

A. Ganiyu RAHIM, Akintunde OLUWAFEMI
University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria
Department of Business Administration
abdulrahimajao@yahoo.com, droluakins@gmail.com

Abiodun Ademola AFOLABI
University of Nsukka, Nigeria
Faculty of Business Administration
Department of Management
afolabimails@yahoo.com

HOMOGENEITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF THE WORKFORCE: LEVERAGING ON DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT TO BUILD INCLUSIVE WORKPLACE

Abstract. Given the globalized nature of the contemporary business environment, organisations require more interaction among people from diverse cultures and heterogeneous demographic characteristics than ever before. Consequently, organisations have no other feasible choice but to adopt and implement diversity initiatives that align sameness or differences in workforce composition to build inclusive workplace. This paper sought to examine the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the workforce with a view of leveraging on diversity management to build inclusive workplace. The paper review extant studies on the subject matter to achieve the focal objectives highlighted. The paper documented that diversity management is characterized by ambiguity; as there are numerous diverse reasons and initiatives of diversity management. Moreover, effective diversity management propel cohesion that integrate all members of the organization. The paper further noted that organisational commitment to diversity is rooted less on a moral dictate toward justice and fairness and more on self-serving desire to address external pressures and achieve other desirable outcomes. Consequently, most firms approached diversity issue as a basic response to change which does not capture its essence. The paper concludes that diversity management is good for business and should be viewed as a key mechanism for improving business competitiveness. Similarly, effective diversity management can lead to better talent management and possession of competence to solve long-term problems.

Keywords: diversity, inclusion, equal employment opportunity, gender, diversity management practices, human resource management

JEDNORODNOŚĆ I NIEJEDNORODNOŚĆ SIŁY ROBOCZEJ: ZARZĄDZANIE RÓŻNORODNOŚCIĄ W CELU STWORZENIA MIEJSCA PRACY UMOŻLIWIĄJĄCEGO INTEGRACJĘ SPOŁECZNĄ

Streszczenie. Ze względu na globalny charakter współczesnego otoczenia biznesu, organizacje potrzebują więcej interakcji między osobami z różnych kultur, o niejednorodnych cechach demograficznych, w większym stopniu niż kiedykolwiek wcześniej. W konsekwencji organizacje nie mają innego wyboru, niż zarządzanie różnorodnością, która pozwoli na dostosowanie sposobu zarządzania do zmieniających się warunków i umożliwi poprawę integracji społecznej. Niniejszy artykuł podejmuje próbę badań w zakresie jednorodności i niejednorodności siły roboczej z myślą o wykorzystaniu tej koncepcji do budowy miejsca pracy, umożliwiającego integrację społeczną. Autorzy dokonują przeglądu istniejących publikacji na omawiany temat. Analiza pozwala na stwierdzenie, że zarządzanie różnorodnością charakteryzuje się wysoką wieloznacznością, ponieważ istnieje wiele różnorodnych przyczyn i inicjatyw zarządzania różnorodnością. Ponadto, skuteczne zarządzanie różnorodnością wymaga działań, które integrują wszystkich członków organizacji. Ponadto, w artykule zauważono, że zaangażowanie organizacyjne w zakresie zarządzania różnorodnością jest mniej zakorzenione w postawach moralnych wobec sprawiedliwości i uczciwości, a bardziej oparte na egoistycznych chęciach zaspokojenia nacisków zewnętrznych i osiągnięcia innych pożądaných rezultatów przez organizacje. W konsekwencji większość firm traktuje kwestię różnorodności jako podstawową odpowiedź na zmiany, które zachodzą w obszarze zasobów siły roboczej. W artykule stwierdza się, że zarządzanie różnorodnością jest dobre dla biznesu i powinno być postrzegane jako kluczowy mechanizm dla poprawy konkurencyjności przedsiębiorstw. Podobnie, skuteczne zarządzanie różnorodnością może prowadzić do lepszego zarządzania talentami i posiadania przez organizację kompetencji do rozwiązywania problemów długoterminowych.

Słowa kluczowe: różnorodność, integracja społeczna, równe szanse zatrudnienia, płęć, praktyki zarządzania różnorodnością, zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi

1. Introduction

Business organisations across the globe are going through remarkable shift, cultural changes and globalization processes and one of the immediate consequences of these changes is the realization that today's workforce is more diverse and increasingly complex to manage. Indeed, today's workforce is distinctly multigenerational and represent a pyramid consisting of diverse cultures which may propel grievances and growing concerns for conflict management. Hence, businesses require workforce that is culturally sensitive and globally connected to remain competitive. The increasing trend of workforce diversity no doubt has several implications for human resource executives, employees and the organisation in general. Notwithstanding, diversity management encourage out-of-the box thinking and it has become a de rigueur notion in all form of business organisations. Therefore, for the 21st

century business organisations to thrive and survive they need to do away with mono-managing style which destroy diversity within the workplace (Yang, 2005).

According to The Network of Executive Women (2006), diversity arises in three forms. The innate features of diversity which include ethnicity, gender, age, tribe, sexual orientation and competence. It may also developed from features like income, disposition, religion, job experience, individual lifestyles and geographical locality. Similarly, there are organisational related characteristics like work function, superiority, task domain, and professional association that influence diversity. Viewing diversity in line with the above categorization, the term 'diversity' connotes all of the important variances between people, encompassing diverse factors that might be feasible or hidden, but that need to be reflected in particular conditions and circumstances (Kreitz, 2008). Diversity, according O'Reilly, Williams and Barsade (1998), is an idiosyncratic or subjective occurrence, created by group members themselves who on the basis of their diverse social characteristics classify others as related or divergent. In general term, workforce diversity denote policies and practices that seek to include people within a workforce who are considered to be somewhat dissimilar from those in the dominant population. Carrell (2006) views workforce diversity as the ways that people differ (such as age, gender, race, education, religion, and culture) and which can upset a task or relationship within an organisation.

Within organisations today, diversity management is a colossal issue which can have severe consequences if not properly managed. This is so because, people with diverse backgrounds, behaviours and personalities are now working together and they are bound to view the same event differently and these dissimilarities more often than not lead to conflicts which have their implications at workplace.

According to Mensi-Klarbach (2012), diversity management is an edgy construct in numerous respects. For instance, the drive for managing diversity may originate from several sources: such as the necessity to abide with legal requirements, the aspiration to espouse moral values, and effort to accomplish economic objectives. Although diversity management researchers unite on the notion that differences should be acknowledged and respected, there is little other than broad stereotypes about what institutes a real and what would be a fictional difference; as well as how diverse forms of dissimilarity should be preserved (Mustafa, n.d.). Similarly, it remains vague what 'managing diversity' actually means and how this elusive idea should be put into practice (Pietschmann, 2014). Likewise, most research effort on diversity focused on diversity on the basis of demographic characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, gender, and age (Olsen & Martins, 2012). However, Van Knippenberg and Schippers (2007) and Tatli and Ozbilgin (2012) observe that a mixed results (both positive and negative) have been reported regarding the relationship of demographic diversity on organisational outcomes. On this note, researchers maintain that these mixed findings suggest the need to investigate contextual variables, such as society-level factors (DiTomaso, Post & Parks-Yancy, 2007), time period (Harrison, Price, Gavin & Florey, 2002), and managerial or

firm approaches to diversity management (Joshi & Roh, 2009; Richard, 2000). Likewise, bulk of the literature on diversity management has focused on specific practices; while firms take diverse all-encompassing tactics to diversity and DM, provoking dissimilar effects (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998; Richard & Johnson, 2001; Olsen & Martins, 2012).

In contrast, a number of researchers have offer strong support regarding the debate that well managed workplace diversity constitute strength and that poorly managed workplace diversity is most likely to impede group functioning organisational inefficiency (Kanter & Brinkerhoff, 1991; Kundu, 2001; Matuska & Sałek-Imińska, 2014). According to Roberson, Kulik and Pepper (2003), the benefits of diversity initiatives are dependent on the situation. Likewise, it is doubtful if there is one best way to implement a diversity programs. Hence, the likelihood of success of diversity initiatives depend on situational issues such as the organisational culture, strategies, tasks alignment, environment, as well as cohesion among people in the organisation to build inclusive workplace.

A review of extant of studies reveals that bulk of research work on diversity focused on either case studies or inferences drawn from consultancy projects, hence, a systematic and comprehensive effort to link diversity management to inclusiveness is still scanty. This leads to demands for more systematic review of literature that will elucidate diversity initiative and programs for clearer understanding of the phenomenon (Gilbert, Stead & Ivancevich, 1999; European Commission, 2003). Against the above presentation, this paper seeks to achieve five objectives. The first is to define diversity and diversity management. Since diversity is a multifaceted construct covering numerous components, its conceptualisation is vital to its understanding. The second objective is to elucidate clusters of homogenous and heterogeneous attributes in the workplace and how they intersect with other vital organisational policy and practices to build inclusive workplace. The third objective is to highlight framework for initiating and executing diversity initiatives across the organization. The fourth objective is to provide a better understanding of cohesion in the workplace vis-à-vis elucidate how it can adopted to nurture diversity management and inclusion in the workplace. The fifth objective is to explicate the relevance and attendants benefits of diversity management in the workplace.

2. Theoretical and Literature Review

2.1. Theories on Diversity Management

There are plethora of theories on workforce diversity. Most prominent among these theories are: equal opportunity approach, diversity management approach, and strategic diversity management approach. Equal oppourtunity approach emphasizes the value added of

diversity in the workplace. According to this theory, discrimination in employment is unfair to those who are not treated on the basis of merit (McDonald & Potton, 1996). In other words, equal opportunity approach advocates that all people should be treated equally, unhindered by artificial obstacles, biases or preferences, except when specific peculiarity can be implicitly justified (Bennington & Wein, 2000). Put differently, vital jobs should be given to the 'most qualified' people and employment procedures should be devoid of arbitrary practices such as (religion, sex, ethnicity, or race). By adopting this practices, opportunity for career advancement will be open to everybody that is interested and individual chances to succeed or fail is hinged to his/her personal efforts and not extraneous circumstances (Standing & Baume, 2000).

The ethical challenges of the diversity management approach and the ostensible absence of a business case for the equal opportunities management approach have created a rift in their theoretical as well as industrial application (Cornelius & Gagnon, 2000). Hence, managing diversity is established on the conception of the difference between seeking equal opportunity approach and managing diversity approach (Ross & Schneider, 1992). The strategic diversity management theory on the other hand, involves the whole organisation and it appears superior to other diversity approaches because it deals with the ambiguities in the equal opportunities approach and the managing diversity approach.

2.2. An overview of Diversity Management

Diversity can be view from primary and secondary characteristics, variable and invariable characteristics, and visible and invisible characteristics (Daft, 1994). The first categorisation relate to the difference between the primary (gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, race) and secondary characteristics (education, religion, geographical origin, income, marital status and profession) relate to the central versus the learned elements that can impact the way people perceive themselves and their environment. The second classification – invariable (race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, nationality and socio-economic background) and variable (age, function, education, marital status and physical condition) highlight dissimilarity on the basis of the relative variability of the sources of diversity. The third categorisation relate to the visible (race, ethnicity, gender and age) and the invisible or non-observable features (education, function, experience in the organisation and socio-economic). Thomas and Ely (1996) highlight three perspectives regarding company's attitude to diversity: (1) the discrimination and objectivity model, (2) the access and legality pattern, and (3) the learning and efficacy paradigm. The aforementioned patterns of diversity relate to organisational members' normative views and anticipations about the purpose to diversify, the implication of diversity, and its link to cohesion in the workplace. Dass and Parker (1999) added a fourth viewpoint, the resistance perspective, where a rise in an outside claim for

diversity is regarded as a risk to the enterprise or which may not sufficiently be vital for consideration.

Diversity is commonly defined as admitting, understanding, respecting, and celebrating dissimilarities among people with respect to age, personality, traditions, gender, physical and mental ability, sexual orientation, religion belief and practices among others (Esty, Griffin & Hirsch, 1995). Notwithstanding its elongated account, diversity is yet to gain a strict definition but tends to change in scope and priorities in line with industry practices, regional setting or business requirements. Therefore, managing diversity is a vital constituent of effective workforce management, which can increase workplace productivity (Black Enterprise, 2001). From an inwardly-focusing perspective, Williams and Reilly (cited in Friday & Friday, 2003) view diversity as any characteristic that is noticeable to an individual and which makes him/her observe that he/she is different from another individual. Rose (2007) defines diversity management as the process of engaging and connecting all employees, regardless of their gender, race, sexual orientation and other visible and or invisible dissimilarities that employee possess.

According to Greenberg (2004), workplace diversity highlight variety of dissimilarities between people in a workplace such as race, gender, ethnic group, age, personality, cognitive style, tenure, organisational function, education background etc. Bennet-Alexander (2000) views diversity as a process of creating an environment where differences among people can be 'responsively discussed', such that diversity does not suggest less superior. Bary and Bateman (1996) posit that diversity is similar social traps, that often require members of organisation to engage in behaviour that place self-interest and those of others in conflict; task decision makers to manage contradictions between short-term and long-term consequences of the choice they make which often constrain and devoid choice making, and characteristically encompass considerable social concerns.

Kersten (2000) adopts critical stance on diversity management. He criticizes diversity management based on three perspectives. Firstly, its discourse does not account organisational and established forms of racism. Secondly, it reserves the distinctiveness politics relating to sex and race relationships by dipping such dissimilarities to one among many. Thirdly, it does not offer remedies that will accommodate vital social apprehensions and distracts consideration to less prominent issues. In the same vein, Gilbert et al. (1999) view diversity management as a staple of broad-spectrum organisational cultural change and specific organisational practices which has led some researchers to doubt the potency of diversity management's capability to fine-tune the strains deep-seated in the construct. According to Kirby and Harter (2001), diversity management may experience strains associated with the concept itself, which may conditioned it as a conservative phenomenon that echoes prevailing norms and standards. Similarly, they criticize diversity management as a system of managerial dominance aiming exclusively at enhancing business bottom line.

2.3. Frontier of Diversity Management

From moral and legal point of view, two opposing components of diversity management can be identified (Risberg & Söderberg, 2008). The first perspective, highlights the (legal/moral) commitment of firms to safeguard and improve dissimilarities by decreasing the fundamental precincts inhibiting certain social groups to have opportunity and prosper within the organisations (Ahonen, Tienari, Merilainen & Pullen, 2014). The other component deals with how companies can advance economic advantages by encouraging equality and concentrating on the capabilities of the individual through equal opportunity initiatives (Friday & Friday, 2003).

According to Olsen and Martins (2012), in defining diversity management (DM), numerous researchers view DM as a practice not as a cultural construct. However, effective adoption of DM style is contingent on how well it engages with other features of the organisation and its members. In general, diversity management approaches involve conditions that may be considered interwoven and complex. Olsen and Martins (2012) further note that numerous organisational dynamics could also serve as a contingency issues upsetting the choice of approach to implement diversity management. For instance, individual member characteristics will possibly influence how organization- or unit-level diversity management strategies translate into unit-level outcomes.

According to Chan (1998), a firm with a weak orientation for diversity will have little capability to build consensus among its members on diversity value type (and even whether or not the value exists). From this perspective, a weak value for diversity will become noticeable from unclear or inconsistent communication about DM goals and approaches, as well as incongruities between values and judgments for workplace norms. On the other hand, a resilient orientation for diversity is exhibited when there is little disparity among organisational members about the diversity approaches, and it is expected to be complemented by dependable internal and external issues regarding DM expectations (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). Similarly, organisations may view diversity as a terminal or instrumental value (Olsen & Martins, 2012). Therefore, firm's that pursue DM approaches to accomplish business-related results can be said to hold diversity as an instrumental value. In contrast, organisations that view diversity as a business goal hold diversity as a terminal value. Nonetheless, firms may hold diversity as both a terminal and an instrumental value (Olsen & Martins, 2012).

2.4. Cohesion: the ties that nurture diversity management and inclusion in the workplace

The word cohesion trails the legacy of Kurt Lewin's theory of group dynamics, and Moreno's methodological innovations in the 1930s and 1940s. Their idea was successively advanced by Shills and Janowitz (1948) and Festinger, Schachter and Back (1950) among others. Essentially, Lewin's idea centers on forces that brought and resisted change in the

group, including cohesive and disruptive forces (Lewin, 1948). The Moreno theory on the other hand, studied why and to what extent people are held together in a group (Moreno, 1943). According to Beck and Maessen (2003), because of the elongated scientific and political account of cohesion, it has been connected with diverse associations such as inclusion, segregation, amalgamation, and dissolution among others. Yitzhak and David (2004) observe that social cohesion is the glue that joins society together and it is fundamental to societal solidarity/interaction of human being, shared identities. Vranken (2001) claims that cohesion nurture a sense of belonging to or identification with a group. From the above narratives, social world are unmanageable without cohesion. Cohesion in the context of this paper is the degree to which employees are able to participate in the social and economic life in their workplace under environments which enrich their well-being and individual potential. Notwithstanding its significance, Berman and Phillips (2004) state that social cohesion is not entirely a central pillars of social quality.

According to Bollen and Hoyle (1990) and Paxton and Moody (2003), literature on cohesion proposes numerous alternative terms for the two dimensional structure of cohesion: including affective vs. instrumental cohesion, social vs. task cohesion, interpersonal vs. task-oriented cohesion, and a sense of belonging vs. morale. Literarily, the term cohesion is a state or circumstance of joining or working together to form a strong force. Normally, the first level of secondary-group cohesion is termed organizational cohesion and it is strongly linked with the primary group cohesion, because they both share similar affective and instrumental dimensions (Rush, 1999).

The significance of studying cohesion in the organisational context is that it exposes the effects of experiencing belongingness, which Cooley (1962) refers to as we-ness within a larger entity and this occurrence is termed as esprit de corps or organizational cohesion. Cohesion differs based on the category of group, and particularly as a function of its formal and informal features. However, whatever forms it takes, its potency is very pervasive in regulating individual and group behaviour. More importantly, it has been documented to support several important outcomes such as: performance improvement, high motivation, reducing turnover intention, regulating deviant behaviour, reduced stress, regulating misconduct, and high re-enlistment intentions among others (Salo, 2011). Given its pervasive effect of diversity on social, psychological, and behavioural outcomes, there are countless expressions that have previously been advocated and which by extension have not only promote, but to emphasize the relevance of cohesion in contemporary workplace. For illustration, there is a popular old saying; 'United we stand, divided we fall'. Several others scholars have also made similar representation. Lincoln advocates that 'A house divided against itself cannot stand'. Helen Keller contends that 'Alone we can do so little; together we can achieve so much'.

From the above representation, diversity is like a foe of unity and equality, because, it embraces some and rejects others. Therefore, a successful workplace should recognise human differences, and develop an enduring framework that foster respect, demonstrate sensitivity, and inclusion. No doubt, using every tactics of influence is a standard behavior and is expected in every workplace, however, the old approach of divide and conquer will cause more harm than good in contemporary workplace. Therefore, organizational structure must be align to build inclusive workplace where all employees will cooperate to eliminate the dark shadow of inequality to achieve common purposes.

2.5. Homogeneity and heterogeneity in the workplace

In contemporary business world, diverse workforce will not simply fade away, but will increase proportionately with the increase in population growth. This is truism given the trend of the impending multicultural, multiethnic, multilingual societies we live in. To talk of diversity management portray the need to understand that there are certain dissimilarities among people and that these variances, if managed effectively will lead to better outcomes for individual and organisations (Kandola & Fullerton, 1994). Hence, diversity necessitates a form of organisational culture where individual employee can pursue his or her career ambitions without being subdued by gender, race, nationality, religion, or other factors that are unconnected to performance (Bryan, 1999). The above illustration echoes the principle of intercultural approach that advocates that no one individual completely symbolizes an ethnicity or a race, hence, each person represents his or her own experience as a member of a group and within his or her cultural context (Ponciano & Shabazian, 2012).

From the foregoing, diversity is not about dissimilarities among people, but rather about variances among individuals, because each individual is distinctive and does not symbolise or speak for a specific group. Hence, given the fact that homogeneous groups do not experience substantial cultural obstacles to social dealings, constructive social relations and in-group social interactions are nurtured (Blau cited in Mazur, 2010); and by extension the level of cooperation/satisfaction increase with the attendant benefit of decreasing emotional conflict (Williams & O'Reilly 1998). However, as cultural diversity rises, social contrast and classification processes ensue, and in-groups/out-groups and mental prejudices may transpire, forming obstacles to social interaction (Blau, cited in Mazur, 2010). Consequently, as heterogeneity in groups extends to certain degree, the psychological manners connected with social identity theory and self-categorisation practices may be more likely to emerge and generate negative consequences such as disunity, gender-sensitivity, and discernment towards out-groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). According to Earley and Mosakowski (2000), moderately heterogeneous groups displayed relationship conflict, communication hitches, truncated identification with group norms and negative consequences for the organisations. They further state that groups with high heterogeneity, out-group discernment is less likely to exist.

2.6. Outcomes of Diversity

Notable reason for adopting diversity policies is the motivation to attract and develop competent employees that will offer the organisation economical advantage to generate superior profits that guarantee job security (Carrel, 2006). Accordingly, Konrad (2003) highlights three arguments in support of the business case for diversity. Firstly, rivalry for the top talent entails organisations to stretch out and embrace a progressively diverse workforce. Secondly, the globalised economy requires that firms have a diverse workforce so that they can efficiently deal with an increasingly diverse client base. Thirdly, demographic diversity enhance organisation's competence. Likewise, diversity management is often theorized along the lines of a regular set of binaries: difference/equality, structure/actor, group/individual, and problem/potential (Lorbiecki & Jack, 2000).

In general, diversity outcome can be evaluated at three levels: individual, group and organisation. Regarding individual outcome, occasionally, employee often interpret unconcealed bias against other be it women or minorities which may inhibit social interaction. As regard group outcomes, McLeod, Lobel and Cox (1996) report that that more diverse groups experience superior-quality results on a brainstorming task, compare to homogeneous groups, and exhibited more supportive behavior. Other strands of research documented that the larger the demographic diversity in groups, the lesser the social interconnection (O'Reilly et al., 1998). Lastly, workforce diversity and organisational outcomes highlight that diversity may upsurge customer demand for related products and services (Richard, Kochan & McMillan-Capehart, 2002). Likewise, those firms with more racial diversity and growth strategy experience greater return on equity and net income per employee, compare to firms with a diverse workforce (Richard, 2000).

2.7. Dialectology of Inclusive Workplace

Literarily, inclusion refer to the sense of attachment, respect, value for self-disposition, sense of supportive drive and obligation from others to actualise one potential at workplace. Workplace diversity management, in Thomas (1992) framework highlight inclusive tendency. According to him, diversity is a 'comprehensive managerial process for developing an environment that works for all employees' (p. 10). Burnett (2003) views inclusion as a practice that recognise dissimilarity and the significance that all people offer to the business in the process of creating an environment that encourage efficient utilization of skills. April (2007) expresses similar opinion with Burnett (2003) and conceptualises 'inclusion' as the process of empowering and enabling environments of dissimilarity, where people can be their natural self, securely safe-guarding their interest, valuing others differences, without harming themselves or others.

Logically, while a firm can have a diverse structure, one cannot assume that it is inclusive. The phenomenon of inclusion therefore, take cognizance of not only the methods in which an enterprise relates with its employees, its rules, configurations and programs, but the manners in which the business interact with customers, clients, partners, and vendors (The Network of Women, 2006). Hence, building and preserving inclusive work workplace entails that businesses not only nurture diversity in the workplace, but also address concerns relating to race and culture that influences employees' lives outside of work (Society for Human Resource Management-SHRM, 2007). Beyond the aforementioned, plans for effective inclusion in the workplace entail the need to establish their obligation to issues of diversity in the workplace, given professional supports (through mentoring and networking opportunities), offer competitive reward systems, and executing organisational changes that echoes the admiration and worth that the firm has for its employees (Kisha, Konjit, Sarah & Jennifer, n.d.). On this note, creating inclusive workplace may be a tedious task if individuals and organisations are resistant to change. Therefore, a firm which is dedicated to making the workplace more inclusive should proactively address issues that may inhibit change within the workplace.

3. Discussion

The notion that every individual is different, not only in terms of race, gender, ethnicity, and colour but also with respect to appearance and character has come to be a system of work lifestyle that corporate organisations have to acknowledge and practice to remain successful and competitive. Similarly, cultural changes and globalisation process have increased the pace of interaction among people from diverse cultures, nations, religion affiliation, and other socio-economic backgrounds than ever before. Hence, no organisation would be able to function optimally without considering and implementing diversity management, this is simply because, the workplace is no longer an insular bazaar; where people work only; contemporary workplaces now constitute an environment where all forms of social interaction and interfaces take place among people of diverse cultural, religion and ethnicity background.

Similarly, diversity management is very vital given the present peculiarity of ongoing worldwide migratory phenomena, increasing firms internalisation, the incidence of ethnic minority that has generate collegial societies, multiethnic, multicultural and multi linguistic cultures and the increasing advocate to control glass ceiling that has hitherto blocked career advancement of people. Correspondingly, one of the most fundamental motives for making diversity management as a priority agenda is fairness; which require that employees with similar or diverse background have equal oppourtunity for advancement. Thus, it is vital that

business organisations recognise the similarities/dissimilarities among the diverse groups of its employees and accord due respect to their customs, culture and educational backgrounds among others to sustain group cohesiveness and organisational performance.

The logic of this new thinking is to emphasize business practices and leadership style that accord similar privileges and opportunity to all employees irrespective of ‘sameness’ and ‘difference’ existing among workforce. No doubt, there is no universal recipe or framework for crafting the business case for diversity. Hence, the business case for each enterprise will be contingent on firm priorities and peculiarities, which must accommodate diverse interests among stakeholders. Consequently, firms need to cultivate a thorough understanding of the business case for diversity, as well as the economic obligation for broadening their capacity level, addressing inequality and eliminating prejudice practices to build inclusive work places. Although managing diversity and attempt to build inclusive workplace is challenging, given the fact that, diversity extends beyond identifying and acknowledging dissimilarities in people. It encompasses recognising the significance of differences and opposing discernment, which encourage inclusiveness. As a result, managing diversity enables minorities, to comprehend the denotation and implication of being “minority” in a domain that is dominated by majority, but where respect for the minority and sense of awareness is encourage to build inclusive workplace.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper reviews the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the workforce and how diversity management can be adopted to build inclusive workplace. All forms of human group or organisation exhibits ‘dissimilarities’, subsequently no two humans are similar. In other words, employees share some commonalities that are homogenous whilst some are heterogeneous. Essentially, diversity extends beyond this simple analogy. Diversity encompasses total dissimilarities that people bring to a group or enterprise. Hence, initiating and managing diversity should be all-inclusive, and give due recognition to the primary dimension of diversity (i.e. age, gender, race, traditions, sexual orientation, disabilities etc.), as well as the secondary dimension of diversity (e.g. values structure, perceptions, convictions, moral values etc.) to build an inclusive workplace that accommodate varying interest.

Given these development, the conventional tactics and practices of human resource management need to be reviewed to meet the challenges brought about by diversity and to create a responsive organisational structure that is supportive. Workplace diversity suggests the need for business organisation to pay deep attention to the differences among people in the workplace and if proactively implemented and managed, a diverse workplace will create

platform for productive corporation, ingenuity, broader prospect for staffing and improved productivity.

In a nutshell, workforce diversity is a multifaceted phenomenon that is difficult to manage and accomplish in any form of business organisations. Notwithstanding its complexity, diversity remains a potent tool to improve firm effectiveness, particularly with contemporary changes taking place all over the world. Thus, firms that initiate and implement diversity initiatives is more likely to succeed and enhance its competitive advantage better than those that ignored or failed to embrace diversity. On this note, valuing individual differences will not only create mutual benefit across the workplace, but create a basis for enhancing social inclusion, competitive edge, employee productivity and business sustainability.

Therefore, firms need to concentrate effort on diversity initiatives and look for methods to project their enterprise as an inclusive workplace. As a matter of fact a diverse workforce echo a changing workplace and world economy. Hence, proactive business enterprises need to develop a comprehensive gamut of organisational structure, leadership style, and business practices to effectively manage diversity. Similarly, management should create a framework that encourages flexibility on how to do things better and empower employees to contest unfair behaviors in the workplace. It is equally, important for organisations to shape and enhance employees perception on diversity related issues so as to transform behaviors and attitudes that foster diversity skills, better interaction and healthier work environment.

Bibliography

1. Ahonen P., Tienari J., Meriläinen. S., Pullen A.: Hidden contexts and invisible power relations: A Foucauldian reading of diversity research. "Human Relations", No. 67(3), 2014, p. 263-286.
2. April K.A.: Ways of looking at reality, [in:] April K., Shockley M. (eds.): Diversity: New realities in a changing world. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke 2007, p. 9-13.
3. Bary B., Bateman T.S.: A social trap of analysis of the management of diversity. "Academy of Management Review", No. 21(3), 1996, p. 758-759.
4. Beck W., Maesen V.W.: Some considerations with regard to Yitzhak Berman's paper about indicators for social cohesion. Working paper DG12.34. European Foundation on Social Quality, Amsterdam 2003.
5. Bennett-Alexander D.: Ten ways to value diversity in your workplace and avoid potential liability in the process. "Empirical Rights Quality", No. 1(2), 2000, p. 57-64.
6. Bennington L., Wein R.: Anti-discrimination legislation in Australia – Fair, effective, efficient or irrelevant? "International Journal of Manpower", No. 21(1), 2000, p. 21-33.

7. Berman Y., Phillips D.: Indicators for social cohesion. Paper submitted to the European Network on Indicators of Social Quality of the European Foundation on Social Quality, Amsterdam 2004.
8. Bollen K.A., Hoyle R.H.: Perceived cohesion: A conceptual and empirical examination. "Social Forces", No. 69(2), 1990, p. 479-504.
9. Bowen D.E., Ostroff C.: Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of the "strength" of the HRM system. "Academy of Management Review", No. 29(2), 2004, p. 203-221.
10. Bryan J.H.: The diversity imperative. "Executive Excellence", No. 6, 1999.
11. Burnett A.: Inclusion: Our biggest organisational challenge. "Footprints", No. 1(2), 2003, p. 156-159.
12. Carrel M.R.: Defining workforce diversity programs and practices in organizations: A longitudinal study. "Labor Law Journal", Spring 2006, www.emeraldinsight.com, 17.06.2015.
13. Chan D.: Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. "Journal of Applied Psychology", No. 83(2), 1998, p. 234-246.
14. Cooley C.H.: Social organization. Schocken Books, New York 1962.
15. Cornelius N., Gagnon S.: Exploring diversity from an ethical perspective. Working paper presented at the Towards a Human-Centred Human Resource Management conference. Imperial College of Science and Technology, London 2000.
16. Daft R.L.: Management. Dryden Press, 1994.
17. Dass P., Parker B.: Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From resistance to learning. "Academy of Management Executive", No. 13(2), 1999, p. 68-80.
18. DiTomaso N., Post C., Parks-Yancy R.: Workforce diversity and inequality: Power, status, and numbers. "Annual Review of Sociology", No. 33, 2007, p. 473-501.
19. Earley P.C., Mosakowski E.: Creating hybrid team cultures: An empirical test of transnational team functioning. "Academy of Management Journal", No. 43, 2000, p. 26-49.
20. Esty K., Griffin R., Hirsch M.S.: Workplace diversity. A manager's guide to solving problems and turning diversity into a competitive advantage. Adams Media Corporation, Avon, MA 1995.
21. Festinger L., Schachter S., Back K.: Social pressures in informal groups. Harper, New York 1950.
22. Friday E., Friday S.: Managing diversity using a strategic planned change approach. "Journal of Management Development", No. 22(10), 2003, p. 863-880.
23. Gaertner S.L., Rust M.C., Dovidio J.F., Bachman B.A., Anastasio P.A.: The contact hypothesis: The role of a common in group identity on reducing intergroup bias. "Small Group Research", No. 25, 1994, p. 224-249.

24. Gilbert J.A., Stead B.A., Ivancevich J.M.: Diversity management: A new organizational paradigm. "Journal of Business Ethics", No. 21(1), 1999, p. 61-76.
25. Greenberg J.: Workplace diversity: Benefits, challenges and solutions. AlphaMeasure, Inc., 2004, <http://www.alphameasure.com>, 14.07.2015.
26. Harrison D.A., Price K.H., Gavin J.H., Florey A.T.: Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface-and deep-level diversity on group functioning. "Academy of Management Journal", No. 45, 2002, p. 1029-1045.
27. Joshi A., Roh H.: The role of context in work team diversity research: A meta-analytic review. "Academy of Management Journal", No. 52(3), 2009, p. 599-627.
28. Kandola R., Fullerton J.: Managing the Mosaic. CIPD, London 1994.
29. Kanter R.M., Brinkerhoff D.: Organisational performance for diversity – recent developments in measurement. "Annual Review of Sociology", No. 7, 1991, p. 321-349.
30. Kersten A.: Diversity management: Dialogue, dialectics and diversion. "Journal of Organizational Change Management", No. 13(3), 2000, p. 235-248.
31. Kirby E.L., Harter L.M.: Discourses of diversity and the quality of work life: The character and costs of the managerial metaphor. "Management Communication Quarterly", No. 15(1), 2001, p. 121-127.
32. Kisha N.B., Konjit V.P., Sarah W., Jennifer S.F. (n.d.): Exploring diversity: Race and culture in the inclusive workplace. Boston College Center for Work & Family, <http://www.bc.edu/cwf>, 17.06.2015.
33. Konrad A.: Defining the domain of workplace diversity scholarship. "Group & Organization Management", No. 28(1), 2003, p. 4-17.
34. Kreitz P.A.: Best practices for managing organizational diversity. "The Journal of Academic Librarianship", No. 34, 2008, p. 101-120.
35. Kundu S.C.: Valuing cultural diversity: A study of employees' reactions to employer efforts to value diversity in India. Proceedings of the 7th Asia-Pacific Management Conference – The Great Asia in the 21st century. University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia and National Cheng Kung University, Tainan. "ROC", No. (2), 2001, p. 635-646.
36. Lewin K.: Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics. Harper and Brothers, New York 1948.
37. Lorbiecki A., Jack G.: Critical turns in the evolution of diversity management. "British Journal of Management", No. 11, 2000, p. S17-S31.
38. Managing a multicultural workforce. "Black Enterprise Magazine", July 2001.
39. Matuska E., Sałek-Imińska A.: Diversity management as employer branding strategy. "Theory and Practice", Vol. VIII, No. 2, 2014.
40. Mazur B.: Cultural diversity in organisational theory and practice. "Journal of Intercultural Management", Vol. 2, No. 2, November 2010, p. 5-15.

41. McDonald F., Patton M.: The nascent European policy towards older working: Can the European Union help the older worker? "Personnel Review", No. 26(4), 1996, p. 293-306.
42. McLeod P.L., Lobel S.A., Cox T.H.: Ethnic diversity and creativity in small group. "Small Group Research", No. 27(2), 1996, p. 248-264.
43. Mensi-Klarbach H.: Diversity management: The business and moral cases, [in:] Danowitz M.A., Hanappi-Egger E., Mensi-Klarbach H. (Eds.): Diversity in organizations. Concepts and practices. Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills 2012, p. 63-89.
44. Moreno J.L.: Sociometry and the cultural order. "Sociometry Monographs", No. 21, Beacon House, New York 1943.
45. O'Reilly C.A., Williams K.Y., Barsade W.: Group demography and innovation: Does diversity help?, [in:] Gruenfeld D. (ed.): Research on managing groups and teams, vol. 1. Elsevier, St. Louis, MO 1998, p. 183-207.
46. Olsen J.E., Martins L.L.: Understanding organizational diversity management programs: A theoretical framework and directions for future research. "Journal of Organizational Behavior", No. 33(8), 2012, p. 1168-1187.
47. Özbilgin M. (n.d.): Global diversity management: the case of automobile manufacturing companies in Japan. School of Business and Management Queen Mary, University of London, www.ozbilgin.net, 17.04.2015.
48. Paxton P., Moody J.: Structure and sentiment: Explaining emotional attachment to group. "Social Psychology Quarterly", No. 66(1), 2003, p. 34-47.
49. Pietschmann P.: Managing diversity: What does it mean? An analysis of different approaches and strategies. Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik gGmbH. Discussion Paper, Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, 2014, from <http://www.die-gdi.de>, 14.07.2015.
50. Ponciano L., Shabazian A.: Interculturalism: Addressing diversity in early childhood. "Dimensions of Early Childhood", No. 40(1), 2012, p. 23-30.
51. Richard O., Kochan T., McMillan-Capehart A.: The impact of visible diversity on organizational effectiveness: Disclosing the contents in Pandora's black box. "Journal of Business and Management", No. 8, p. 2002, p. 1-26.
52. Richard O.C., Johnson N.B.: Understanding the impact of human resource diversity practices on firm performance. "Journal of Managerial Issues", No. 13(2), 2001, p. 177-195.
53. Richard O.C.: Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. "Academy of Management Journal", No. 43(2), 2000, p. 164-177.
54. Richard O.C.: Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. "Academy of Management Journal", No. 43, 2000, p. 164-177.
55. Risburg A., Soderberg A.M.: Translating a management concept: Diversity management in Denmark. "Gender in Management", No. 23(6), 2008, p. 426-441.

56. Roberson L., Kulik C., Pepper M.: Using needs assessment to resolve controversies in diversity training design. "Group and Organization Management", No. 28(1), 2003, p. 148-174.
57. Rose M.: Why so fed up and footloose in IT? "Industrial Relations Journal", No. 38(4), 2007, p. 356-384.
58. Ross R., Schneider R.: From equality to diversity – A business case for equal opportunities. Pitman, London 1992.
59. Rush R.S.: A different perspective: Cohesion, morale and operational effectiveness in the German Army. Fall, 1944. "Armed Forces and Society", No. 25(3), 1999, p. 477-508.
60. Salo M.: United we stand-divided we fall: A standard model of unit cohesion. Dissertation. 2011. Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, <http://www.books@unigrafia.fi>, 12.01.2016.
61. Shills E.A., Janowitz M.: Cohesion and disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II. "Public Opinion Quarterly", No. 12, 1948, p. 280-315.
62. Society for Human Resource Management-SHRM: How should my organization define diversity?, 2007, http://www.shrm.org/diversity/library_published/nonIC/CMS_011970.asp#TopOfPage, 17.06.2015.
63. Standing H., Baume E.: Equity, equal opportunities, gender and organization performance. Workshop on Global Health Workforce Strategy Annecy, France, 9-12 December 2000, World Health Organization Department of Organization of Health Services Delivery. Geneva, Switzerland 2000.
64. Tajfel H., Turner J.: The social identity of intergroup behavior, [in:] Worchel S., Austin W. (eds.): Psychology and intergroup relations. Nelson- Hall, Chicago 1985.
65. Tatli A., Ozbilgin M.F.: An emic approach to intersectional study of diversity at work: A bourdieuan framing. "International Journal of Management Reviews", No. 14(2), 2012, p. 180-200.
66. The costs and benefits of diversity. European Commission, 2003, [http://www.diversityatwork.net/NL/ Docs/CostsBenefExSum.pdf](http://www.diversityatwork.net/NL/Docs/CostsBenefExSum.pdf), 17.06.2015.
67. The Network of Executive Women. Leveraging management diversity for competitive advantage. Best Practices, First in a Series, 2006, from www.newsonline.org, 17.06.2015.
68. Thomas D.A., Ely R.J.: Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. "Harvard Business Review", September-October, 1996, p. 79-90.
69. Thomas R.R. Jr.: Managing diversity: A conceptual framework, [in:] Jackson S.E. (ed.): Diversity in the workplace: Human resources initiatives. Guilford Press, New York 1992, p. 306-317.
70. van Knippenberg D., Schippers M.C.: Work group diversity. "Annual Review of Psychology", No. 58, 2007, p. 515-541.

71. Vranken J.: No social cohesion without social exclusion? Research Unit on, social exclusion and the City University of Antwerp, 2001, <http://www.shakti.uniurb.it/eurex/syllabus/lecture4/Eurex4-Vranken.pdf>, 12.01.2016.
72. Williams K.Y., O'Reilly C.A.: Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. "Research in Organizational Behavior", No. 2, 1998, p. 77-140.
73. Yang Y.: Developing cultural diversity advantage: The impact of diversity management structures. "Academy of Management Best Conference Paper", 2005, GDO: H1-6.