adjustments or flexible work spheres and schedules, and when attracting and integrating a diverse workforce (Ball et al., 2005; Baumgärtner et al., 2014; Kulkarni & Lengnick-Hall, 2011; Wooten, 2008;). Consequently, corporate leadership and culture play a crucial role in encouraging or discouraging inclusive attitudes and practices for employees with disabilities (Schur et al., 2005).

Sexual orientation diversity management is essentially targeted at fostering positive effects of sexual orientation and mitigating its negative effects (Ozturk & Rumens, 2014; Ragins & Wiethoff, 2005). This type of

diversity represents an invisible or underlying type of diversity instead of more visible traits such as race or gender. Research on sexual orientation diversity (e.g., gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transsexual (LGBT) employees) has been predominantly focused on heterosexism and discriminatory practices. The concept of heterosexism can be defined as “an ideological system that denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes any non-heterosexual form of behavior, identity, relationship, or community” (Herek, 1990, p. 316). Research has demonstrated that heterosexism in the organization can lead to a decrease in perceived productivity, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and professional growth, as well as high turnover intentions among gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees (Berg & Lien, 2002; Blandford, 2003; Brown, 1998; Ellis & Riggle, 1995; Klawitter & Flatt, 1998; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Van Hove & Lievens, 2003).

It is indicated that gay and lesbian employees may choose to work in lower-paying sectors or occupations such as the public sector, enabling them to disclose their sexual orientation in the workplace so that they feel more comfortable openly expressing their sexual orientation at work. This openness in lower-paying sectors is often more highly valued than monetary reward. The first bill on sexual orientation discrimination was introduced in the US Congress in 1974. An increase in the number of LGBT employees in the workforce was already evident to HR managers in the eighties (Day & Schoenrade, 2000). Consequently, in May of 1993, the board of the Society for Human Resource Management, the premier national association of American human resource practitioners, introduced a resolution to include sexual orientation in its statement, acclaiming the value of a diverse workforce (Day & Schoenrade, 2000). By 1994, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) was introduced in the United States Congress. The act would prohibit civilian nonreligious employees with at least 15 employees from discriminating against employees based on sexual orientation or gender identity. It should be noted that the bill failed several times. Until 2009, each proposal for protecting sexual diversity had failed. Currently, 21 states have laws that ban sexual orientation discrimination: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin. Due to the limited number of states that enabled the law, LGBT people are more likely to face serious discrimination in employment, including being fired, denied a promotion, or experiencing harassment. Despite the adoption of LGBT-friendly HR practices and organizational performance (Chuang et al., 2011; Wang &

Schwarz, 2010), more research is needed to measure the effects of existing institutional mechanisms of LGBT-friendly policies by organizations on sexual orientation diversity in the workforce (Van Hove & Lievens, 2003).

In the literature on human resource management (HRM), a distinction is being made between visible and invisible diversities when theorizing diversity (Kossek et al., 2005; SHRM, 2012). Visible diversity refers to those differences that are unchangeable and external. Visible diversity refers to certain identity groups, such as gender, race, and physical disability¹ (Foldy, 2002). In comparison, invisible diversity refers to those differences which are not instantly recognized or considered. Invisible differences can include, for example, family history, sexual orientation, political opinion, religion, culture, and education. The complexity in defining invisible diversity lies in the process of intersectionality, which addresses how intersecting social identities (e.g., gender, race, sexuality, class) interact in complex ways to construct simultaneous forms of dominance and subordination, and privilege and oppression (patriarchy, colonialism, imperialism, neoliberalism, etc.) (Brah & Phoenix 2013; Patil, 2013, p. 850; Warner and Shields 2013).

As such, intersectionality's conceptual boundaries take on various contextual meanings, interpretations, and analyses. Intersectionality, as Bose (2012) has recently argued, is becoming an emerging favorite for methodological design since it has been shown as the best tool for investigating cross-cutting themes, such as health, religion, or militarization. These themes are composed of interrelated foundations upon which broad inequalities or manifestations of oppression are built (Bose 2012; Hankivsky & Renee, 2011). The field of intersectionality grants researchers the ability to see how interlocking systems of oppression converge to create a complex interplay of multiplicity and intersecting identities within structures of power. Furthermore, burgeoning research has begun to explore the relationship between "intersectionality in action" and social movement organization. Albeit still in its fledgling stages of exploration, the interplay between intersectionality and social movements promises to demystify the various pathways to identities affected and informed by oppression within an organizational structure.

Due to socio-political context shifts, an added layer of complexity to invisible diversity encompasses generational differences. For example,

1. One should note that disability is considered both a visible and an invisible type of diversity, see the discussion in Konrad, Alison M. (Ed); Prasad, Pushkala (Ed); Pringle, Judith K. (Ed). *Examining the Contours of Workplace Diversity: Concepts, Contexts, and Challenges*. Thompson-Southwestern, Mason, Ohio, 2005 (chapter 16).

in the United States, older people may define themselves as “Blacks” while younger people may use “African Americans.” Cultural variations influence the conceptualization of diversity, specifically in the workplace environment. For example, in the US workplace, diversity is associated with differences in gender, race, ethnicity, age (including generational age), physical disability, religion, and sexual orientation. In Europe, diversity refers to language, culture, and nationality (Mor Barak, 2005). Therefore, understanding diversity’s conceptual variations across countries (and even subcultures) requires the analysis of the social meanings and relative power positions of diversity groups (Haq, 2004). This approach builds on Konrad’s (2003) definition of diversity that emphasizes intergroup interaction and is inclusive of power differences, rather than concentrating on individual differences. Furthermore, one must take into account past discrimination and oppression in producing socially marginalized groups.

Gazley, Chang, and Bingham (2010) differentiate between diversity and representativeness, which are often used interchangeably. They suggest that diversity holds a different meaning from representativeness as it is “closely synonymous with a variety of heterogeneity, or having qualities or characteristics,” while representativeness is viewed as a “more purposeful term, referring to the extent to which an organization reflects constituent characteristics in its governance or operations” (p. 610).

Additionally, closely related to the concept of diversity is the concept of cultural competency. Cross (1988) defined cultural competency as “a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or professional and enable that system, agency, or professional to work effectively in cross cultural situations” (p. 1). Wyatt-Nichol and Antwi-Boasiako (2008) offer to define cultural competency as “the ability to effectively interact with individuals different from oneself” (p. 79). Drawing on these definitions, the concept of cultural competency is distinguished from the concept of diversity in that it provides a more inclusive framework that better meets the multi-dimensions of diversity (Norman-Major & Gooden, 2012). It is by no means suggested that cultural competency and diversity may not be integrated to foster diversity management strategies. Indeed, cultural competency is the mechanism through which diversity is managed appropriately. This goes the other way around—if diversity does not evolve, cultural competency will become a meaningless instrument (Sabharwal & Royster, 2014). Therefore, both diversity and cultural competency are needed to better account for and foster various diversity management practices across sectors.

1.2. Managing Diversity in the Workplace

Diversity management is human resource management (HRM) practice that aims to promote a diverse workforce in recruitment, hiring, and retention to improve organizational performance and efficiency as well as encourage social justice and inclusion (Cunningham, 2009; Morrison et al., 2006). It is difficult to locate the origin of diversity initiatives in the workforce. According to McCormick (2007), the first modern equal employment legislation was introduced in the United States Congress in 1943 (and subsequent legislative initiatives proposed over the next 20 years). In 1948, President Truman signed Executive Order 9981 to bring together the armed services, which is observed as introducing diversity initiative in the workplace (McCormick, 2007). The Executive Order 9981 specified equality of treatment and opportunity in the armed services but did not go further to forbid segregation. As it is stated in Executive Order 9981: “It is hereby declared to be the policy of the President that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin” (Note the lack of reference to “sex” among the protected categories) (See Executive Order 9981, “Establishing the President’s Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services,” July 26, 1948). Both President Truman and the President’s Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services created to administer the integration of the armed services used Executive Order 9981 to manage the integration of the armed services. This initiative has led to the integration of 95% of African American army soldiers in integrated service units (Truman Presidential Museum and Library, Desegregation of the Armed Forces Documents at www.trumanlibrary.org). During the 1960s, social and political changes led to the passage of civil rights legislation that prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, and later, age. Indeed, in the course of the congressional debates over Title VII, amendments were proposed that would have also prohibited discrimination based on age.² While these amendments were defeated, Congress asked the secretary of labor to deliver insights on the effects of age discrimination (McCormick, 2007). In 1965, the secretary of labor issued *The Older American Workers—Age Discrimination in Employ-*

2. See 42 U.S.C. 2000e, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, (“Title VII”); 29 U.S.C. 621, The Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

ment report, which recorded discrimination against older workers, which later became the basis for the Age Discrimination in Employment Act in 1967. Consequently, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 signaled the beginning of raising the awareness of workplace diversity in the US by providing the regulatory framework for advancing the interest of people of color in the workplace.

During the 1990s, research on diversity focused mainly on representative bureaucracy, affirmative action, and equal employment opportunities (Grabosky & Rosenbloom, 1975; Kellough, 1990; Meier, 1975; Meier & Nigro, 1976; Nachmias & Rosenbloom, 1973; Rosenbloom, 1977). Studies aimed at evaluating the adequate representation of women and minority groups enrolled in public organizations to the extent to which government organizations mirror the composition of the larger population they are committed to serving. Scholars were interested in finding whether the government succeeded in complying with the laws and regulations governing the public service, thus prohibiting discrimination in recruitment, selection, and other human resources functions (Cornwell & Kellough, 1994; Kellough, 1990; Lewis, 1996; Lewis & Allee, 1992; Nkomo & Cox, 1999). These studies showed confusing findings as several studies documented the government's ability to manage diversity among public servants by providing equal employment opportunities to women and people of color. However, at the same time, they also showed the failure of the government to gain the advantages of this diversity to increase the effectiveness of public service delivery (Cornwell & Kellough, 1994; Foldy, 2004; Gentile, 1994; Riccucci, 2002).

In 1990, Thomas first introduced diversity management as an organizational strategy for enhancing an environment in which employees are able to reach their full potential in pursuit of organizational objectives. Thomas defined diversity as a concept that "includes everyone: it is not something that is defined by race or gender. It extends to age, personal and corporate background, education, function, and personality. It includes lifestyle, sexual preference, geographic origin, tenure with the organization . . . and management and non-management" (1990, p. 12). Such definition of diversity views individuals as different and equally valued, thus ignoring power relations between identity groups. Similarly, Ivancevich and Gilbert (2000, p. 75) defined managing diversity practice as "the systematic and planned commitment by organizations to recruit, retain, reward, and promote a heterogeneous mix of employees." Pitts (2006, p. 235) suggests that "diversity management is a multifaceted concept" and,

as such, encompasses three components: “recruitment programs, cultural awareness initiatives, and pragmatic management policies.” Critics of the implicit hierarchical power of the term managing diversity view it as the powerholders’ “continued commitment to pursuing control . . . under the guise of liberal affirmation” (Casey, 2002, p. 143). Therefore, a hierarchy of appropriateness and differential disbursement of power within and amongst identity groups approaches regards diversity management as part of affirmative action initiatives. Following this approach, diversity management enlists with traditional affirmative action (AA) or equal employment opportunity (EEO) policies (Groeneveld & Verbeek, 2012).

Commonly, a distinction is made between managing diversity and EEO and AA (Cassell, 2001; Hays-Thomas, 2004) by arguing that affirmative action or equal employment opportunity policies (AA/EEO) engage solely in recruitment and selection processes, while diversity management embraces broader organizational policies and methods that aim to increase legitimacy, creativity, and innovation, and positive employee attitudes and behaviors, which improves organizational performance (Ashikali & Groeneveld, 2015; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Groeneveld, 2011; Groeneveld & Van de Walle, 2010; Pitts, 2009). Consequently, diversity management, AA, and EEO differ in terms of methodological operationalization, e.g., managing diversity is based on behavioral research in which the emphasis is on building employees’ competencies through the rewarding system to achieve the objectives such as profit and productivity. Unlike managing diversity, affirmative action uses quantitative techniques to increase the understanding of the impact of diversity on different effects on employees and workplace outcomes (Rice, 2001; 2004).

Drawing on the differences between managing diversity and AA/EEO, it is argued that managing diversity builds on individual assessment presumably in a way that does not increase discrimination or favoritism. Managing diversity carries a legacy of management that is about control, leadership, organization, and power. Moreover, it is commonly argued that managing diversity needs to go beyond a passive (valuing diversity) to an active (managing diversity) approach. An active approach lies within the hierarchical corporate control systems where organizational authority lies with senior management. As such, diversity management should be implemented by senior managers to bring organizational change, including mentoring programs, succession planning, responsive programs, alternative work arrangements, training, and accountability (Bozeman & Feeney, 2009; Kellough & Naff, 2004; Morrison, 1992; Pitts,