

Antinomian Diversity of Organizational Behavior – Selected Aspects of Primary Identity in Empirical Researches

Katarzyna Januszkiewicz, Izabela Bednarska-Wnuk

Chair of Management, Faculty of Management, Łódź University

The aim of the article in the theoretical layer based on the analysis of the literature on the subject is a description of the concept of diversity and identification of the main indicators of behavioral differentiation in selected aspects of primary identity (gender and age). On the other hand, the empirical goal, the explanation of the gender and age, differentiates the character of the employee-organization relationship (in four distinct components: location of responsibility for tasks, location of sources of knowledge, location of development responsibility and localization of identification). The article presents the results of empirical research in 2015, on a sample, randomly selected population of 2,274 employees from 40 Polish companies.

Keywords: organizational behavior, employee-organization relationship, diversity, primary identity, age, sex

Introduction

Within past years there has been a growing interest of researchers in the subject of diversity (Wziątek-Staśko, 2012, Stor, Listwan, 2014). However, in the West the concept of diversity has been analyzed since 1960s (Rakowska, 2014, Graham, Belliveau, Hotchkiss, 2017, Heres, Benschop, 2010). In Poland the researches on the subject are growing in number which is the effect of globalization processes in this country and its integration with the European Union. Therefore, the contemporary organizations are facing up to a challenge of how to successfully manage the diversity (Gardenswartz, Rowe, 1998, Kundu, Turan, 1999, Waszczak, 2009).

In the article the assumption has been made that one of major effects of human resources diversity is the differentiation of organizational behaviors, i.e.

heterogeneous behavioral model and patterns of people from different identity groups (differentiated in terms of primary identity, secondary identity and organizational one). Yet, such a general assumption should be made more detailed one, and, thus, through narrowing the area of the analysis the article puts forward the thesis that characteristics of primary identity impact organizational behavior, differentiating an employee-organization relationship.

The objective of the article in its theoretical layer is a literature based description of the concept of diversity and identification of the main indicators of behavioral differentiation in selected aspects of primary identity. In its empirical layer, the article aims at providing – based on the Authors' own researches – an explanation to what extent both age and gender differentiate the employee-organization relationship.

Diversity – the concept and its meaning

In the literature on the subject there are many definitions of diversity, most often of attribute character, referring to:

- all possible aspects in which people are different from and similar to one another (Gryszko, 2009, p. 5);
- division of personality qualities of individual people (Jackson, Joshi, Ehri, 2003, p. 802);
- aspects that differentiate society and – from the perspective of an organization – its employees (Blackwell, 2007, p. 110).

The above definitions significantly reflect differentiation of the research area, observed by A. Rakowska, who distinguished two categories of diversity: in broader and narrower terms. The narrower attitude considers usually one or two characteristics (gender, age) differentiating individuals, whereas the broader one presents diversity through a prism of numerous qualities, both inborn and acquired ones (Rakowska, 2014, p. 352).

The problems concerning defining the interpretation framework of the diversity concept result from its being multidimensional. Many authors point to various suggestions regarding the notions (names) to describe the dimensions. However, S. Wiśniewska is of the opinion that the most commonly used ones to describe what diversity really is are those identified as a primary and secondary dimension (Wiśniewska, 2016, p. 16). On the other hand A. Wziątek-Staśko classifies features differentiating individuals into: observable (gender, age, race, ethnic origin, disability) and non-observable (referring to the feeling of identity in relation to other groups of employees) (Wziątek-Staśko, 2012, p. 23). In turn J. Kopeć

suggests considering employees' diversity in terms of: demography, economics, culture, organizational and social terms (Kopeć, 2016, p. 178).

In the field of organization and management most often it is possible to find a reference to a triad, discussing diversity by means of primary, secondary and tertiary identity. Within the attributes differentiating individuals in terms of the above dimensions, there are:

- for primary identity: gender, age, race, nationality, ethnic origin, sexual orientation and disability;
- for secondary identity: characteristics acquired by people within their lifetime: professional experience, religion, language, generation, educational background, marital status, parental status, geographical environment, status of place of residence and social class;
- for organizational identity: elements connected with working environment – job profile and description, scope of responsibilities, seniority, post and position in corporate organizational structure, diplomas, certificates or fringe benefits (Waszczak, 2009, p.79, Kundu, Turan, 1999, Arredondo, 1996, p. 8).

The above classification leads to a conclusion that the divisions constituting diversity are ambiguous, and thus individual features could be attributed to many categories. For instance, gender or age might be included in the primary, demographic and observable dimensions. However, it is primary identity with gender and age as its attributes that seems to be a vulnerable dimension that might be of significance for both roles and behaviors in a workplace (Farndale, Biron, Briscoe, Raghuram, 2015, pp. 679–682). In the context of socio-demographic changes they are the key characteristics, differentiating employees in the contemporary labor market.

Gender and age as determinants of individual differences – review of researches

In case of age, two main scope of analyses referring age of an individual to a biological and psychological categories could be distinguished. The biological age is connected with the natural process of aging of an organism and it has its behavioral and intellectual correlates. The results of the vertical researches prove, i.a. a drop in intellectual and perception capacity after 40 years of age and a drop in sensual efficiency (time of straight reaction, eyesight efficiency) from the age of 30 (Ulrich, Randall, Sędek, 2006) which are of physiological background and are a natural consequence of going through subsequent stages in a life of a human being (Brzezińska, 2005, p. 24). Individual differences in this field are treated

as insignificant deflections and may concern speeding up or postponing some changes due to cognitive activity of an individual in selected areas (Strelau, 2006).

Larger differentiation can be observed in the aspect of biological age which is connected with gaining life experience by an individual and results from the individuals' knowledge and/or experience. However, within the dimension socio-demographic factors play a moderating role. These factors to a large extent constitute experience of an individual, shaping their values, attitudes and behaviors. The analysis of differentiation of conditions of professional activity enables the identification of some characteristic qualities of behaviors of successive generations of employees.

Another area discussed in the article concerning organizational behaviors is the differentiation of individuals in terms of gender. In this area there is also some dichotomy of analyses as – on the one hand – the subject of the researches is objective differences in the abilities of women and men, and – on the other hand – the researches concern differences in behavior and their explanation, based on the gender stereotypes.

The differences in behaviors of women and men are the subject of broader analyses than the differences in abilities of the two genders. They stem from the gender stereotypes, whose significance – in the opinion of B. Wojciszke – result from various and far-reaching consequences. From psychological perspective they can be divided into: intrapersonal and interpersonal ones (Wojciszke, 2009, p. 420). Considering the discussion in this article, of more significance are intrapersonal consequences as they determine cognitive evaluations of one's own organizational behaviors, i.e. the way a situation in a workplace is interpreted. In this respect, shaping an individual identity by women and men is the major moderator. The effect of the identity shaped in this way could be both differentiation of the contents of self-verification made by women and men, i.e. measures they take and the ways in which they perceive their own behaviors (men more often take up the task of managing others and perceive themselves as more efficient leaders than women) (Wojciszke, 2009, p. 421). Therefore, in such a situation it is difficult to unanimously judge where and when social expectations of a role are the cause of acting and when they become its effect.

The analysis of the subject literature points out, however, that among the researchers there is a consensus concerning stereotypes of femininity and masculinity. In the literature there is also some approve canon of the description of generation group behaviors in job market. In both areas some discrepancies could be observed, notably in case of identifying major dimensions describing this differentiation. Thus, it seems justifiable to develop some kind of a holistic

approach, enabling both and independent analysis of the two dimensions and their comparison.

Employee-organization relationship – theoretical approach

The description of organizational behaviors differentiation – due to broadness of this area – has been restricted in this article to the analysis of employee-organization relationship, defined by means of four components:

- location of a responsibility for tasks (*locus of task*);
- location of sources of knowledge (*locus of knowledge*);
- location of a responsibility for development (*locus of development*);
- location of identity (*locus of identity*).

The above components are a basis for distinguishing three different types of behaviors¹ (Table 1).

Table 1. Components of employee-organization relationship description

Components of employee-organization relationship	Types of behaviors		
Location of a responsibility for tasks	Dependency	Partnership	Autonomy
Location of sources of knowledge	Unilateral	Bilateral	Multilateral
Location of a responsibility for development	Organizational	Shared	Individual
Location of identity	Object	Subject	Temporary

Source: Authors' own.

The component of a *responsibility for tasks* aims at presenting the extent of dependency on employee in relation to a superior in the context of accomplishing objectives and tasks in a workplace. The passive accomplishment of the tasks delegated by a superior, being a passive pursuer of the tasks delegated, results in total dependency on the superior. There is no room for autonomy of an employees in the process of pursuing the tasks. In case of partnership, employees can do their work on their own, without the supervision of the others, they have more

¹ The model used in the article is based on the assumptions of the Multidimensional Analysis of Organizational Behaviors concept in which three types of organizational behaviors are distinguished. In order to make the analyses conducted in the article as transparent as possible, the Authors decided not to use the original names of categories, making use of their characteristics only.

freedom and responsibility. However, it should be stressed that the final decision is taken by their superior, and their entire autonomy is typical for the third type of the discussed behaviors.

Location of sources of knowledge is linked to the ways of acquiring it by employees. Unilateral flow of knowledge is the first of them and making use of such a way employees acquire knowledge solely from their superior. In case of bilateral way of acquiring knowledge, the employees get to know how to complete their tasks from their superior. They also gain knowledge thanks to their growing autonomy in the process of their work. This autonomy is reflected in seeking multilateral sources of knowledge.

Responsibility for development as a traditional concept is attributed to an organization which is perceived by employees as the only depositor of their competences and skills. In the entire process of their development the employees adapt a passive attitude, subordinated to the objectives of their organization. In case of *shared* responsibility, employees benefit from the support of their organization while being active participants of the process. They are also actively involved in a decision-making process concerning the direction and pace of their personal development. Yet, it should be stressed that taking the entire responsibility by an employee, characteristic for *individual* type of behavior does not mean the abandonment of the organization's support. The support is only restricted to the instrumental one, i.e. taking advantage of development opportunities offered by the employer. However, the responsibility for the whole development process is borne by the employee who constructs his/her own career path independently of the organization he/she works for.

The component of *location of identity* defines two relevant features of the relationship: kind of identity and time factor. In case of object identity, an employee has a feeling of being an integral part of an organizational system, yet, it is the integrity of being "a part of a machine" with the scope of influence strictly determined and restricted. Unlike the object identity, the subject one means that an employee feels an important and needed member of the organization and, while planning the future, he/she links it with the current employer, assuming that the success of both subjects of the relationship is strictly combined with each other. Given the temporary nature of the relationship, the *organosphere* is becoming the source of identity. The *organosphere* is the space where both current and potential employers of an individual are positioned (Januszkiewicz, 2016).

Research methodology²

2,274 employees of 40 organizations (36% woman and 64% men) participated in the empirical researches. The average age of the researched amounted to 38.2. A half of the employees were over 36 years of age, with the youngest aged 15 and the oldest one – aged 83.

In the research the Multidimensional Analysis of Organizational Behaviors questionnaire was used. The questionnaire is usually used to examine organizational solutions and cognitive aspects of organizational behaviors both in general terms and in the terms of individual dimensions. Theoretical constructs included in the model were operationalized in the empirical research by means of indicators referring to cognitive aspects of the evaluation of work (Januszkiewicz et al., 2016).

Basing on the thesis put forward in the article that characteristics of primary identity differentiate employee-organization relationships, two research hypotheses were formulated: H1: There is a relationship between a gender of the people surveyed and their attitude towards their organization. Women – to a larger extent identify themselves with their organization and they more often shape their co-dependency identity than their male equivalents.

H 2: There is a relation between the people surveyed and the nature of employee-organization relationship. Employees starting their professional career and those who are just about to finish it are the most “independent”.

The gender and age of surveyed are independent variables that have a status of explanatory variables. To determine the relationship and verify the hypothesis chi-square test was used through Pearson correlation coefficient with the assumed level $\alpha = 0.05$.

² The data presented in this article have been gathered as a result of the research project “Multidimensional Analysis of Organizational Behaviors – methodology and tools of measurement”, conducted in the Chair of Management at Łódź University. The project was financed from the funds of the National Centre for Science, decision No. DEC-2013/09/B/HS4/02722. Dr Katarzyna Januszkiewicz was in charge of the research project. In line with the assumptions prior to the research, the project included two stages, with the first one aimed at describing the organizations (297 non-profit entities took part in the research). The second stage included the description of employees’ organizational behaviors in intentionally selected organizations included in the first stage. The research findings presented in the article were obtained within the second stage.

Results of empirical researches

The statistical analysis proved that there is a correlation between some components of employee – organization relationship and a gender and age of the surveyed (Table 2).

Table 2. Isolated variables vs. gender and age of the surveyed

Variable	Gender	Age
Location of responsibility for tasks (locus of task)	0.555	0.013*
Location of sources of knowledge	0.038*	0.001*
Location of responsibility for development	0.094	0.000*
Location of identity	0.037*	0.000*

p – probability in chi-square depending test; – statistically relevant dependency ($\alpha = 0.05$)

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches (n = 2.274).

It is noticeable that gender is a variable that to a smaller extent than age differentiates organizational behaviors of employees. Statistically relevant differences have been recorded in two out of four categories: location of sources of knowledge ($p=0.038$) and location of identity ($p=0.037$). In case of age statistically relevant differences have been observed in all categories.

In the area of detailed analyses the first to be presented are the results concerning differentiation of organizational behaviors among women and men.

Table 3. Location of responsibility for tasks vs. gender of the surveyed

Location of responsibility for tasks (locus of task)	Gender ($p=0.555$)	
	Woman	Man
Dependency	13.2%	14.7%
Partnership	68.5%	68.0%
Autonomy	18.3%	17.2%

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches (n = 2.274).

The findings indicate that the correlation between a gender and location of responsibility for tasks is not statistically relevant ($p>0.05$). Regardless of the gender the dominant type of responsibility for tasks location is *partnership*. The percentage of such indications is similar in case of women and men (68.5% and

68% respectively). Independently of the gender *dependency* is the most seldom indicated type of location of the responsibility for tasks.

The findings concerning the sources of knowledge indicated by man and women are quite different (Table 4).

Table 4. Type of knowledge sources vs. gender of the surveyed

Sources of knowledge	Gender (p=0.038)	
	Woman	Man
Unilateral	10.3%	11.3%
Bilateral	83.0%	79.0%
Multilateral	6.7%	9.7%

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches (n = 2.274).

In this area of the researches their findings prove statistically relevant differences (p=0.038). Both women (83%) and men (79%) most often chose a hybrid way of acquiring information (both on their own and from their superior). However, the men (11.3%) slightly more often than the women (10.3%) present in this area a unilateral attitude, i.e. passive way of acquiring the information. The surveyed most seldom (6.7% of women and 9.7% of men) acquire the knowledge in a multilateral way, i.e. on their own and in a diversified way.

Referring to the location of responsibility to development (Table 5) it should be observed that in both groups the vast majority of people declare co-operation with their organization in the area of creating and realizing their career path. However, in case of men the percentage is slightly lower: 64.1% of men and 68.3% of women. Taking actions on their own is declared by slightly more men (14.5%) than women (11.6%). These differences – as it has already been mentioned – are not statistically relevant (p=0.098).

Table 5. Responsibility for development

Location of responsibility for development (locus of development)	Gender (p=0.098)	
	Woman	Man
Responsibility of organization	20.1%	21.4%
Proportional responsibility	68.3%	64.1%
Responsibility of an individual	11.6%	14.5%

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches (n = 2.274).

It is worth emphasizing that in case of location of identity (Table 6), there is a lack of dominance of one of the categories as it is the case with other components. Both women and men most seldom declared temporary identity, however, as far as the men are concerned over 50% of the respondents feel treated as objects (51.1%) in their relationship with their organization.

Table 6. Identity vs. gender of the surveyed

Location of identity (locus of identity)	Gender (p=0.037)	
	Woman	Man
Object identity	45.6%	51.1%
Subject identity	47.0%	41.4%
Temporary identity	7.4%	7.6%

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches (n = 2.274).

Age of the surveyed employees is another variable that has been analyzed. In the analysis, first, the results of the researches on the relations between location of responsibility for tasks and age group have been interpreted (Table 7). The researches indicate that there is a correlation between the two variables (p=0.013). Partnership is considered to be the dominant location of the responsibility for tasks in all age groups. Yet, analyzing the results in individual age groups it appears that the oldest employees (over 64 years of age) and the youngest ones (under 25 years of age) are characterized with the dependency while pursuing their tasks and they take no responsibility for the accomplishment of their tasks.

Table 7. Type of location of responsibility for tasks vs. age of surveyed

Location of responsibility for tasks (locus of task)	Age (p=0.013)					
	under 25	25–34 years of age	35–44 years of age	45–54 years of age	55–64 years of age	Over 64
Dependency	20.4%	10.4%	11.4%	14.7%	18.6%	22.2%
Partnership	69.4%	71.7%	67.3%	68.7%	64.0%	66.7%
Autonomy	10.2%	17.8%	21.3%	16.6%	17.4%	11.1%

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches (n = 2.274).

Referring to the presented below statistical relevance between age and source of knowledge it is worth noting that in all age groups the employees most of acquire their knowledge in a bilateral way (Table 8). However, considering the results in the remaining categories it could be observed that more than 1/3 of employees over 65 years of age advocates a unilateral information flow, and no one – in this age group – has indicated the multilateral channel. This is also the case in the age group of under 25 years of age (6.1%).

Table 8. Type of knowledge source vs. age of the surveyed

Sources of knowledge	Age (p=0.001)					
	under 25	25–34 years of age	35–44 years of age	45–54 years of age	55–64 years of age	Over 64
Unilateral	13.3%	6.6%	9.5%	12.3%	16.9%	33.3%
Bilateral	80.6%	85.9%	81.3%	79.6%	72.7%	66.7%
Multilateral	6.1%	7.5%	9.2%	8.1%	10.5%	0.0%

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches (n = 2.274).

As for professional development, independently of the age of the people surveyed, shared responsibility was the most often chosen answer. The largest percentage of such attitudes was characteristic for the age group over 64 (77.8%), while the lowest (64.6%) for the age group of 35–44 years of age. The detailed data are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Responsibility for the development vs. age of the surveyed

Location of responsibility for development	Age (p=0.000)					
	under 25	25–34 years of age	35–44 years of age	45–54 years of age	55–64 years of age	Over 64
Responsibility of organization	18.6%	14.7%	21.0%	20.6%	24.3%	11.1%
Bilateral responsibility	68.0%	68.4%	64.6%	71.6%	69.8%	77.8%
Responsibility of an individual	13.4%	16.9%	14.5%	7.8%	5.9%	11.1%

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches (n = 2.274).

The responsibility of an organization has been most often indicated by the employees aged 55–64 (24.3%), whereas the largest autonomy in this respect has been declared by the employees aged 25–34. These differences, as mentioned above, are statistically relevant ($p = 0.000$).

Discussing in detail the correlation between age and location of identity, it can be stated that along with the age the feeling of being an object is growing (from 46.9% to 66.7%) and there is a drop in the feeling of being a subject in the relationship (from 46.9% to 22.2%) (Table 10).

Table 10. Identify vs. age of surveyed

Location of identity	Age ($p=0.000$)					
	under 25	25–34 years of age	35–44 years of age	45–54 years of age	55–64 years of age	Over 64
Object identity	46.9%	38.8%	46.2%	53.5%	65.5%	66.7%
Subject identity	46.9%	54.1%	46.0%	41.9%	28.7%	22.2%
Temporary identity	6.1%	7.1%	7.8%	4.6%	5.8%	11.1%

Source: Authors' own based on empirical researches ($n = 2.274$).

In this area some exception seems to be employees aged 25–34, for who the proportion between object and subject identity is different from the other age groups and it acts to the advantage of partnership relationships (object – 38.8%, subject – 54.1%).

Discussion on results and conclusions

Categories of primary identity distinguished in the article (age, gender) have appeared to explain the differentiation of employee-organization relationship no in a homogenous way. Statistically relevant dependencies for each of the surveyed employees, whereas in case of gender variable – only in the case of the components location of sources of knowledge and location of identity.

The obtained results enable accepting H1 only partly. H1 states: *there is a relationship between the gender of the surveyed and their attitude to their organization*. However, concerning the detailed assumption: women to a larger extent identify themselves with their organizations and more often develop dependent identify than men, ambiguity of the results allows neither to accept, nor to reject the

hypothesis. It is women who most often described their relationship with the organization as the subject one, feeling like being both partners and important element of a working process, whereas men more often positioned themselves in a passive, object role. However, in the latter group initiative and readiness to act autonomously predominated (information was acquired in a multilateral way).

The lack of significant differences in organizational behaviors of women and men might be connected with the disappearing differences in the behavioral patterns of women and men within the past decades, already signaled by the researches (Wojciszke, 2009) and some gender unification that does not mean, however, the dominance of either of the types. It could result from the emergence of a new androgynous type within an organization, which includes characteristics of typical feminine and masculine behaviors. In the set of qualities required from the employees there is both firmness and empathy, assertiveness and readiness for co-operation. Moreover, acting in favor of equality of rights and promoting a defined type of behavior, impede unanimous gender identity. In such a context the object identity of women may neither prove dependent identity nor autonomous one. It could be a part of sheer calculation, with no burden resulting from temporary character of the relationship that is combined with temporary identity.

In case of the second variable that has analyzed age of the surveyed, it is worth underlining that the empirical data allow to confirm the first part of the hypothesis – existing relationship between the age of the surveyed and the character of employee-organization relationship. Yet, the data concerning the second part of the hypothesis (the most “independent” are the employees starting their professional career and those who are about to finish it) have to be discussed in detail. Their independency results mainly from their different professional values and other perception of the working environment, in case of employees under 25 years of age, it seems that they treat the values and the environment as an opportunity to gain their first professional experience and are at the stage of seeking their own professional identity. On the other hand, the employees aged over 64 have already achieved their professional stabilization and are no longer so much interested in active involvement in their organization as the other age groups are.

The differences between the two age groups could also be observed while analyzing the variables in more detail. Location of responsibilities for tasks variable as well as the sources of knowledge one, indicate that partnership and bilateral way of knowledge acquisition (from the superior and on their own) are characteristic for the majority of the respondents. The above results from the fact that the organization treats its employees as partners who have an opportunity to

express their opinions on the tasks performed. They are also empowered to take decisions concerning accomplishment of organization's objectives. The attained research results are surprising as for the similarity of responses from two age groups (under 25 and over 64 years of age). Both groups declare total dependency and subordination in the area of responsibility for performing organizational tasks. They are also least numerous groups, for whom autonomy is characteristic in terms of location of responsibility for tasks.

Such attitudes might be connected with the nowadays professional values. Generation of baby Boomers (over 64 years of age) or younger generation Y (under 25 years of age) do not have the need of self-identification with their organizations and commitment to it. Neither do they depend on stability and job security. In case of generation Y such attitudes might result from their belief in easier and faster change of working environment. Moreover, they are the employees whose knowledge acquisition process has just started; they are just gaining experience and work being supervised by more senior employees. Therefore, they are characterized by small degree of autonomy in a decision-making process and majority of them are not able to acquire knowledge in the multilateral way. Such people usually change oriented, ready to take up challenges of trainings and mentoring (Brdulak, 2014, p. 164). Therefore, it would be advisable to launch a mentoring program including such employees, given the fact that senior employees have unique knowledge and it is difficult to replace them. On the other hand, the employees aged more than 64 are at such a stage of their development that they do not need new challenges, reluctantly adapt to change, dislike taking autonomous decisions and acquire knowledge in a multilateral way. They feel the best in their known and stable environment, having a large need of job security (Kołodziejczyk-Olczak, 2014). Such employees cannot be shaped contrary to the junior ones who could be well adjusted to the needs and objectives of their organizations.

Employees of all the age groups declare shared responsibility for their development. This indicates that – on the one hand – the organization sets the pace and direction of employees' development. On the other hand, the development is the aftermath of employees' involvement in the working process. Thus, at each stage of their career path majority of employees perceive their development in a similar way. However, some differences are noticeable. They concern the location of the responsibility for development in the context of employees' autonomy. It is observed that along with the age the attitude towards shaping the employee own career and taking the responsibility for it is changing. It could be stated that such a phenomenon is typical for functioning of various generations in labor market. Similar conclusions could be drawn in case of location of identity. The feeling of

being an object increases along with the age – the employee feels like being treated as a part of a machine performing a delegated task. The employee is no longer an important and valuable element in the organization's development process, thus, the subject relationship is shrinking. However, it cannot be neglected that some employees, regardless of their age, prefer such kinds of jobs that do not require autonomy and responsibility for the job. They like being led and supervised by the others and they appreciate traditional values.

Concluding, it should be stated that the diversity of organizational behaviors is to remain an integral part of the organizations. Yet, the features of the diversity are likely to undergo changes due to social and demographic processes taking place in the surrounding environments. However, although it could be expected that some characteristics will no longer unanimously determine organizational behaviors (e.g. gender), their entire unification is dubious, if not impossible. Organizations wanting to effectively manage diversity should – first of all – not only seek the unification of behaviors, but they also should work out solutions tailored to diversified employee groups, thus ensuring optimal conditions in the area of functioning of the organization. This could be achieved thanks to:

- creating and launching mentoring programs using the knowledge of more seniors and experienced employees (inter-generations transmission);
- enlarging self-awareness of employees and their responsibility for their own development through their participation in coaching workshops;
- conducting interpersonal trainings enhancing motivation and involvement of especially junior and senior staff;
- considering different psycho-physical predispositions in managing employees;
- implementing instrument from the area of age management aimed at shaping the working environment, taking in to account heterogeneous labor resources.

Both the implementation and systematic evaluation of the suggested solutions seem to be the desired direction of development in the field of managing the social sub-system of an organization.

References

- Arredondo, P. (1996). *Successful Diversity Management Initiatives: A blueprint for planning and implementation*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Blackwell, A. (2007). *Zarządzanie różnorodnością. Materiały dla osób uczestniczących w konferencji* – Responsible Business Forum, Oxford: P.H. Publishing.
- Brzezińska, A.I. (2005). *Psychologiczne portrety człowieka. Praktyczna psychologia rozwojowa*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

- Brdulak, H. (2014). Zmiany demograficzne – nowe wyzwania w zarządzaniu, Wybrane aspekty. *Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie*, Vol. XV, Book 11, Part I, 157–170.
- Farndale, E., Biron, M., Brisco, D.R., Raghuram S. (2015). A global perspective on diversity and inclusion in work organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26 (6), 677–687.
- Gardemswartz, L., Rowe, A. (1998). *Managing diversity: a complete desk reference and planning guide*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gryszko, M. (2009). *Raport z zarządzania różnorodnością w Polsce*. Warszawa: Responsible Business Forum.
- Graham, M.E., Belliveau, M.A., Hotchkiss, J.L. (2017). The view at the top or signing at the bottom? Workplace diversity responsibility and women's representation in management. *ILR Review*, 70 (1), January, 223–258.
- Heres, L., Benschop, Y. (2010). Taming diversity: An exploratory study on the travel of a management fashion. Equality. *Diversity & Inclusion: An International Journal*, 29(5), 436–457.
- Jackson, S.E., Joshi, A., Erh, N.L. (2003). Recent Research on Team and Organizational Diversity: SWOT Analysis and Implications. *Journal of Management*, 29, 801–830.
- Januszkiewicz, K. (2016). Kreatorzy sukcesu organizacji – zachowania organizacyjne pracowników w świetle badań empirycznych. *Zarządzanie i Finanse*, 2016, 14 (2), 145–155.
- Januszkiewicz, K. i zespół (2016). *Wielowymiarowa Analiza Zachowań Organizacyjnych (WAZO) w polskich przedsiębiorstwach*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Kołodziejczyk-Olczak, I. (2014). Praktyki zarządzania międzypokoleniowego w obszarze rekrutacji i selekcji pracowników. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, No. 5, 29–42.
- Kopeć, J. (2016). Dylematy zarządzania różnorodnością pracowniczą. In: M. Stor, A. Fornalczyk (ed.), *Sukces w zarządzaniu kadrami: dylematy zarządzania kadrami w organizacjach krajowych i międzynarodowych: problemy zarządczo-psychologiczne*. Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu No. 430, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, 176–184.
- Kundu, S.C., Turan, M.S. (1999). Managing Cultural Diversity in Future Organizations. *The Journal of Indian Management and Strategy*, 4(1), 61–72.
- Parham, P.A., Muller, H.J. (2008). Review of workforce diversity content in organizational behavior texts. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7 (3), 424–428.
- Rakowska, A. (2014). Różnorodność zasobów ludzkich – stań badań i wyzwania. In: Stor, M., Listwan, T. (eds.), *Sukces w zarządzaniu kadrami. Różnorodność w zarządzaniu kapitałem ludzkim – podejścia, metody, narzędzia. Problemy zarządczo-ekonomiczne*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu No. 349, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, 351–360.

- Stor, M, Listwan, T. (ed.) (2014). *Sukces w zarządzaniu kadrami. Różnorodność w zarządzaniu kapitałem ludzkim – podejścia, metody, narzędzia. Problemy zarządczo-ekonomiczne*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu No. 349, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.
- Strelau, J. (2006). *Psychologia różnic indywidualnych*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Waszczak, S. (2009). Postawy wobec różnorodności – uwarunkowania, próba typologii, implikacje. In: M. Juchnowicz (ed.), *Kulturowe uwarunkowania zarządzania kapitałem ludzkim*. Kraków: Wolters Kluwer.
- Wiśniewska, S. (2016). Zarządzanie różnorodnością kulturową – aspekt teoretyczno-praktyczny. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 9–24.
- Wojciszke, B. (2009). *Człowiek wśród ludzi. Zarys psychologii społecznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Wziątek-Staśko, A. (2012). *Diversity management. Narzędzia skutecznego motywowania pracowników*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Ulrich, H., Randall, E.W., Sędek, G. (2013). *Ograniczenia Poznawcze Vol. 12, Starzenie się i psychopatologia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Katarzyna Januszkiewicz, PhD

Faculty member in the Faculty of Management, Łódź University, M.A. in Psychology, in charge of numerous Polish and international projects in the field of people's behaviors in organizations. She is the author of several dozen scientific publications in which psychological knowledge is used to analyze organizational processes.

Izabela Bednarska-Wnuk, PhD

Faculty member in the Faculty of Management, Łódź University. Among her scientific interests there is the field of social aspects of management, including organizational behaviors, mobility of employees and functioning of human resources within organizational systems. The author or co-author of five publications and more than fifty scientific articles. She participated in research projects, both Polish and international ones, as a leader or performer.