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**ABSTRACT**

An ageing population has led to calls for greater consideration of age in the social, economic, political and market arenas. Little is known about which age diversity policies, practices and programs are effective in which types of organizations or for what outcomes. This paper proposes and tests a positive relationship between three elements of age diversity management (diversity policies and systems, age diversity practices, and work-life programs) and one organisational outcomes namely, corporate social responsibility. It also proposes and tests for a moderating effect of the organizations’ diversity perspective (fairness, access or learning). Data were collected from 248 medium to large sized for profit organizations, private or publicly listed on the Australian Securities Exchange. The results suggest the use of different policies, practices, and work-life programs for appropriate and meaningful age diversity management for different business propositions. Some aspects of age diversity management may be seen by employees as transactional such as work-life programs with an age focus; while others, such as age diversity policies and systems may provide real opportunities for substantive transformational organizational learning.
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**Background**

The ageing of the world’s populations is a phenomenon that is challenging many societies. Globally, by 2020 - 90% of people aged 15-24 will live in developing regions where there is also a scarcity of stable jobs and required skills. While in established industrial economies the working age population continues to fall and the retirement age population continues to grow, creating economic challenges to social models, welfare systems, and economic growth (Catalyst 2015). However, the process of an ageing population is not identical in all western countries. The major reason for this is the difference in the moment at which the decline in birth rates set in and the speed at which it proceeds (Kene Henkers and Shippers 2012). This population shift will have significant consequences on the demand for and provision of social and support services among them health care, housing, income security, and long-term care Swanson (2002). Therefore the age management experience will likely be different and also be required to be different within different regions.

Jurisdictions around the world are seeking to address the ageing population issue through various means such as immigration; increasing the birth rates; youth employment schemes; persuading people to stay in the labour force longer; pension schemes; and health care schemes (Kulik et al 2014). Social and legislative change has brought new demands on organisations too, in the effort to involve all aspects of the community. Various legislations in relation to overcoming age discrimination and managing age diversity has forced the hand of organisations through their corporate responsibility for age diversity management. Increasingly this is becoming an important workplace issue. Employers now face the management of up to four generational groups and resolving their intergenerational differences will present as a major future challenge (Patrickson & Ranzijn 2004; Lester et al 2012). Patrickson and Ranzijn (2004) believe that organizations (and their communities) will need to consider the degree to which they are prepared to reverse present negative attitudes towards employment of older staff. Yet little is known of age diversity management implementation and the link to organizational outcomes. Our research seeks to address this gap by investigating age diversity management implementation in 248 medium to large sized for profit organizations.

**Managing age diversity**

In addition to social policy and legislative change, organizational management of age diversity is increasingly recognised as paramount in age diversity management in industrialised countries. Successfully attracting and retaining employees across all age groups has long been important for the long term effectiveness, not to mention the very survival, of organizations (Kunze et al 2011). How management teams and HR management accomplish this through the messages they send and the policies and practices they support has become more critical in recent times (Bieling, Stock, & Dorozalla 2015). In understanding how organizations are addressing age diversity management Kulik et al., (2014) suggests that the who of the age-diverse workforce; the what needs to be managed; (e.g. recruitment, training, remuneration) and the why of managing it (legal, social and business cases for age diversity) are all relatively well understood (Kulik et al., 2014). However, how to manage (which human resource policies, systems, practices and programs are effective) demands further investigations (Kulik et al., 2014). Walker (2005) identified five main dimensions of age management which include four HRM practices (recruitment, training, promotion and flexible work and job design) and a policy for developing attitudinal change. Mahon and Miller (2014) suggest the first change is the province of senior management who must provide the leadership and sustained attention to ageing as a positive policy contribution to the overall health and life of the organization.

Results show that managing age diversity does have positive outcomes for organizations. Böhm et al. (2014) examined the indirect impact of five age-inclusive practices (recruitment, employees’ training and development, career development, management training and education, and organizational culture) on perceived organizational performance and collective turnover intentions and found positive links in all cases. Similarly, Kunze et al. (2013) assessed the effect of three diversity-friendly policies (workshop sponsorship, efforts in diversity management, and money and time spent on diversity awareness) on the age diversity–diversity climate–perceived performance relationship also with positive results. Bieling et al. (2015) assessed the effect of age-inclusive appraisal and compensation practices on perceived organizational performance with findings that indicate that age diversity management in both appraisal and compensation contributes to employee welfare, which is related to organisational performance

These studies provide evidence of the positive effects of both age diversity policies and age diversity practices on numerous organizational outcomes. While these studies provide some evidence of the positive effects of age diversity policies and practices the small number of diversity policies and practices studied offer little insight into comprehensive age diversity management. Böhm et al.’s (2014) five practices were based on equal opportunity principles rather than voluntary age diversity management, while Kunze et al.’s (2013) three policies were generic diversity management policies – not age diversity management. Bieling et al.’s (2015) focus was limited to appraisal and compensation practices.

Our research addresses this gap by investigating the use of three broad elements of age diversity management, namely age diversity policy and systems; age diversity practices; and, the further element of work and family policies implemented in the name of meaningful age diversity management. We added work and family friendly workplace policies because these have previously been designed to meet the needs of employees with family responsibilities, such as caregiving demands (Callan, 2007). However over time caregiving roles have shifted, resulting in the development and implementation of paternity, bereavement, and adoption leaves, among others (Wright & Wysong, 1998). In recent years, another shift has happened. The increasing responsibilities being placed on working-aged people to care for aged or dying relatives McKee et al. 2000) particularly within developed nations that face large ageing populations (Vuksan, Williams & Crooks, 2012).

**Corporate Social Responsibility**

A corporation’s responsibility in dealing equitably with diversity matters continues to grow. Employers often espouse their commitment to employee diversity and cite their efforts as part of their reporting of CSR campaigns. Increasingly organizations call on their employees for support of CSR initiatives (Gillespie Finney, Zachary Finney, & Parry 2014). Research into diversity management and CSR continues to grow particularly gender, race and age diversity (Hatch & Stephens 2015; Haldar & Mizhra 2015; Harjoto, Laksmana, & Lee 2015; Hafsi, T., & Turgut, G. 2013). However much of the research has been looking into demographic diversity and its links with corporate social responsibility. However changing the demographics alone in an organization is not considered an extensive approach to managing diversity (MD). MD is based on the belief that undertaking specific policies and practices is designed to achieve specific strategic goals of organizations (Cox & Blake 1991; Thomas & Ely, 1996) rather than merely changing the demographics.

In 2001 the EU defined Corporate Responsibility (CR) as: "A concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis." CR links an organization to its community and as such it offered our study an external focus for a measure of organizational outcome relative to age diversity management implementation. According to Hatch and Stephen (2015) the importance of CR has been surging over recent years. The recent global financial crisis highlighted the importance of an organizational investment strategy focused on the long term that has corporate sustainability at its core. CR offers both monetary and non-monetary benefits in competitive advantage and economic success. While its definition and constructs remain debated as dimensions, responsibility areas; discretionary and non-discretionary practices (Carroll 1979; Carroll 2000; Wang, 2008; Weber 2008 and Turker 2009) its management through diversity policies and practices is increasingly recognized.

Few studies examine the operationalization of diversity and links to CSR. Kabongo, Chang, & Li, (2013) found that operational diversity (i.e. implementing diversity policies and practices) do influence CSR, namely, the act of corporate giving, (a philanthropic dimension of CSR) much more than demographic diversity alone. Finding support for earlier work (Wang & Coffey 1992; Williams, 2003) that board diversity does positively influence CSR, their study also investigated the impact of operational diversity and found that such practices (including work/life balance practices) are a more important indicator that predicts future corporate giving than does board diversity (Kabongo, Chang & Li, 2013). Operational diversity, they predict, results in more interdependent relationships with the environment than mere board diversity alone. But, their investigation did not specifically include age diversity measures. Gillespie Finney, Zachary Finney, & Parry (2014) found links between EEO/AA implementation and CSR efforts but they did not include MD operationalization in their study. Their study of potential employees found both supporters of EEO and AA and non-supporters of EEO and AA positively viewed companies' CSR efforts as meeting their goals and their customers' goals with supporters of EEO and AA less positive about the companies' CSR efforts. Gillespie Finney, Zachary Finney, & Parry (2014) recommend that rather than citing the coercive efforts of EEO/AA as part of their CSR activities, employers may be better served citing broader diversity initiatives. We propose that there will be a positive relationship between the various elements of age diversity management and employees perspective of the organizations’ corporate social responsibility.

**Diversity Perspective**

We propose that the relationship between the three different elements of age diversity management and employee perceptions of CSR will be contingent upon the diversity perspective of the organisation. Managing Diversity for strategic outcomes within organizations has been the subject of much speculation and debate, with acknowledgement that different and often flawed assumptions regarding diversity impact on its ability to affect outcomes (Dass and Parker 1999; Lorbiecki 2001; Ely & Thomas 2001; Swanson 2002; Foldy 2004). Ely and Thomas (2001) suggest that the perspective held on diversity by a work group influences both how the individuals in that group express and manage the tensions related to diversity and the respect and value felt by those traditionally under-represented in the organization.

Thomas and Ely (1996) identified three diversity perspectives: ‘discrimination and fairness’, ‘access and legitimacy’, and ‘integration and learning’. The ‘discrimination and fairness’ perspective considers the elimination of discrimination and ensuring justice- and equality the all-encompassing rationale for diversity. The value of diversity in itself is low in that it is little recognized, with assimilation the most important feature. The ‘access and legitimacy’ perspective considers diversity a means to an end, such that it uses diversity to gain access and legitimacy within diverse markets or with diverse clients. The value of diversity is purposeful and moderate only as an interface between the organization and its markets. Any connections between diversity and work is an indirect one through the marketplace but there is a potential for an increase in representation of traditionally underrepresented groups particularly in positions operating close to markets. The ‘integration and learning’ perspective of diversity considers diversity as a resource for learning and adaptive change in the workplace. Its characteristics are a rationale to inform and enhance core work and work processes with a high value of identity and a direct link between diversity and work. Indicators of change or progress include increasing representation of traditionally underrepresented groups; and, process and product innovation with a shared perspective in learning. We propose that organizations with an access and legitimacy perspective or an integration and learning perspective will benefit more from age diversity management than their counterparts with a discrimination and fairness perspective.

The discrimination and fairness perspective has been linked to equal employment opportunity and its failure to stem racism and discrimination due to its principle of “sameness”. “This colour-blind, gender-blind ideal is built, however, on the assumption that, underneath, `we are all the same' or `we aspire to being all the same': thus placing pressures on employees to make sure that differences do not count” Lorbiecki 2001:351). As such, difference is seen as problematic and a liability to be neutralized. In a study of inclusion of minorities, Bernstein and Bilimoria (2013) found support for this argument as organizations with a ‘discrimination and fairness’ perspective of diversity were not linked to the outcome of greater feelings of inclusion of minority board members on not-for-profit boards.

The ‘access and legitimacy’ perspective fits with the ‘business case’ for diversity management which perceives ‘difference’ as an investment that is strategically vital to the organization (Lorbiecki 2001). It is contested as a means of influencing organizational outcomes. The ‘access and legitimacy’ perspective suggests cultural background matters but it is limited to narrow spheres, for example, when members of a group are dealing with other members of their group such as customers or networks (Foldy 2004). Thus, members of non-dominant groups may be seen as having a special contribution to make to their organization only when dealing with other members of the same marginalized group. It has been acknowledged that this perspective may provide organizations with a stepping stone to developing a culture of learning in managing diversity and substantive cultural change (Ely & Thomas 2001; Lorbiecki 2001; Foldy 2004; Bernstein & Bilimoria 2013). However Bernstein and Bilimoria (2013) found no links between the ‘access and legitimacy’ perspective held by an organization and the inclusion experiences of minority board members. In a study of four large firms Kochan, Bezrukova, Ely et al (2003) also found no support for the business case approach (access and legitimacy) of MD linking to effective business level performance data and recommend moving beyond the narrow business case of MD to building human resource policies and practices that inculcate cultures of mutual learning and cooperation.

The ‘integration and learning’ perspective of diversity has been proposed as highly beneficial in the link to effective organizational outcomes as it provides a strategic link to the core activities and existing systems of the organization so that the work gets diversified, not just the staff (Dass & Parker 1999; Lorbiecki 2001). It is recommended as encouraging real cultural change by effectively inspiring the talking through of the dimensions of difference in an organization (Swanson 2002); and that pay policy may equally be a crucial factor (Ofori-Dankwa & Scott 2014). Bernstein and Bilimoria (2013) identified a direct path between the diversity perspective of ‘integration and learning’ and the inclusion experience of minority board members, demonstrating that individuals feel included when they perceive they are valued for their differences such as talents, contributions, and abilities to assist the board serve its mission and feel less included when they perceive that perspective to be lacking.

In sum, we propose that different diversity perspectives will moderate the relationship between age diversity management and employee perspectives on CSR. Specifically, in organizations that take an access and legitimacy perspective or an integration and learning perspective, the relationship between the elements of age diversity management and the organizational outcomes will be stronger than those evidenced in organizations with a discrimination and fairness perspective.

**METHODS**

To test the propositions we surveyed HR Managers in 248 medium to large sized for profit organizations listed on the Australian Securities Exchange.

**Sample and Data Collection**

In May 2013, the survey was sent to HR decision-makers (e.g. HR directors and HR managers) at 2276 organizations. Managers from 248 organizations participated in the survey. They reported on their organization’s diversity policies and systems, age diversity practices, work-life programs, diversity perspective, and corporate social responsibility, number of employees, year the organization was founded, organization type (holding/subsidiary or stand-alone), and industry type. The survey response rate was 11.2% after adjusting for 55 undelivered surveys. A small sample can provide generalizable results if it represents the population of the study ([Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000](#_ENREF_30); [Werner, Praxedes, & Kim, 2007](#_ENREF_111)). The final sample of participating organizations reflects a wide range of organizations in size and industry. Organization size ranged from 40 employees to 65,000 employees (mean 1639). The participating organizations were drawn from all ten industry groups (based on two-digit standard industry classification (SIC) codes) with the following major representations: 55 from Services; 54 from Manufacturing; 46 from Transportation, Communications, Electric, Gas and Sanitary Services; and 19 from mining.

**Measures**

***Predictors.*** *Diversity policies and systems* were measured using a 12-item scale with yes (1) or no (0) responses (see the Appendix for a list of items). Eight items were borrowed from Konrad and Linnehan’s ([1995](#_ENREF_64)) scale of HR structures with a reported reliability of .93. Four items were drawn from Armstrong, Flood, Guthrie, Liu, MacCurtain and Mkamwa’s (2010) diversity management scale with a reported reliability of .85. The 12-item scale used in this study has a reliability of .79. The total number of ‘yes’ responses indicated the level of diversity policies and systems in an organization. *Age diversity practices* were measured using 16 items (see the Appendix for a list of items). Twelve items were borrowed from Konrad and Linnehan’s (1995) HR structures scale and four items were drawn from Armstrong et al.’s (2010) diversity management scale. For this study, the Cronbach’s alpha was .91. The responses were coded as follows: never (1), sometimes (2), most of the time (3), and always (4). The total score for 16 items (ranged from 16 to 64) indicated the level of age diversity practices. *Work-life programs* were measured using 9 items. Five items were drawn from Konrad and Mangel’s (2000) work-life programs scale with a reported reliability of .77. Four items were added to this scale to cover these programs: compressed week, flexible holidays, unpaid extra holidays, and aged employee support group (see Appendix for a list of items). The response options were: does not offer (1), offered to few employees (2), offered to most employees (3), and offered to all employees (4). These response options also cover the dimension of how many employees may benefit from these programs. The Cronbach’s alpha for the current study is .71. The final scores for work-life programs (ranged from 9 to 36) were calculated by adding the responses to each item.

All three predictors are based on formative scales. The responses to items combine to create the final index score (e.g. [Armstrong et al., 2010](#_ENREF_8); [Liao, Toya, Lepak, & Hong, 2009](#_ENREF_74)) rather than reflecting an underlying construct in the case of reflective scales. Therefore, factor analysis was not needed to investigate whether the items loaded on to the three different constructs. Items of each formative scale should not be highly correlated to each other; high correlations might suggest that some items are redundant ([Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2006](#_ENREF_36); [Petter, Straub, & Rai, 2007](#_ENREF_87)).

***Outcomes.*** *Corporate social responsibility* was measured using a seven-item scale with a reported reliability of .89 ([Turker, 2008](#_ENREF_106)). The Cronbach’s alpha for the current study is .88. The respondents reported on each item (see the Appendix for a list of items) using a five-point scale coded as follows: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The mean of responses to the seven items indicated the level of corporate social responsibility demonstrated by the organization.

***Moderator.*** Diversity perspective was measured using three categories: fairness, access and learning (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Thomas & Ely, 1996). The survey asked respondents to select their organization’s overall diversity perceptive. A short description of each perspective was provided for clarity. Two dummy variables called “access” (with “1” representing access and “0” representing fairness) and “learning” (with “1” representing learning and “0” representing fairness) were created.

***Controls.*** The analyses controlled for the effects of organization size, organization age, organization type and industry type. Organization size is associated with diversity policies and practices([Konrad, 2007](#_ENREF_63); [Kotey & Sheridan, 2004](#_ENREF_68)). Consistent with previous research, organization size was operationalized as the total number of full-time equivalent employees (Alexander, Nuchols, Bloom, & Lee, 1995). Organization age may have an impact on the adoption of diversity policies and practices ([Blum, Fields, & Goodman, 1994](#_ENREF_16)). It was operationalized as the number of years since the organization was founded ([Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000](#_ENREF_86)). Organizations that are holding companies or subsidiaries, compared to stand-alone organizations, may benefit from their combined financial resources ([Richard, McMillan, Chadwick, & Dwyer, 2003](#_ENREF_93)). A dummy variable called ‘Organization type’ was created with ‘0’ representing ‘Holding or subsidiary’ and ‘1’ representing ‘Stand-alone’. The ten SIC groups of the sample organizations were collapsed into services and manufacturing (Ali, Kulik, & Metz, 2011; [Richard, Murthi, & Ismail, 2007](#_ENREF_94)). A dummy variable called ‘Industry type’ was created with ‘0’ representing services and ‘1’ representing manufacturing.

**Discussion**

Increasing age diversity in the workplace has resulted in an increase in a range of age diversity management practices (Bieling et al 2015). But what that means for organizational outcome is not yet well understood (Kunze 2013). The main contribution of this study was to examine a range of age diversity management policies and practices in the workplace and their relationship with one organizational effectiveness measure that has been growing in importance in recent years, that of corporate social responsibility. Results supported a positive relationship between the use of various age diversity management policies and practices and CSR. Further the perspective of diversity provided a moderating effect on age diversity management and CSR. We interpret these findings as indicating that managing an organization’s perspective on diversity has become an imperative for influencing the best outcomes for any meaningful age diversity management implemented.

**Age Diversity Management and CSR**

All three indicators of Age Diversity Management; namely age policy and systems; age diversity practices and, work and life balance programs with an age focus, were positively associated with a positive perspective of the organizations’ CSR. No previous research has shown such links. Our findings add weight to the work of Kabongo, Chang, & Li, (2013) who found that two indicators of Age Diversity Management, namely implementing diversity policies and diversity practices influence the philanthropic dimension of CSR of an organization. Our addition is important as it indicates a third dimension of Age Diversity Management namely work and life balance programs with an age focus is also an important influence in employee perspectives of CSR, and further, that more than organizational gifting may be influenced through Age Diversity Management. Our findings also add to the work of Gillespie Finney, Zachary Finney, & Parry (2014) who found links between EEO/AA implementation with organizations and CSR and recommended an investigation into the broader implementation of diversity management.

**Moderating Effects of a Diversity Perspective**

Our research also proposed and tested for the moderating effect of a diversity perspective (fairness, access or learning) on the relationships between age diversity management and CSR. The perspective of organizational diversity was found to influence a number of relationships. We predicted the relationship between age diversity management and corporate social responsibility would be moderated by the type of diversity perspective held by the organization such that a learning perspective or an access perspective would have a moderating effect while a fairness perspective would not (Ely & Thomas 2001). We found: 1. Organizations with a learning perspective demonstrated a significant and strong link between their use of age diversity policies and systems and their employee positive perspectives of the corporation’s social responsibility; BUT, so too did organizations with a fairness perspective. We take this to indicate that both the fairness and the learning perspectives may be important when implementing age diversity policies and systems. One explanation of this is that the learning perspective is built upon but not separate from a fairness approach when implementing diversity policies and systems. This supports the position taken by Bernstein and Bilimoria (2013) who found that the integration and learning perspective draws upon the two previous diversity paradigms when promoting equal opportunity and recognizing cultural differences. We propose that the two approaches together allow for a transforming change to occur in the approach to age diversity management and its reception.

2. An organizations’ diversity perspective was not found to moderate the relationship between the implementation of age diversity practices and employee perspective of CSR.

3. An organizations’ diversity perspective was found to moderate the relationship between work-life programs with an age focus and CSR. In this instance it was an access perspective that was found to strongly influence the relationship between work life programs with an age focus and CSR. One explanation for this result is that employees link the approach to diversity and the approach to corporate social responsibility through the concept of a meaningful business transaction. By ensuring access to work-life programs with an age focus employees can see the meaningfulness of the transaction as it translates to their understanding of the corporation’s social responsibility

In total our findings are that Age Diversity Management in the form of age diversity policy and systems; age diversity practices and work and life balances with an age focus are a positive link to CSR and that these relationships are variously influenced by the type of diversity perspective within the organization. These findings join with others (Ng & Sears, 2012) to highlight the importance of strategy and leadership in determining and implementing meaningful diversity management.

**Theoretical and research implications**

This study makes several contributions in the age diversity management field and the role of diversity perspectives. Much of the past research on age diversity management did not consider a broad range of the elements of age diversity management. Unlike past research (Bieling et al., 2015; Böhm et al., 2014; Kunze et al., 2013), we not only distinguish between diversity policies and systems and age diversity programs, we also include work-life programs relevant to aged employees. This is an important step forward in understanding what constitutes a comprehensive approach to age diversity management and identifying the future for age diversity management research and practice. This study proposed and tests whether particular age diversity policies and systems, age diversity practices and work-life programs (age-focused) offered as a signal of positive characteristics of age diversity management lead to improved CSR performance. It extends our theoretical understanding of the impact of age diversity management on social responsibility. Moreover, this research proposes and tests whether the strength of the positive relationship between age diversity management and organizational outcomes is contingent upon a particular diversity perspective (fairness vs. access vs. learning) (Ely and Thomas, 2001; Thomas and Ely, 1996). It provides pioneering evidence of a moderating effect of an organization’s diversity perspective on the age diversity management–organizational outcomes relationship in both transactional and transformational ways.

**Practical implications**

In an era of intensified war for talent, resulting in highly competitive and dynamic job markets due to an ageing workforce (Bieling et al., 2015) this study offers decision-makers insights into how to improve one measure of organizational performance through the elements of age diversity management. The findings provide support for a strong strategic business case for managing age diversity through its various dimensions, including age diversity policy and systems; age diversity practices and work-life balance programs when considering the effects of the organizations own diversity perspective. This supports the recommendations of Böhm et al. (2014) who suggested that firms should not only install age-inclusive practices but also actively speak about them to increase employees’ awareness. Our findings suggest that employees should be assisted in focusing on the transformational effects of age diversity policies and systems for the organization and its stakeholders and the win/win situation of work-life balance programs with an age focus.

**Limitations**

This study focused on age diversity management and did not take into account other demographic diversity practices implemented within the organizations. A broad spectrum of demographic diversity has been recognized as influencing CSR (Pelled, 1996; Muchiri and Ayoko, 2013). We were also not able to control for all other factors outside diversity that influence organizational outcomes (Antony and Bhattacharyya, 2010). Moreover, the design did not allow us to make causal inferences regarding the effects of age diversity management on CSR. Menard (1991) suggests that a longitudinal research design with multiple data points mapping changes over time would offer stronger evidence of causality. A further limitation of this study is its generalizability of findings to other non-Anglo cultures. Previous research has identified that the culture in which an organization operates may influence the findings related to diversity management (Chiu et al., 2001).

**Conclusion**

Managing Age Diversity within organizations does have benefits for organizational outcomes. Employee perspectives of a corporation’s engagement with its social responsibility can be positively influenced and social responsibility increasingly has links to the corporations’ economic and social success. But it is wise to ensure the corporations own diversity perspective is taken into consideration to ensure the best possible outcomes. Some aspects of age diversity management may be seen by employees as transactional (such as work-life programs); while others, such as age diversity policies and systems may provide real transforming opportunities for substantive corporate learning in age diversity management.
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**TABLE 1**

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlationsa**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | | **Mean** | **SD** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** |
| **Controls** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | Organization size | 1639.15 | 6310.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | Organization age | 49.59 | 42.91 | .08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | Organization type  (0 = Holding/subsidiary;  1 = Stand-alone) | .42 | .49 | -.14\* | .07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. | Industry type  (0 = Services; 1 = Manf.) | .42 | .49 | .11 | .19\*\* | .03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Predictors** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | Diversity policies and systems | 5.71 | 2.70 | .13\* | -.04 | -.16\* | -.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | Age diversity practices | 46.94 | 14.46 | .07 | .02 | -.15\* | -.07 | .63\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. | Work-life programs | 19.66 | 4.55 | -.02 | -.06 | -.01 | -.14\* | .30\*\* | .27\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Moderators** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. | Diversity perspective access  (0 = fairness, learning; 1 = access)Manf.) | .09 | .28 | .01 | .08 | -.06 | -.01 | -.05 | -.02 | .00 |  |  |  |  |
| 9. | Diversity perspectives (0 = fairness, access; 1 = learning) | .40 | .49 | -.01 | .11 | .16\* | .14\* | -.01 | -.04 | -.02 | -.25\*\* |  |  |  |
| **Outcome** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. | Corporate social responsibility | 3.89 | .70 | .17\* | .04 | .02 | -.05 | .25\*\* | .25\*\* | .18\* | -.09 | -.04 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a2-tailed; \* *p*<.05, \*\* *p*<.01

**TABLE 2**

**Hierarchical Regression Analyses – Diversity policies and systems**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | Corporate social responsibility | | | |
|  | | β (Model 1) | β (Model 2) | β (Model 3) |
| **Controls** | |  |  |  |
| Organization size | | .18\* | .15\* | .17\* |
| Organization age | | .03 | .03 | .04 |
| Organization type | | .04 | .07 | .09 |
| Industry type | | -.08 | -.07 | -.05 |
| **Predictor** | |  |  |  |
| Div. policies and systems | |  | .23\*\* | .39\*\*\* |
| **Moderators** | |  |  |  |
| Access perspective  (fairness = 0, access = 1) | |  |  | -.10 |
| Learning perspective  (fairness = 0, learning = 1) | |  |  | -.08 |
| **Interaction terms** | |  |  |  |
| Div. policies and systems ×  access perspective | |  |  | -.07 |
| Div. policies and systems ×  learning perspective | |  |  | -.21\* |
|  | |  |  |  |
| *R2* | | .04 | .09 | .12 |
| *F* | | 1.83 | 3.69\*\* | 2.81\*\* |
| *∆R2* | | .04 | .05 | .03 |
| *F for ∆R2* | | 1.83 | 10.72\*\* | 1.65 |
|  |  | |  |  |

*n* = 190 (corporate social responsibility), Standardized coefficients are reported

\* *p*<.05, \*\* *p*<.01, \*\*\* *p*<.001

**TABLE 3**

**Hierarchical Regression Analyses – Age diversity practices**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | Corporate social responsibility | | |
| β (Model 1) | β (Model 2) | β (Model 3) |
| **Controls** |  |  |  |
| Organization size | .18\* | .18\* | .18\* |
| Organization age | .03 | .02 | .04 |
| Organization type | .04 | .07 | .08 |
| Industry type | -.08 | -.05 | -.05 |
| **Predictor** |  |  |  |
| Age div. practices |  | .24\*\* | .30\*\* |
| **Moderators** |  |  |  |
| Access perspective  (fairness = 0, access = 1) |  |  | -.10 |
| Learning perspective  (fairness = 0, learning = 1) |  |  | -.06 |
| **Interaction terms** |  |  |  |
| Age div. practices ×  access perspective |  |  | .02 |
| Age div. practices ×  learning perspective |  |  | -.11 |
|  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .04 | .09 | .11 |
| *F* | 1.83 | 3.70\*\* | 1.11\* |
| *∆R2* | .04 | .05 | .02 |
| *F for ∆R2* | 1.83 | 10.79\*\* | .98 |
|  |  |  |  |

*n* = 190 (corporate social responsibility), Standardized coefficients are reported

\* *p*<.05, \*\* *p*<.01, \*\*\* *p*<.001

**TABLE 4**

**Hierarchical Regression Analyses – Work-life programs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | Corporate social responsibility | | |
| β (Model 1) | β (Model 2) | β (Model 3) |
| **Controls** |  |  |  |
| Organization size | .19\* | .19 | .18\* |
| Organization age | .03 | .04 | .04 |
| Organization type | .04 | .05 | .07 |
| Industry type | -.09 | -.05 | -.04 |
| **Predictor** |  |  |  |
| Work-life programs |  | .18\* | .28\*\* |
| **Moderators** |  |  |  |
| Access perspective  (fairness = 0, access = 1) |  |  | -.10 |
| Learning perspective  (fairness = 0, learning = 1) |  |  | -.07 |
| **Interaction terms** |  |  |  |
| Work-life programs ×  access perspective |  |  | .07 |
| Work-life programs ×  learning perspective |  |  | -.18 |
|  |  |  |  |
| *R2* | .04 | .07 | .11 |
| *F* | 1.87 | 2.81\* | 2.46\* |
| *∆R2* | .04 | .03 | .04 |
| *F for ∆R2* | 1.87 | 6.38\* | 1.94 |
|  |  |  |  |

*n* = 189 (corporate social responsibility), Standardized coefficients are reported

\* *p*<.05, \*\* *p*<.01, \*\*\* *p*<.001

**FIGURE 1**

**Interaction effects of diversity policies and systems and learning perspective on corporate social responsibility**



**Appendix**

**Diversity policies and systems** (Armstrong et al., 2010; Konrad & Linnehan, 1995)

1. The organization has a formal written policy on equal opportunity (EO)
2. There is a written statement of the consequences of not adhering to EO policy
3. The organization has a formal written policy on managing diversity
4. Equality and diversity are integrated into overall business strategy
5. An EO/diversity plan exists
6. A committee comprised of members of the board of directors overseas EO/diversity issues exists
7. A committee comprised of senior managers/executives overseas EO/diversity issues exists
8. A senior manager is designated to champion equality and diversity in your organization
9. There is a person with EO expertise on staff
10. A formal policy of proactively recruiting aged people exists
11. A formal policy of proactively recruiting aged people for all management positions exists
12. A system exists which identifies positions for which EO goals have been set but have not been achieved

**Age diversity practices** (Armstrong et al., 2010; Konrad &Linnehan, 1995)

1. Employees are informed about the specifics of the EO/diversity plan
2. An outside EO/diversity expert is consulted to develop or modify employment practices
3. Positions for which EO goals have not been achieved are noted on the job requisition
4. Employment agencies which specialize in finding aged candidates are used
5. The hiring manager is informed if EO goals for the position have not been met
6. EO concerns influence the hiring decision
7. Being an aged person is a criterion considered in hiring decisions
8. Recruitment and selection are monitored by age groups
9. A major proportion of total employees receives equality/diversity training
10. Managers are trained in their EO/diversity responsibilities
11. Aged employees are specifically targeted to receive management development training
12. Aged employees who are potential candidates for management jobs are identified and targeted for promotion
13. Promotions are monitored by age groups
14. Performance rating distributions are examined for aged employees
15. Pay rates are monitor by age groups
16. Turnover rates are calculated for aged employees

**Work-life programs** (First five items from Konrad & Mangel, 2000)

1. Flexitime
2. Job-sharing
3. Part-year work
4. Part-time work
5. Voluntary reduced time (work fewer hours and then may return to their full time status)
6. Compressed week (a standard workweek is compressed to fewer than five days)
7. Flexible holidays
8. Unpaid extra holidays
9. Aged employees support group

**Corporate social responsibility** ([Turker, 2008](#_ENREF_106))

1. Contributes to campaigns and projects that promote the well-being of the society
2. Implements special programs to minimize its negative impact on the natural environment
3. Participates in activities which aim to protect and improve the quality of the natural environment
4. Targets sustainable growth which considers future generations
5. Makes investment to create a better life for future generations
6. Encourages its employees to participate in voluntary activities
7. Supports non-governmental/non-profit organizations