

WORKFORCE DIVERSITY AND CORPORATE SUSTAINABILITY: A MODERATING ROLE OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE OF MULTINATIONAL CORPORATION IN NIGERIA

Dr Dumo Nkesi Opara

**Department of Office and Information Management
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni Port Harcourt**

Email: dumopara@gmail.com-

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between workforce diversity and corporate sustainability, a moderating role of organisation culture of oil and gas multinational corporations in Nigeria. Research evidence indicates that the environmental sustainability goal is yet at its optimum using the infrastructural and social responsibility approach. The study specifically addressed the relationship between gender diversity and environmental sustainability. The study adopted the cross-sectional survey design. Structured questionnaire from 158 members of the 44 target organizations was used to generate data for the study. Three null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. The Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient was used to test the bivariate analysis. The tests were carried out at 0.05 level of significance and analysed using SPSS tool. The findings showed that there is a significant relationship between gender diversity and environmental sustainability. In conclusion, the study affirmed that gender diversity of oil and gas corporations in Nigeria impact significantly on environmental sustainability as it contributes substantially towards the unification of organizational members' ideals and values. Based on the findings, the study recommends that organizations in pursuit of environmental sustainability should emphasize on policies and culture of inclusive diverse workforce with focus on generational gaps to achieve a greater environment sustainability.

Keywords: Workforce Diversity, Environmental, Sustainability, Corporation, Multinational

INTRODUCTION

The concept of sustainability in an organizational context, predicates the principle of enhancing the societal, environmental and economic systems within which a business operates (White, 2009). It relates to the consideration organizations offer their contexts about the impact of their actions on the overall wellbeing of the context. This therefore, connotes the essence of planning and establishment of organization, basically, for the provision of goods and services for satisfying human needs. The satisfaction of these needs expectedly is to have a long-time consistency, developmental and progressive effect on the society and the environment. This by extension indicates that the overall goal or purpose of any organization is to consistently grow and survive on a long-term basis (White, 2009). A sustainable economy, according to Ogbo, Eneh, Agbaeze, Chukwu & Isijiola (2017) is not only that which is profitable for a short time period but also an economy whose focus is from one generation to the other. They opined that sustainability means meeting our needs without compromising the ability of future generations. In addition to natural and mineral resources found in the environment, there is also a need for social and economic resource

sustainability (Steiner, 2008). Thus, sustainability is not just environmentalism, embedded in the definition of sustainability in this context is the thought of sustainability to mean, 'the ability to sustain' for environmental, social equity and economic development (Ogbo, Eneh, Agbaeze, Chukwu & Isijiola, 2017).

Research suggests that the effective management policies and organizational cultural orientation towards workforce diversity is significantly associated with organization positive outcomes such as innovativeness and change receptivity (Ozbilgin & Tatli, 2008). It is also imperative to take note of cultural content of organizational context, if firms must survive in a multicultural setting. Hence, Hofstede (1998) suggested that while it is imperative to learn the customs, courtesies and business protocols of other countries, it is likewise also compulsory to understand the national characters, management philosophies and mind-sets of the people. These notwithstanding, diversity discriminations has largely shown in all ramifications, hence, according to Thompson (2016), race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual identity, age, language, disability, religion and so on are just some of the dimensions of diversity and are just some ways through which difference can so easily be translated in discrimination. Workforce diversity is therefore, critical to the health of the organization in the sense that it can become an inhibitor for organizational growth when relegated to the background. In this direction, product quality, competitive edge and profitability among other organizational outcomes may collapse due to lack of teamwork among the employees within a heterogeneous workforce.

Given the observed implications of workforce diversity on organizations, this study extends the corporate sustainability research by examining the role of workforce diversity in the corporate sustainability concept of oil and gas corporations in Nigeria.

Concept of Workforce Diversity

The classification of most of these scholars who choose narrow perspectives to the definition of the concept contend that the concept of workforce diversity should be restricted to specific cultural categories, such as race and gender (Cross, Katz, Miller & Seashore, 1994). Hence, Esty, Griffin and Hirsch, (1995), defined the concept of diversity in the workplace as acknowledging, understanding, accepting, and valuing differences among people with respect to age, class, race, ethnicity, gender, disabilities, etc. Nevertheless, some argued that diversity based on race, ethnicity and gender cannot be understood in the same way as diversity based on organizational functions, abilities or cognitive orientations (Nkomo, 1995). Moreover, the key issues of diversity are those that arise because of discrimination and exclusion of a given cultural groups from conventional organizations such as the Nigeria Public Service (Littrell, Billingsley & Cross, 1994). Consequently, if diversity is a concept that is inclusive of all individuals, it may become very difficult to identify discriminatory practices in a given situation. The main concern of this perspective is that a broad definition of the concept may suggest that all differences among people are the same.

Therefore, diversity studies would then be reduced to the conclusion that everyone is different and, if the scholars of management sciences accept this conclusion, then the concept of diversity may become "nothing more than a benign, meaningless concept (Nkomo, 1995). The problems of narrowly defining the concept of diversity, however, is that only one dimension of cultural diversity (race, age, ethnicity, or gender) is largely the subject of research at a time. Since a cultural diversity dimension interacts with other dimensions of diversity, a narrow concept of diversity would be deficient by failing to recognize these interactions (Michaela, Deanne, Paul, & Janique, 2003). On the other hand, Scholars, who

choose a broader part to the definition of workplace diversity contends that diversity encompasses all the possible ways people can differ from each other and not just in language, religious ethnic or cultural differences (Jackson, May & Whitney, 1995). Individuals, according to these scholars, do not only differ because of their race, gender, age and other demographic categories; they differ because of their values, abilities, organizational function, tenure and personality. They argued that an individual has multiple identities and that the manifold dimensions cannot be isolated in an organizational setting. Apart from bringing their race, age, ethnicity, and gender, individuals also come with their particular knowledge, personality, and cognitive style to the work place. Therefore, in order to understand the dynamics of a heterogeneous workforce, the interactive effects of multidimensional diversity have to be addressed.

concept of Corporate Sustainability

Corporate sustainability has been a topic of intense academic research, especially in the Western countries. The evolution of the corporate sustainability construct began in the 1950s, which marks the modern era of corporate sustainability. Corporate sustainability has piqued interest towards the possibilities that sustainable business actions have to offer (Halme, Laurila 2009). Problems, such as pollution, progressive climate change and child labour abuse plague especially large organizations (Guarnieri, Kao 2008). Sustainability actions are necessary and any company that considers operating at the expense of a society, quickly finds out to have chosen a rocky road (Haanaes, Michael, Jurgens & Rangan, 2013, Porter & Kramer 2006).

The possibility of raising corporate sustainability to a very new level by utilizing it as a competitive advantage has recently gained attention in academic business research (Nwagbara, Reid 2013, Porter, Kramer 2006, and Quisenberry 2012). Social and economic goals are not any longer conflicting (Porter, Kramer 2002). Corporate sustainability is seen nowadays as a strategic investment that truly pays off, rather than as a voluntary expense or a necessity to brighten a brand image (Orlitzky, Schmidt & Rynes 2003). Indeed, the focus has shifted from studying the definitions of corporate sustainability to specifying different company attitudes towards responsibility, in order to appreciate and understand corporate sustainability outcomes. Recent literature has paid attention to different action-orientation types of CSR, which has helped to understand that not every type of corporate sustainability activity can increase the firm competitiveness (Halme, Laurila 2009). Companies have started to realize that a strategic performance in corporate sustainability have also notable implications on the company's financial performance (Becchetti, Ciciretti, Hasan, & Kobeissi, 2012, Lee 2008, Orlitzky, Schmidt & Rynes 2003). There is evidence that investments in corporate sustainability sections, for example employee relations or environmental risk management contribute noticeably to reducing companies' cost of capital (El Ghoul, Guedhami, Kwok & Mishra, 2011, Sharfman, & Fernando 2008). Thus, the reason for interest in sustainability is economic outcome in nature (Martin & Schouten 2012, 15). Furthermore, in corporate sustainability reporting, focus includes internal benefits for increased understanding of risks, opportunities, emphasis on the link between financial and non-financial performance, influence long-term management strategy and policy, and business plans. It also reduce costs and improve efficiency, benchmarking and assessing sustainability performance with respect to laws, norms, codes, performance standards, and voluntary initiatives. (<https://www.globalreporting.org/information/sustainability-reporting/Pages/reporting-benefits.aspx>). Studies have been conducted with the view to

identify what enhances organization and its sustainability. For instance, research on employees' attitude towards the organization in workplace is essential as 'the most serious barriers to change in businesses are attitudinal' (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003). Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) theory of reasoned action, concludes that a strong relationship between belief, attitudes, and behavioural intentions exists, which then leads to certain behaviour. It follows therefore, that Macro-environmental pressure, personal relationships, individual values and motivations, influence and forms beliefs and attitudes (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). Hobson and Essex (2001) point out that the general attitude towards environment and the implementation of sustainable business practices is most important. However, several authors highlight that agreement with broad statements representing the idea of sustainability is easy (Horobin and Long, 1996; Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Deng, Ryan and Moutinho, 1992). Nevertheless, more specific statements and actions taken are more difficult to agree with and a certain gap between attitudinal statements and actual initiatives becomes apparent (Dewhurst & Thomas, 2003). Studies about businesses' attitudes towards responsibility for sustainable development reveal contradicting results. A survey of senior managers in the Danish tourism industry suggests that comparatively larger proportion of businesses consider the prime responsibility with the industry or with the industry working in partnership with the government (Bramwell & Alletorp, 2001).

Concept of Organizational culture

In this study, organizational culture is assumed to moderate the livewire of the work environment. An organization is a combination of diverse individuals that comes to workplace with different ideas, beliefs, religion, values and perceptions. The values, norms and the internalized mode of actions, governs the behaviour of the people in the workplace as a way of work ethics (Hansen & Wernerfelt, 1989). To understand this concept in our present time, culture as a concept expresses an essential element within the classic world that influences the way in which a man should educate himself in order to be a successful and an excellent human being in the organization and the society in general. According to Edewor & Aluko, (2007) citing Tylor (1871), culture is seen as that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, laws, custom and any other capabilities and habits that is acquired by man as a member of a social group. On the other hand, a 2002 document from the United Nations agency, UNESCO, states that culture is the set of distinctive spiritual, material, Intellectual and emotional features of a people or a social entity and that it encompasses in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs (Extra, & Yagmur, 2002).

With this background, organizational culture as a moderating variable is therefore, the personality of the organization (Kansal, 2011). This indicates that what culture means to organization could be likened to what personality values means to an individuals. It comprises the assumptions, values, norms and tangible signs (artifacts) of organization's members and their behaviour (Schein, 2004). The culture of a group could be defined as a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration (Schein, 2004). This means that, which has worked well enough to earn valid consideration and therefore, worth teaching to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.

In other words, as groups evolve over time, they face two basic challenges: integrating individuals into an effective whole, and adapting effectively to the external environment in order to survive. As a group finds solutions to these problems over time, they engage in a

kind of collective learning that created the set of shared assumptions and beliefs we call "culture". Therefore, simply defined, "organizational culture" is an organization's values, beliefs, principles, practices, and behaviour (Foldy, 2003). According to Thomas (1991), culture means more than race and gender in the workplace. Cultural diversity could be referred to lifestyle tenure, position in the organization, age, sexual preference, functional specialty or geographic location; it is the human differences that play an important role in the culture and operation of organizations (Brazzel, 1991). With this in mind, cultural diversity is, therefore, the representation, in one social system, of people with distinctly different group affiliations of cultural significance (Powell & Persico, 1995; Cox, 1994).

The primary dimensions shape our basic self-image as well as our fundamental worldview. Additionally, they have the most impact on groups in the workplace and society (Loden & Rosener, 1991). The secondary dimensions include educational background, geographic location, income, marital status, religious beliefs and work experience. These secondary dimensions of diversity affect our self-esteem and self-definition. Numerous studies have established that culturally diverse teams have different dynamics than homogeneous teams (Williams and O'Reilly, 1998). These groups are broadly seen as having both increased challenges and opportunities: diverse groups often experience miscommunication and disabling conflict (Shaw, 1981; Tsui, Egan, and Xin, 1995) yet under the right circumstances, they can be synergistic and creative (Cox, Lobel and McLeod, 1991; McGrath, 1984). Multiculturalism is more of a policy response for coping with cultural and social diversity in societies and organizations. Inglis (1994) has noted that there are three interrelated but distinctive referents of the concept 'multiculturalism', namely, the demographic- descriptive usage, the ideological-normative, and the programmatic-political usages. The demographic--descriptive usage occurs where 'multicultural' is used to refer to the existence of ethnically or racially diverse segments in the population of a society or organization. It represents a perception that such differences have some social significance, primarily because of perceived cultural differences though these are frequently associated with forms of structural differentiation. In the programmatic-political usage, 'multiculturalism' refers to specific types of Programme and policy initiatives designed to respond to and manage ethnic diversity. The ideological nonnative usage of multiculturalism is that which generates the greatest level of debate since it constitutes a slogan and model for political action based on sociological theorizing and ethical or philosophical consideration about the place of those with culturally distinct identities in contemporary societies. Multiculturalism emphasizes that acknowledging the existence of ethnic diversity and ensuring the rights of individuals to retain their culture should go hand in hand with enjoying full access to constitutional principles and commonly shared values prevailing in the society or organization. It has been used interchangeably with cultural diversity.

Organizational Culture as a moderator of the relationship between workforce diversity and corporate sustainability

H0₁: Organizational culture does not significantly moderate the relationship between workforce diversity and corporate sustainability of oil and gas corporations in Nigeria.

Organizational culture shows how members of an organization think, and the development of an attitude considering the needs of society as a whole is dependent on it. Thus, it is the role of organizational culture to create or develop new ways of people's thinking and acting in everyday activities, and the increase of social sustainability to environment and future

generations. In this respect, changing the culture of the organization is necessary, because through it, its members are informed about the objectives, methods and accepted values, about how to act, desirable practices, a guide of behaviour for overcoming the complexity and uncertainty, specific to their work (Khademian, 2002, in Austin and Classen, 2008).

The organizational culture of sustainability is the culture in which the organization's members share common beliefs about the importance of ensuring a balance among economic efficiency, social equity and social responsibility. Organizations with a strong culture of sustainability make efforts to support a healthy environment and to improve others' lives, operating with success on long-term (Bertels, Papania, & Papania, 2010). There are several types of organizational cultures, depending on the degree of integration of sustainability principles: reactive, defensive, adaptive, proactive. The reactive organization is any organization that does not approach items regarding sustainability in its work, being concerned solely in maximizing the value of its stakeholders, while the defensive organization is characterized by responses to legislative pressures, assuming some actions targeting sustainable development. The adaptive organizations have already integrated sustainable development principles in the management processes, but they do not have clear objectives in this regard, while sustainable / proactive organizations are those in which actions that aim community and environment are considered an important asset (Zerbe, Hartel, & Ashkanasy, 2010).

Studies indicate that there is a strong relationship between organizational culture and corporate sustainability. Thus, several studies affirm that a weak organizational culture impedes the companies' progress regarding the increase of responsibility towards the environment (Hunt & Auster, 1990; Starik & Rands, 1995). Curkovic, Sroufe, & Eckert (2006) studied the correlation between organizational culture and sustainability issues, indicating the failure in transmitting the environmental information, the obstruction in participation of stakeholders and the failure of initiatives taken in this regard.

Abbett, Coldham & Whisnant (2004), noticed that there is an empirical relationship between organizational culture of companies and their success related to environmental initiatives; a greater similarity between the corporate culture and the initiative regarding sustainability leads to a higher probability of its success. In order to implement some sustainability initiatives, there are several adjacent dimensions to be considered while designing and implementing initiatives related to sustainability and which are not currently detailed in the company's program. It is therefore necessary to know the company culture so that sustainability initiatives are consistent with this, because changes in the organizational culture of the company are hardly implemented and they require longer time. On long term, managers can think of a way of enriching the culture at the same time with sustainable initiatives (Abbett *et. al.* 2004).

Institutional theory

Institutional theory broadly states that their institutional environment, context or field governs the behaviour of organizations. The constituents of the field include the organization's social context, the scope of its activities, and its network of social relationships (Doshi & Khokle, 2012). In reviewing and analysing institutional theory, the theory of symbolic interactionism comes to limelight in order to explain vividly, the concept and theory of human existence, diversity and its cultural reality. According to Ritzer (2012) in Linstead, (2006), ethnomethodology is the study of the body of common sense, knowledge and range of procedures by which members of a society make sense as symbolic. Therefore,

institutional context tends to bring uniformity in business practice and organizational actions through three mechanisms: coercive, mimetic and normative. Coercive mechanisms refer to pressure techniques that aim to bring business practice in line with societal expectations. Mimetic practices refer to peers' pressure on firms to conform to certain behaviours. Normative practices refer to internalization of beliefs about the suitability of certain behaviour (DiMaggio & Powell, 2000). Broadly speaking, the institutional forces drive agent's behaviour by aligning agent's beliefs with societal norms, with the alignment being caused by either internalization of norms or external pressure. Norms drive group as well as organizational behaviour especially when the groups' normative focus and member's group identification is high (Terry & Hogg, 1996; Kallgren, Reno & Cialdini, 2000). Organizations can be conceptualized as a consciously coordinated social unit that functions on a relatively continuous basis to achieve a set of goals (Robbins, Judge & Vohra, 2013). Hence, organizations being a specific type of group are likely to be affected by group norms. The concept of corporate sustainability denotes a voluntary, organizational-level behaviour that includes non-harmful, wellbeing of stakeholders' interest (Campbell, 2007), and looking at social and environmental issues besides business issues (Jackson & Apostolakou, 2010).

METHODOLOGY

The research design adopted in this study is a census cross-sectional survey(explanatory) design. The population for this study comprised of 44 active oil-producing firms as licenced by the Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR). These oil and gas corporations were the notable oil and gas corporations operational in Nigeria. Thus, Human resources managers, administrative managers, operations managers, and finance managers of the 44 corporations were targeted as respondents within the organization. The questionnaire was the major instrument for data collection. The Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient was utilized in the assessment of the relationship between the variables of the study at a 95% confidence (implying a 0.05 level of significance). The choice of the Spearman is premised on its flexible features and applicability for hypothesis test for data scaled both as interval and as ordinal.

RESULTS

Multivariate Analysis

The result on the test on the moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationship between workforce diversity and corporate sustainability is presented in this section. The test follows the premise put forward by Preacher & Hayes (2004) in their emphasis that, for the affirmation of moderating effect, results must satisfy three major outcomes; (i) the evidence of a significant relationship between predictor and moderator; (ii) the evidence of a significant relationship between moderator and criterion; and (iii) the evidence of a significant relationship between predictor and criterion.

Hence, where indirect effect (predictor → moderator → criterion @ $\rho=0.731$) is more significant than the direct effect (predictor → criterion @ $\rho=0.686$) then there is a significant moderating effect.

Correlation for variables of study

Control Variables		Diversity	Sustain	Culture
-none ^{-a}	Correlation	1.000	.731	.416
	Diversity			
	Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
	Df	0	156	156
	Correlation	.731	1.000	.356
	Sustain			
	Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
	Df	156	0	156
	Correlation	.416	.356	1.000
Culture				
Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	
Df	156	156	0	
Correlation	1.000	.686		
Diversity				
Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000		
Df	0	155		
Culture				
Correlation	.686	1.000		
Sustain				
Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.		
Df	155	0		

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Research data, 2019

Moderating Impact of Organizational Culture

The evidence reveals organizational culture to be a significant moderator of the relationship between workplace diversity and corporate sustainability. This position further draws on the premise that organizational culture determines not only the effects of the diversity within an organisation but also the level of openness to dissimilarity characteristics among the organisation's members, work groups, and culture, Andrew-Patrick (2011). Diversity is not just a racially contentious issue but one of culture too. Understanding the cultural inclinations of organisations would affect the ways diverse workforces operate and also their tendencies for sustainable practices (Nwadike, 2011).

Therefore, organizational culture concerning diversity, within the context of this study addresses the conduct and behaviours of individuals within this oil and gas firms especially those who come from different ethnic backgrounds, of different languages as well as have varying values about corporate sustainability. The linguistic and cultural identity constitutes the core of the cultures of most ethnic groups, absence or denial of these linguistic and cultural rights could promote conflict and violence (Jerma (2016) citing Skutnabb, Kangas & Phillipson (1994). Such ethnic groups in Nigeria include Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa, and Edo, Isoko and Urhobo as well as other minorities with different backgrounds.

In a nutshell, one can say that managing diversity has to do with maximizing diversity's potential benefits for instance, greater cultural awareness and broader language skills while at the same time minimizing the potential barriers such as prejudices and bias that can undermine the company's performance (Dessler, 2011). However, several researchers have opined that how organisations approach diversity management can have significant implications for whether the organisation is helped or harmed by its diversity (Ely & Thomas, 2001).

Diversity within an organisation according to Dahm (2003) can invoke an array of emotions. Some researchers view diversity as a menace that requires hard measures of management.

Ugwuzor, (2014) citing Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, (2003) and Webber & Donahue (2001) states that research shows that various types of team and organisational diversity sometimes increase conflict, reduce social cohesion, and increase employee turnover. Some researchers, on the other hand, believe that workforce diversity possesses potentials for enhancing performance. According to Ozbilgin and Tatli (2008) there is a strong empirical confirmation that successful diversity management and a resulting improvement in organisational actions and behaviour are positively correlated and that diversity has enhanced organizational values by broadening the group's perspectives especially in line with its social values.

O'Leary and Weathington,(2006) in their study, have found that various forms of diversity are associated with greater innovation, improved strategic decision making, and enhanced societal values. Ethnic diversity would benefit the organization through group performance due to a more diverse pool of skills and knowledge that leads to complementary and mutual learning. In other words, diversity (which comes with inclusiveness) enhances the shared values of organizations and their tendencies for environmental, social and economic actions that are considerate of their related implications for the environment.

For example, the novel recruitment practices adopted in the wake of the enactment of inclusive policies tend to fan real or imagined fears – among them, of undue favouritism, of unwarranted exclusion, of reverse discrimination, of cultural or group "contamination" and of alienation. Diversity, in this context, has been adjudged to be the bane of the public service and by extension, Nigeria's economic existence. If diversity as a phenomenon has had the same consequences in all the countries where it occurs, then, it would have been right to conclude that the concept in itself is negative with no positive outcomes. But as we find with some countries, the United States in particular, diversity has yielded dividends, especially on the social values of these nations that have helped to shape countries into powerful entities. So much so that diversity has not only been embraced but also pursued. Lack of performance in most culturally diverse organizations could be attributed to the inability of all connected to its wellbeing to manage its inherent diversity status and attendant conflicts. Balogun (2001) puts it rather directly when he stated that the root problem of most organizations abysmal performance is the lack of consensus on the building blocks of a collective political culture as well as on the essential ingredients of a goal-focused, co-operative and functional system of administration. The challenge facing the most Nigerian organizations, he concluded, is primarily that of poor diversity management. It portends a set of challenges to the manager ranging from perceived unfairness, intergroup/interpersonal conflicts, and workforce environmental changes to a probable loss of identity. As a driver of change, the manager must provide the right leadership necessary to stir the organization along the course of progress. This implies that the manager/leader should be trained to acquire the necessary skills to be a successful change agent because leadership according to Kavanagh and Ashkenazy (2006) is the process of motivating people to change and the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations. In the Nigerian context, where there is an array of cultural differences, the term "detrribalized leader" has arisen, connoting a leader whose leadership style does not smack of ethnic bias; whose discharge of responsibilities is not influenced by ethnic affiliation/consideration but rather merit.

The leader's major challenge in a public service setting is building an inclusive management system that would assimilate employees from minority groups or outside the dominant group. This confirms Adeleye, Aja-Nwachukwu and Fawehinmi, (2012) in Falola and

Heaton's (2008) assertion that the dominant approach to managing diversity in Nigeria is the assimilation paradigm with focus on anti-discriminatory practices and fairness. The argument against this approach is that assimilated people are often denied the opportunities to be themselves having been mentored and coached to adopt the necessary traits for inclusion into the privileged group as opposed to being embraced for their differences. This may eventually decrease organizational performance.

CONCLUSIONS

The results on the relationship between the variables provides empirical basis for the assertions put forward in this section of the study. This is as the study finds that workplace diversity has strong implications for the shared values and in this vein contributes towards the extent to which the organization is able to harness the benefits and advantages offered the diversity within its workplace. In this vein, the study identifies workplace diversity as a substantial antecedent of corporate sustainability.

Hence, in conclusion, it was affirmed that workforce diversity, groups or labels, especially that which addresses the age, gender and ethnic diversity of the workforce of oil and gas corporations, has a significant impact on corporate sustainability of oil and gas corporations. Invariably, this contributes substantially towards the unification of organizational members' ideas and values. This is as such could facilitate improved sustainability outcomes in the areas of environmental sustainability, social sustainability and economic sustainability of the 44 oil and gas corporations in Nigeria. The study, given the evidence of significant associations between the predictor: Workforce diversity and the criterion: corporate sustainability, as well as the moderator: organizational culture, recommends as follows:

- i. The oil and gas corporations in Nigeria should, as a matter of Policies framework, institutionalize gender diversity and emphasize on fairness, equity, exchange of ideology that involves both male and female sex in the supervisory and managerial level of leadership. This is to achieve corporate sustainability goals and objectives of the organization through members' collaboration and teamwork, rather than particular gender categories of groupings. Such specifications should guide what is expected of the workers and the extent to which their performance as individuals matches with the requirement of the organization.
- ii. Consideration should also be given to the installation of platforms, frameworks and measures by oil and gas corporations in Nigeria to address evidence of ethnic heterogeneity. Such consideration are those, that addresses relationships with others (interpersonal) premised on more receptive, accommodating and collaborative formats that are geared towards establishing the same sustainability values across all ethnic groups within the organization.
- iii. Finally, the culture of the oil and gas corporations in Nigeria should be adequately structured to offer the required format and platform through divergent views and opinions to be harmonized within the organization. This is for the strengthening of ties and experiences across the organization in a way that is healthy and considerate of the goals of corporate sustainability.

REFERENCES

Andrew-Patrick, H. (2011). Knowledge Workers demography and workplace diversity. *Journal of Marketing & Management*, 2(2)

- Becchetti, L., Ciciretti, R., Hasan, I. & Kobeissi, N. 2012, "Corporate social responsibility and shareholder's value", *Journal of Business Research*, 65(11), 1628-1635.
- Campbell, J. L. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 946–967.
- Cox, T. Jr. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations*. Theory, research & practice. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Curkovic, S., Sroufe, R., & Eckert, J. (2006). A preliminary framework for using total cost assessment in total quality environmental management. *The International Journal of environmental, cultural, economic and social sustainability*, 1(3), 81-88.
- Dahm, M. J. (2003). The Development of a Need Analysis Instrument for Cultural Diversity Training.
- Dessler, G. (2011). *Fundamentals of human resource management*. Pearson Higher Ed
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (2000). *The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields*. In J. A. C. Baum & F. Dobbin (Eds.), *Economics meets sociology in strategic management* 17,143–166. *Advances in Strategic Management*.
- Doshi, V., & Khokle, P. (2012). An institutional perspective on corporate social responsibility. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, 37(2), 98–102.
- El Ghouli, S., Guedhami, O., Kwok, C.C.Y. & Mishra, D.R. 2011, "Does corporate social responsibility affect the cost of capital? " *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 35, (9) 2388-2406.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative science quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Extra, G., & Yagmur, K. (2002). *Language diversity in multicultural Europe: Comparative perspectives on immigrant minority languages at home and at school*.
- Foldy, E. (2003). *Being all that you can be: Identities and interactions in organizations*. Division of research, Harvard business school.
- Haanaes, K., Michael, D., Jurgens, J. & Rangan, S. 2013, "Making sustainability profitable", *Harvard business review*, 91, (3) 110-115.

- Hansen, G. S., & Wernerfelt, B. (1989). Determinants of firm performance: The relative importance of economic and organizational factors. *Strategic management journal*, 10(5), 399-411.
- Hunt, C. B., & Auster, E. R. (1990). Proactive environmental management: avoiding the toxic trap. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 31(2), 7-18.
- Jackson, S.E.; May, K.E; Whitney, K. (1995) *Dynamics of diversity in decision making teams*: R.A. Guzzo & E. Silas (Eds.), Team effectiveness and decision making in organization, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass
- Jackson S. E., Joshi, A.& Erhardt NL (2003). Recent research on team and organizational diversity: SWOT analysis and Implications, *Journal of management* 29: 801-830.
- Jackson, G., & Apostolakou, A. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in Western Europe: An institutional mirror or substitute? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(3), 371–394
- Kavanagh, M. H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. *British journal of management*, 17(S1), S81-S103.
- Khademian, A. M. (2002). *Working with culture: The way the job gets done in public programs*. CQ Press.
- Lee, M.P. 2008, "A review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: Its evolutionary path and the road ahead", *International Journal of Management Reviews*,10(1) 53-73.
- Linstead, S., & Pullen, A. (2006). Gender as multiplicity: Desire, displacement, difference and dispersion. *Human Relations*, 59(9), 1287-1310.
- Loden, M., & Rosener, J. B. (1991). *Workforce America: Managing employee diversity as a vital resource*. McGraw-Hill.
- Martin, D. & Schouten, J. 2012, *Sustainable marketing*. Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, N.J.
- Michaela C.S; Deanne, N.D. H; Paul, L. K.: Janique, A.W, (2003) Diversity and Team Outcomes; The Moderating Effects of Outcome Interdependence and Group Longevity and the Mediating Effect of Reflexivity, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*,24 (6) 779-802.
- Nwadike, F. O. The International Symposium on Cultural Diplomacy in the USA Washington DC May 18 th-21st, 2011.

- Nwagbara, U. & Reid, P. 2013, "Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and management trends: Changing times and changing strategies", *Economic Insights - Trends & Challenges*, 65(2) 12-19.
- Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F.L. & Rynes, S.L. 2003, "Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis", *Organization Studies* (01708406), 24 (3) 403-441.
- Ozbilgin, M., & Tatli, A. (2008). *Global diversity management: An evidence-based approach*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. 2006, "Strategy & society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility", *Harvard business review*, 84 (12) 78-92.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behaviour research methods, instruments, & computers*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Schein, R. H. (2004). *Cultural traditions*. A companion to cultural geography, 11.
- Sharfman, M.P. & Fernando, C.S. 2008, "Environmental risk management and the cost of capital", *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(6) 569-592.
- Shaw, B. (1981). *My Country of the Pelican Dreaming: The life of an Australian Aborigine of the Gadjerong, Grant Ngabidj, 1904-1977 as told to Bruce Shaw*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Sold and distributed in North and South America by Humanities Press.
- Terry, D. J., & Hogg, M. A. (1996). Group norms and the attitude-behaviour relationship: A role for group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(8), 776-793.
- Thompson, N. (2016). *Anti-discriminatory practice: Equality, diversity and social justice*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Thomas, K. M. (2005). *Diversity dynamics in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & Xin, K. R. (1995). *Diversity in organizations: Lessons from demography research*. In An earlier version of this chapter was presented as a paper at the American Psychological Society meeting, Chicago, IL, Jun 1993. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wentling, R. M., & Palma-Rivas, N. (2000). Current status of diversity initiatives in selected multinational corporations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(1), 35-60.
- Williams, K. U. and O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 6 (20), 771-800.

