

## VCU Libraries Electronic Reserves

This work may be copyrighted. By printing this document, you agree to abide by the following copyright statement.

**NOTICE CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS** The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproduction of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If electronic transmission of reserve material is used for purposes in excess of what constitutes "fair use", that user may be liable for copyright infringement. VCU reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order, if in its judgement, fulfillment of the request would involve violation of copyright law

Visit the VCU Libraries' Electronic Reserves Homepage at:

<http://www.library.vcu.edu/cfapps/ereserve/index.cfm>

## C H A P T E R 3

# Workforce Diversity, Identity Groups and Management Theory

Blue Wooldridge  
*Virginia Commonwealth University*

### Introduction

“As the World’s workforce grows ever more diverse, our ability to manage these demographic challenges will determine whether the United States and other nations, can compete globally. We see diversity, in its broadest meaning, as this century’s greatest challenge to organizational life worldwide” (Griggs and Louw, 1995). Similarly, Jamieson and O’Mara (1991) in their book *Managing Workforce 2000* suggest that “Diversity is-creating unparalleled workplace challenges.” It is conventional wisdom that everyone is different. This chapter briefly describes research on identity groups, reviews demographic data on several population groups, describes research findings on the organizational behavior differences of groups in a diverse workforce, and suggests that the organizational behavior differences of groups have implications for management theories.

### Identity Groups

Mirvis and Kanter (1991: 47) have pointed out that:

*Life attitudes are not randomly distributed through the population. Members of the same 'identity groups' say the same age, gender, race and such, have had overlapping life experiences which may, in turn, predispose them toward more or less favorable attitudes about particular company practices and cultures.*

In a recent graduate class the author co-taught, the students and the two instructors identified at least 15–20 important identity groups that form an important part of the future work force. These include: white males, people of color, women, dual working couples, individuals with different work-related values, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, individuals with different cognitive styles, employees with different organizational roles, work force illiteracy, the older worker workers with disabilities, immigrants, Native Americans, the “Knowledge” worker, workers who suffer from substance abuse, HIV infected workers, workers with compensation disparity, as well as workers with different religious views.

There are at least two important considerations that must be kept in mind when discussing identity groups. The first is whether membership in each identity group is considered of equal value or whether membership is one or some identity group(s) has greater organizational significance than in others. A view of diversity that assumes that such characteristics race gender or age are more or less equal in their organizational consequences can be referred to as the “horizontal” perspective. A view that membership in different identity groups serves as a cue that is used to assign people to positions in a hierarchy of asymmetrical power relationships is referred to as “vertical” differentiation (Sessa and Jackson, 1995). Loden and Rosener apparently share the “vertical perspective.” They divide dimensions of diversity into primary and secondary groupings. Their primary dimensions of diversity are “. . . those immutable human differences that are inborn and/or exert an ongoing impact throughout our lives,” (Loden and Rosener, 1991: 18). Their primary dimensions are age, ethnicity, gender, physical abilities/qualities, race and sexual/affective orientations. They go on to say that, “. . . it is the six core dimensions . . . that have the most significant impact on individuals and groups in society and within the workplace.” Secondary dimensions of diversity include: educational background, geographic location, income, marital status, military experience, parental status, religious beliefs, and work experience (Loden and Rosener, 1991: 19).

A recent survey of organizational human resource managers by Carrell and Mann also appear to reinforce the vertical perspective towards identity groups. In response to the request to “Please indicate whether differences in the following characteristics are what is meant by diversity to decision makers in your organization,” 93% of the respondents identified Race; 85% gender; 82% culture; 77% national origin; 71% handicap; 67% age; 51% religion and only 30% regional origin. “Respondents suggested a number of other diversity categories on an open-ended item. The following were proposed by one percent or more of the sample: language differences, educational background, sexual preferences, and philosophical or political viewpoints,” (Carrell and Mann, 1995: 105).

A second confounding variable that must be taken into consideration when discussing identity group membership is the level of group identity that exists. This issue arises to account for the fact that not all members of a given group are alike. “Within each groups there is diversity regarding adherence to the values and beliefs thought to be typical of the groups” (Carter Gushue, and Weitzman, 1994: 187). Most of the studies on levels of group identity have focused on identity groups of race or ethnicity (Carter, Gushue and Weitzman, 1994;

Helms and Piper, 1994, and Leong and Chou, 1994). However, following this review it is argued that the level of groups identity is an important construct to be recognized in any research seeking to explain differences in group organizational behaviors.

## Key Trends in Workforce Diversify

### DECREASE IN THE PERCENTAGE OF WHITE MALES

One of the most remarkable changes projected in the composition of the future workforce, and one that will present major challenges to organizations, is the dramatic decrease in the percentage of white males. While white (Hispanic and non-Hispanic) males comprised 51% of the workforce as recently as 1980, they are projected to comprise only 44 percent in the year 2005 (Galen, 1994). The total percentage of Whites (both male and female, Hispanic and non-Hispanic) in the workforce decreases over this twenty-five-year period from 87.6 percent to 82.9 percent. When one subtracts the Hispanic population, the percentage of white males is projected to be only 38 percent in 2005, down from 42.5 percent in 1992 (Fullerton, 1993).

### PEOPLE OF COLOR

These demographics changes are caused (not by a decrease in the number of white, non-Hispanic males) but by an increase in the number of people of color in the workforce. Specifically, Blacks, non-Hispanic are estimated to increase from 10.8 percent in 1992 to 11 percent in 2005, Hispanics from 8 percent to 11 percent and Asians, Native Americans, and Alaskan Natives 3.4 percent to 5 percent over the same period (Fullerton, 1993).

The Asian-American population during this same period will rise dramatically, from 1.5% to 2.9% of the total population. The Asian-American population is expected to double, growing twice as fast as the Hispanic population. The Asian-American population growth rate is about eight times as fast as the Black population and 15 times as fast as the White population. The Asian-American population is expected to continue to grow rapidly (Fullerton, 1993). The principal reason for the growth in the Asian-American population is the post-1965 influx of immigrants and Refugees from Asia and the Pacific Islands. After forty years of being virtually banned from the U.S. by immigration laws, people from Asia began to come to the U.S. in greater numbers starting in 1965. This is the point at which the U.S. abandoned the "national origins" system of immigration (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1992). Table 3.1 shows the country of origin of the American population and the percentage of Asian American that are foreign born.

People of Chinese descent remain the largest element in the growing U.S. population of Asians and Pacific Islanders, followed by those of Philippine and Japanese origins. In addition, the census found significant growth among certain groups from Asia—especially the Hmong who are from mountainous regions of Laos, and people from Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka (Noah, 1991).

**Table 3.1:** Characteristics of Asian Americans BY Country of Origin

|                 | Percentage of Asian-American Population | Percentage Foreign Born |
|-----------------|---|-------------------------|
|                 | 22.6                                    | 63.3                    |
| Chinese         | 19.3                                    | 64.7                    |
| Filipino        | 11.6                                    | 28.4                    |
| Japanese        | 11.2                                    | 70.4                    |
| Asian Indian    | 11.0                                    | 81.9                    |
| Korean          | 8.4                                     | 90.5                    |
| Vietnamese      | 2.0                                     | 93.7                    |
| Laotian         | 1.3                                     | 82.1                    |
| Thai            | 2.0                                     | 93.9                    |
| Cambodian       | 1.2                                     | 90.5                    |
| Hmong           |   | 85.1                    |
| Pakistani       |   | 83.4                    |
| All Asian Amer. | 100.0                                   | 62.1                    |

Sources: Derived from Barbara Vobejda (1991), U.S. Bureau of the census, *We, the Asian and Pacific Islander Americans*, p. 11, table 7, and US General Accounting Office, *Asian Americans: A Status Report*

## WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

Women will constitute 47 percent work force in 2005 (Fullerton, 1993). In recent years, the most dramatic change in women's workforce participation rates has been among married women with children. In 1986, 54 percent of women with a child under six were working. Some 63 percent of women with children under 18 were in the labor force. This is in sharp contrast to 1940, when only 8.6 percent of women were in the labor force. The influx of women, particularly women with children into the workplace is having tremendous impact. With the increase of dual-earner and single-parent families, concern is growing with balancing the demands of work and family settings (Offermann and Glowing, 1990: 96). In light of these changes, there has been evidence that employees may be willing to leave traditional employers for those more willing to help them achieve their goal of a more balanced work/family lifestyle. "A growing body of research indicates that family problems affect employee productivity, recruitment, retention, and absenteeism" (General Accounting Office, 1992).

## Research on the Organizational Behavior of the Diverse Workforce

Some twenty years ago, Dunnette (1976) pointed out that one of the major gaps that existed in the field of organizational psychology was that no extensive coverage was given to groups such as women, minorities or the disadvantaged. In spite of recognition of the growing diversity of the work force, this gap still exists. For example, in the matter of racial diversity, Cox and Nkomo (1990) surveyed twenty major management journals that published organizational behavior research between 1964 and 1989 and found that the amount of total published research is small relative to the importance of the topic. They also found that the topics covered are not representative of the domain of organizational behavior. Amazingly, they concluded that the trend is for less rather than more research on these topics.

Similarly, Friderger (1992) agrees and argues that with a very few exceptions, research in organizational behavior has generally disregarded the domestic cross-cultural and interracial implications of its theories. He says:

*Not surprisingly, some demography researchers have emphasized the following: (1) the need for developing an understanding of the effects of racial and gender diversity in the organizational context, particularly as this increasing diversity impacts individuals who are members of what have traditionally been the dominant majority group in organizations; and (2) the need for understanding the relationship between demographic attributes and process variables such as communication, conflict, influence, and decision-making.*

Cox and Nkomo (1990) conclude, at least in the area of racial diversity, "in addition to a general lack of researcher attention, the development of research in this area has been hindered by research questions that are too simplistic, by an absence of theories of race effects and by the types of research designs employed." They observe that less than 35% of the 140 empirical studies reviewed addressed racial groups other than Blacks and Whites, and only 33% of the 132 organizations studied were public.

The need for this type of research is manifested by the differences based on gender and race shown by the research that has been completed. Blazini and Greenhaus (1988, as reported by Dance, 1993) asked the question: do the work values of the Black woman manager differ from those of the White woman or the Black or White male manager? With a  $N = 322$ , each manager was asked to respond to the importance they placed on 25 job characteristics. According to the weighted score, the value was assigned to one of four principle factors: Factor I-Extrinsic (respect for others, job security, income, and working conditions); Factor II-Managerial Activities (opportunity to take risks, work on important problems, supervise others and develop personal contacts); Factor III-Independence (working independently and determine one's own work method); and Factor IV-Intrinsic (importance of task variety, feelings of accomplishment, and recognition for a job well done).

The results showed that Black females and males placed a greater emphasis on extrinsic work values than did the White females or males. Under Factor II there was little difference between the responses of the Black females and other groups and the factors associated with "Managerial activities." Both Black females and males placed a higher emphasis on the val-

**Figure 3.1: Work Climate Attitudes and Job Satisfaction of Hispanics Employees, Supervisors and Managers as Compared to Their White Counterpart**

**Employees:**

**Differences:**

|                                       |                            |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Satisfaction with Personnel Policies  | (Hispanics more satisfied) |
| Satisfaction with Supervision         | (Hispanics less satisfied) |
| Satisfaction with Job Tasks           | (Hispanics less satisfied) |
| Satisfaction with Rewards             | (Hispanics less satisfied) |
| Satisfaction with Coworkers           | (Hispanics less satisfied) |
| Satisfaction with Employee Competence | (Hispanics less satisfied) |

**No Difference by Ethnicity:**

Satisfaction with Promotion, with Pay, with Employee Motivation, with Participatory Management, with Stress Levels and Overall Satisfaction with the Job.

**Supervisors**

**Differences:**

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| Satisfaction with Personnel Policies         | (Hispanics more satisfied) |
| Satisfaction with Employee <b>Competence</b> | (Hispanics less satisfied) |
| Satisfaction with Participatory Management   | (Hispanics less satisfied) |

**No Difference by Ethnicity:**

Satisfaction with Supervision, with Job Tasks, with Rewards, with Coworkers, with promotion, with Pay, with Employee Motivation, with Stress Levels, Overall Satisfaction with the Job.

**Managers:**

**Differences:**

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| Satisfaction with Personnel Policies         | (Hispanics more satisfied) |
| Satisfaction with Employee <b>Competence</b> | (Hispanics less satisfied) |

**No Difference by Ethnicity:**

Satisfaction with Supervision, with Job Tasks, with Participatory Management, with Rewards, with Coworkers, with Promotion, with Pay, with Employee Motivation, with Stress Levels, Overall Satisfaction with the Job.

**Source:** Derived from Rubalcaba-Barrett, Beck, Lillibridge (1991)

ues of “independence” than did the White males or females, and finally, under Factor IV—both the Black females and White females placed a higher emphasis on “intrinsic” work values than did the White and Black males.

From the research on gender differences, Segal (1991) found that men and women apparently had different styles of management. The Operating Style Model of men was competitive and that of female managers cooperative. The Organizational structure for men was vertical and *hierarchical* while that of women was horizontal and egalitarian. The Basic Objective for the male managers was found to be winning, while the females basic objective was that of quality output. The problem-solving approach of men was rational and objective and of the female managers intuitive and subjective. Bowman and French, while evaluating the affects of implementing Total Quality Management in a government agency found that while more than seventy percent of the respondents felt that the team concept is excellent, males are more like to view team impact on somewhat less favorable terms than females. They conclude, “Apparently, females are more inclined to work collectively and are more apt to believe that these efforts have a cumulative effect” (Bowman and French, 1992: 57).

It is true that most managers possess the characteristics of both male and female; however, in a study that compared perceptions about male/female managers who used either an authoritarian or participative leadership style, managers were viewed more positively when they used a leadership style that was typical of and consistent with their gender (Griffin, 1992). In this study, more participants said that they would not like to work for the authoritarian women than any of the managers. Women managers, however, have shown that using the “command-and-control” style of managing others is not the only way to be effective and successful. They are drawing on the skills and attitudes they have developed from their shared experiences as women, not by adopting the style and habits that men have found successful (Rosener, 1990).

Differences between Hispanic (predominately Mexican-American) and Anglo employees of a general purpose local government, in terms of their attitude toward the work environment and their levels of job satisfaction with various aspects of the job, were investigated by Rubaii-Barrett, Beck, and Lillibridge (1991). Figure 3.1 summarizes the differences and similarities in work climate attitudes and job satisfaction.

In their summary of organization-related research on Asian Americans, Sue and Wagner (1973) reported that, in general, Asian-American males exhibited less need for dominance, aggressiveness, exhibitionism, autonomy, and heterosexuality, whereas Asian-American females were more deferent, nurturing, and achievement-oriented than their Caucasian counterparts.

Another scholar that has conducted research on group differences is Hofstede (1980a, 1980b, 1991, 1994, and with Bond, 1988). Hofstede originally identified four dimensions of work-related values and more recently added a fifth. The original four are power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and femininity/masculinity. *Power Distance* can be defined as “... the degree of inequality which people... consider normal; from relatively equal (that is, small power distance) to extremely unequal (large power distance)” (Hofstede, 1994: 5). “It indicates the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally,” (Hofstede, 1980b: 45). *Uncertainty Avoidance* can be defined as the degree to which individuals prefer structured over unstructured situations (high degree of formalization (Seers, 1977). This dimension:



... indicates the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise. (Hofstede, 1980b, p. 45)

*Individualism* refers to which individuals prefer to act as individuals rather than as members of groups, *Collectivism* represents low individualism:

*Individualism* implies a loosely knit social framework in which people are supposed to take care of themselves and of their immediate families only, while *collectivism* is characterized by a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups; they expect their in-group... to look after them and in exchange for that they feel they owe absolute loyalty to it. (Hofstede, 1980b, p. 45)

The fourth dimension has been called *Masculinity* and its opposite pole *Femininity*. It is the degree to which values like assertiveness, performance, success, and competition, which in nearly all societies are associated with the role of men, prevail over values like the quality of life, maintaining warm personal relationships, service, care for the weak, and solidarity which in nearly all societies are more associated with the role of women. (Hofstede, 1994: 6).

More recently Hofstede and his colleagues have added a fifth dimension, *Long-term versus Short-term Orientation or Confucian Dynamism* (Hofstede, 1991, 1994). At one pole, one finds values oriented towards the future, like thrift and perseverance. On the opposite side one finds values orientated towards the past and present, like respect for tradition and fulfilling social obligations (Hofstede, 1994).

The relationship between these differences and management theory is suggested by Hofstede (1980b). He points out that those theories that advocate participation in the manager's decisions by his/her subordinates is quite logical in countries like the U.S. which rank in the middle position on the *Power Distance Index*. However in countries like France, which has a larger power distance index, there is little concern with participative management, and in countries with a lower power distance score, like Sweden, and Norway... there is considerable sympathy for models of management in which even the initiatives are taken by the subordinates (forms of industrial democracy) and with which there's little sympathy in the United States. (Hofstede, 1980b: 57).

Hofstede (1980a, 1980b), presents other examples of how these culture differences can affect the choice of appropriate management theories and styles. For example he points out that in societies with the *Individualist* concept the relationship between the individual and the organization is essentially calculative (Etzioni, 1964):

In more *Collectivist* societies, however, the link between individuals and their traditional organizations is not calculative but moral: It is based not on self-interest, but on the individual's loyalty toward the clan, organization, or society—which is supposedly the best guarantee of that individual's ultimate interest. (Hofstede, 1980b: 61)

**Table 3.2: Hofstede's Five Dimensions of Work Related Cultures**

(0 = low, 100 = High)

| Countries          | Power | Uncertainty | Individualism | Masculinity | Long-term |
|--------------------|-------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| <b>USA</b>         | 40    | 46          | 91            | 62          | 29        |
| <b>Chile</b>       | 63    | 86          | 67            | 66          | 31        |
| <b>Germany</b>     | 35    | 65          | 14            | 46          |           |
| <b>Indonesia</b>   | 78    | 48          | 48            | 56          | 61        |
| <b>India</b>       | 77    | 40          | 70            | 68          |           |
| <b>Ireland</b>     | 28    | 35          | 76            | 70          |           |
| <b>Italy</b>       | 50    | 72          | 46            | 95          | 80        |
| <b>Japan</b>       |       |             | 30            | 69          |           |
| <b>Mexico</b>      | 81    | 82          | 32            | 64          | 19        |
| <b>Philippines</b> | 94    | 44          | 20            | 4.6         | 16        |
| <b>West Africa</b> | 78    | 54          | 25            | 57          | 96        |

Individuals, like countries, differ in their work-related values. Hofstede (1994) presents data for workers in some countries for his five dimensions of work-related cultures. This data is summarized in Table 3.2.

These data would appear to support Cox, Lobel and McLeod who found empirical evidence that ethnic group differences affect at least some aspect of behavior in task groups. "The study found that at an individual level, Asian, Black, and Hispanic individuals had a more collectivist-cooperative orientation to a task than Anglo individuals. . . . and that those behavioral differences tended to increase when the situational cues favored cooperation" (Cox, Lobel, and McLeod, 1991: 839). These findings **assume even greater relevance since** Cox, Lobel and McLeod review of the literature found evidence that the attitudes, values and norms of people of different ethnic backgrounds reflect their cultural heritages. They suggest there is some carryover of the national traditions of individualism-collectivism, ". . . among the most strongly represented ethnic groups in the U.S. work force" (p. 829).

## Management Theories and Organizational Behavior Differences of Groups

There are many different ways to categorize management/organization theory. Shafritz and Ott (1992) review several attempts to categorize theories. They conclude:

*Despite their differences, most of the better-known approaches to grouping organization theories . . . have commonalities. First they group theories by their perspectives on organizations--in other*

*words by basic assumptions about humans and organizations and by those aspects of organizations that they see as most important for understanding organizational behavior.*

Shafritz and Ott group theories into the following categories: Classical Organization Theory, Neoclassical Organizational Theory, the Organizational Behavior Perspective or Human Resource Theory, "Modern" Structure Organizational Theory, Systems, Contingency, and Population Ecology Organization Theory, Multiple Constituencies/Market Organization Theory, Power and Politics Organization Theory and Organizational Culture and Symbolic Management Organization Theory.

Scott (1992) suggests that it might be insightful to group theories of organization by whether they respond to a *Rational System*, *Natural System*, or *Open System* definition. The definition of organizations compatible with the *Rational Systems* perspective suggests that, "Organizations are collectivities oriented to the pursuit of relatively specific goals and exhibiting relatively highly formalized structures." If we accept a definition of organizations as being "collectivities whose participants share a common interest in the survival of the system and who engage in collective activities, informally structured, to secure this end," we would be accepting a *Natural System* definition. A third definition, useful for viewing organizations as open systems is: "Organizations are systems of interdependent activities linking shifting coalitions of participants; the systems are embedded in—dependent on continuing exchanges with and constituted by the environment in which they operate." (Scott, 1992: 23, 25). Scott then goes on to group the leading organizational theories under the appropriate definition.

Koontz expanded his categorizes from the six represented by (1) the management process school, (2) the empirical or "case" approach, (3) the human behavior school, (4) the social system school (5) the decision theory school and (6) the mathematics school (1961) to eleven groups: (1) the empirical or case approach, (2) the interpersonal behavior approach, (3) the groups behavior approach, (4) the cooperative social system approach, (5) the sociotechnical systems approach, (6) the decision theory approach, (7) the systems approach, (8) the mathematical or "management science" approach, (9) the contingency or situational approach, (10) the managerial roles approach, and the (11) operational theory approach (1980) over a twenty year period.

Argyle (1996) review of the literature leads him to conclude that the classification scheme developed by Tausky (1978) is one of the better attempts. Tausky divides the classical approach to organization theory into two sub-approaches, physiology and the organization of work, and organizational structure. He further subdivides the humanist approach into human relations and human resources (Argyle, 1996).

Perhaps the best preference is the topology developed by Schein (1970: 55) whereby management theories are grouped according to the assumptions that the manager makes about the employee. He says:

*Every manager makes assumptions about people. Whether he is aware of these assumptions or not, they operate as a theory in terms of which he decides how to deal with his superiors, peers, and subordinates. His effectiveness as a manager will depend on the degree to which his assumptions fit empirical reality.*

Schein not only identifies the basic assumptions that managers might have concerning the nature of their workers, but suggests the role of management for each assumption and relates each assumption to its relevant orthodox management theory.

Schein categorizes management theories around the four “models of the worker” that corresponds to the managerial assumptions. These four models, in order of their historical appearance are: 1. the *rational-economic employee*, 2, the *social employee*, 3, the *self-actualizing employee*, and the *complex employee*. For each of these models Schein describes the basic assumptions concerning the characteristics of the worker, the implied managerial strategy based upon these assumptions, and research evidence for these assumptions. These findings are summarized below:

The rational economic employer is primarily motivated by economic incentives and will do that which gets him the greatest economic gain. He must be motivated by outside incentives (extrinsic organizational incentives (Mottaz, 1985)). Accepting this assumption about the employee places the burden for organizational performance entirely on management. Management has the responsibility to determine the “one best way” to conduct the job, select the employee with the most relevant aptitudes and train him or her to perform the task in the prescribe fashion (Mouzelis, 1967). This role for management is closely linked to Taylor’s Scientific Management or McGregor’s Theory X (Steers and Black, 1994; Silverman, 1971; Pugh and Hickson, 1989).

The social employee is “. . . basically motivated by social needs and obtains his basic sense of identity through relationship with others” (Schein, 1970: 59). The incentives most effective in motivating this employee are extrinsic social incentives (Mottaz, 1985). The implied managerial strategies required for employees that meet this assumption are drastically different from those involving rational-economic employee:

*First, they dictate that a manager should not limit his attention to tk task to be performed, but should give moreattention to the needs Of the people who are working for him. Second, instead of being concerned with motivating and controllingsubordinates, the manager should be concerned with their feelings, particularly their feelings in regard to acceptance and sense of belonging and identity. Third, the manage should accept work groups as a reality and think about group incentives rather than individuals incentives. Fourth, and most important, the manager’s role shifts from planning, organizing, motivating, and controlling to acting as an intermedia y between tk men and higher management, listening and attempting to understand tk needs and feelings of his subordinates, and showing consideration and sympathy for their needs and feelings} (Schein, 2980: 59)*

The assumptions and managerial strategies that are fundamental to the *Social Employee* model are associated with the Human Relations school of management theory and such researchers as Mayo, Zaleznik, Roethlisberger, and the Hawthorne studies (Silverman, 1971; Mouzelis, 1967, Pugh and Hickson, 1989).

The self-actualizing employee model assumes that the employee’s motivates fall into classes which are arranged in a hierarchy. “In particular, ‘self-actualization’, or the realisation of an individual’s own potential, becomes increasing important as ‘lower-level’, needs are satisfied,” (Silverman, 1971: 81). This employee seeks to be mature on the job and is capable of being so. The self-actualizing employee is primarily self-motivated and self-controlled (intrinsic incentives) (Mottaz, 1985). Thus the role of management is to worry less about being

considerate to employees and more about how to make their work intrinsically more challenging and meaningful (Schein, 1970):

*The manager may find himself often in the role of interviewer, attempting to determine what will challenge a particular worker. He will be a catalyst and facilitator rather than a motivator and controller. Above all, he will be a delegator in the sense of giving his subordinates just as much responsibility as he feels they can handle. (p. 66)*

The self-actualizing model of the employee is associated the management school of Organizational Humanism (Gordon, 1992), and with the work of such scholars as Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg, and Argyris (see Pugh and Hickson, 1989; Ivancevich and Matteson, 1993; Silverman, 1971; Steers and Black, 1994; Mouzelis, 1967).

The complex employee model assumes that the worker is a more complex individual than the rational-economic, social, or self-actualizing employee. "Not only is he more complex within himself, being possessed of many needs and potentials, but he is also likely to differ from his neighbor in the patterns of his own complexity" (Schein, 1970: 70). The complex employee may have different motives stemming from his/her separate experiences and "... may attach different meanings to the same aspects of 'reality'" (Silverman, 1971: 89). Differences between workers have been found by such researchers as Turner and Lawrence (1965), Hulin and Blood (1968), and Vroom (1960) as reported in Shepard and Houglan (1978).

## Conclusion

For managers of complex workers to be successful, they must be a good diagnostician and must value a spirit of inquiry. These managers would realize that there is no one best way to manage, and develop a contingency approach to developing incentives and other organizational policies. Although contingency theory was first applied and limited to the design of organizational structure (Scott, 1992; Galbraith, 1973; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967), Shepard and Houglan (1978) report this important concept can be applied to individual employee differences (complex man) as well.

A diverse workforce is part of each manager's present and future and it will not go away. Managers must make it a priority to create the kind of environment that will attract the best talent and make it possible for each employee to make their fullest contribution (Thomas, 1991). Whether the increased diversity of the workforce leads to lower organizational performance, stress, lower commitment, and job satisfaction or to creative, effective, organizations with high performance and morale will depend largely on the skills of the public manager in selecting the most appropriate management theory to guide public organizations. In light of the evidence presented here highlighting some of the differences exhibited by members of different identity groups, it can only be concluded that the contingency theory of management is the most appropriate for a diverse workforce.

## References

- Argyle, N. J. (1996). "Dwarfs Standing on the Shoulders of Giants." **Proceedings of the Ninth National Symposium on Public Administration Theory** Public Administration Theory Network, Savannah, GA. February 18-19.
- Bowman, J. S. and French, B. J. (1992). "Quality Improvement in a State Agency Revisited." **Public Productivity and Management Review** 16 (1): 53-64.
- Carroll, M. R. and Mann, E. E. (1995). "Defining Workforce Diversity in Public Sector Organizations." **Public Personnel Management** 24 (1) (Spring): 99-109.
- Cox, T. and Nkomo, S. (1990). "Invisible Men and Women: A Status Report on Race as a Variable in Organizational Behavior Research." **Journal of Organizational Behavior** 11 (6): 419-431.
- Cox, T. H., Jr., Lobel, S. A., and McLeod, P. L. (1991). "Effects of Ethnic Group Cultural Differences on Cooperative and Competitive Behavior on A Group Talk." **Academy of Management Journal** 34 (4): 827-847.
- Dance, R. A. (1993). "African American Women: How Do They Rate as Managers." Paper presented as partial fulfillment of requirements for PAD 691 Special Topics: **WorkForce 2000: Creating Effective Organizations in the 21st Century: Department of Public Administration, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA: Spring Semester.**
- Dunnette, M. D. (ed.) (1976). **Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology**. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.
- Frideger, M. A. (1992). "The Affect of Accent on Hiring Decisions: Human Resource Implications." Paper presented at the **Academy of Management Meeting, Las Vegas, NV**
- Fullerton, H. N., Jr. (1993). "Another Look at the Labor Force." **Monthly Labor Review** November 16 (11): 31-40.
- Galbraith, J. (1973). **Designing Complex Organizations**. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Galen, M. (1994). "White, Male and Worried." **Business Week** (January 31): 50-55.
- Gordon, G. J. (1992). **Public Administration in America**. 4th ed. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Griffin, B. Q. (1992). "Perceptions of Managers: Effects of Leadership Style and Gender," Paper presented at the **Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association**. March.
- Griggs, L. B., and Louw, L. (eds.) (1995). **Valuing Diversity: New Tools for a New Reality**. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1994). "Management Scientists are Human." **Management Science** 40 (1): 4-12.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). **Culture's Consequences: Software of the Minds**. London: McGraw Hill.
- Hofstede, G. and Bond, M. H. (1988). "The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth." **Organizational Dynamics** 16 (4): 4-21.
- Hofstede, G. (1980a). **Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values**. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980b). "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?" **Organizational Dynamics** (Summer): 42-63.
- Hulin, C. L. and Blood, M. R. (1968). "Job Enlargement, Individual Differences, and Worker Responses." **Psychological Bulletin** (69): 41-55.
- Ivancevich, J. M. and Matteson, M. T. (1993). **Organizational Behavior and Management**. 3rd ed. Homewood, IL: Irwin Publishers.
- Jamieson, D. and O'Mara, J. (1991). **Managing Workforce 2000: Gaining the Diversity Advantage**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Johnson, Dwight L. (1988). **We, the Asian and Pacific Islander Americans**. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- Koontz, H. (1961). "The Management Theory Jungle." **Academy of Management Journal** 4: 174-188.

- Koontz, H. (1980). "The Management Theory Jungle Revisited." *The Academy of Management Review* 5: 175-187.
- Lawrence, P. R., and Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration*. Boston, MA: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
- Loden, M., and Rosener, J. B. (1991). *Workforce America: Managing Employee Diversity as a Vital Resource*. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.
- Mirvis, P. H. and Kanter, D. L. (1991). *Beyond Demography: a Psychographic Profile of the Workforce* (1): 45-68.
- Mottaz, C. J. (1985). "The Relative Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Work Satisfaction." *The Sociological Quarterly* 26 (3): 365-385.
- Mouzelis, N. P. (1968). *Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Models, Rewards, and As Determinants of Theories*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Noah, T. (1991). "U.S. Population Grew Less white in the 1980's as Hispanics, Asians Boosted Presence." *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Offermann, L. R., and Gowing, M.K. (1990). "Organizations of the Future: Changes and Challenges," *American Psychologist* 45 (2): 95-108.
- Pugh, D. S. and Hickson, D. J. (1989). *Writers on Organizations*. 4th ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. (November/December): 119-125.
- Rosenet, J. B. (1990). "Ways Women Lead." *Harvard Business Review* 68 (6) (November/December): 119-125.
- Rubain-Berrett, N. Beck, A., and Lillibridge. (1991). Minorities in the Majority: Implications for Managing Cultural Diversity." *Public Personnel Management* 22: 503-21.
- Schein, E. H. (1970). *Organizational psychology*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Scott, W. R. (1992). *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Segal, J. A. (1991). "Women on the Verge of . . . Equality." *HR Magazine* 36 (6) (June): 117-123.
- Sessa, V. L., and Jackson, E. (1995). In M. M. Chemers, S. Oskamp, and M. A. Costanzo (eds.) *Diversity in Organizations: New Perspectives for a Changing Workforce*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shafritz, J., and Ott, J. S. (1992). *Classics of Organization Theory*. 3rd ed. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Shepard, J., and Hougland, J. G. Jr. (1978). "Contingency Theory: 'Complex Man' or 'Complex Organization'?" *Academy of Management Review* 12: 413-427.
- Silverman, D. (1971). *The Theory of Organizations*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Steers, R. M. and Black, J. S. (1994). *Organizational Behavior*. 5th ed. New York, NY: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). *Organizational Effectiveness: A Behavioral View*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Sue, S. and Wagner, N. N. (1973). *Asian Americans: Psychological Perspectives*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, Inc.
- Tausky, C. (1978). *Work Organizations: Major Theoretical Perspectives*. 2nd ed. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.
- Turner, A. N., and Lawrence, P. L. (1965). *Industrial Jobs and the Worker: An Investigation of Responses to Task Attributes*. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1992). *Civil Rights Issues Facing Asian Americans in the 1990's*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. General Accounting Office (1992). *The Changing Workforce: Demographic Issues Facing the Federal Government*. "A Report to the Congressional Committees." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- U.S. General Accounting Office (1990) *Asian Americans: A Status Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Vroom, V.H. (1960). *Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vobejda, B. (1991). "Asians, Hispanics Giving Nation More Diversity." *Washington Post* June 12: A1.
- Wooldridge, A. B. and Wooldridge, B. (1995). "Increased Diversity of the Workforce: Implications for the Successful Implementation of Total Quality Management." *Proceedings of the Global Conference on Managing Diversity*. Athens, GA. The American Institute for Managing Diversity September 5-7.
- Wooldridge, B. E. (1995a). "Increasing the Effectiveness of University/College Instruction: Integrating the Results of Learning Style Results into Course Design and Delivery." In Sims, R.R. and S. J. Sims (eds.) *The Importance of Learning Styles: implications for Learning, Course Design, and Education*. Westport, CT Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc. 1995.
- Wooldridge, B. (1995b). "Meeting the Challenge: Being a Successful Leader of an Increasingly Diverse Workforce." *Journal of Public Management and Social Policy* 1(1): 26-41.
- Wooldridge, B. and Maddox, B. (1995). "Demographic Changes and Diversity in Personnel: Implications for Public Administrators." In Jack Rabin et al (eds.) *Handbook of Public Personnel Administration*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Wooldridge, B., Maddox, B., and Zheng, Y. (1995). "Changing Demographics of the Workforce: Implications for the Design of Productive Work Environments-An Exploratory Analysis." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* (Summer): 221-235.
- Wooldridge, B. (1994). "Changing Demographics of the Workforce: Implications for the Use of Technology as a Productivity Improvement Strategy." *Public Productivity and Management Review* XVIII (4) (Summer): 371-386.
- Wooldridge, B., Smith-Mason, J., and Clark-Maddox, B. (1993). "Changing Demographics of the Workforce: Implications for Research in Human Resource Management." Paper presented at the Annual National Conference of the American Society for Public Administration, San Francisco, CA.
- Wooldridge, B., and Wester, J. (1991). "The Turbulent Environment of Public Personnel Administration: Responding to the Challenge of the Changing Workplace of the Twenty- First Century" *Public Personnel Management* 20 (2): 207-224.