

The mediating or moderating effect of high-performance work systems on the relationship between gender diversity, generational diversity and employee engagement

European Journal
of Management
and Business
Economics

Received 17 May 2023
Revised 12 February 2024
13 February 2025
26 June 2025
Accepted 11 September 2025

M. Carmen Saorín-Iborra

Department of Business Management, Universitat de València, Valencia, Spain, and

Beatriz Cámara-Campos

University of València, València, Spain

Abstract

Purpose – Effectively managing gender diversity is increasingly recognized as a critical success factor for achieving competitive advantage in organizations. This challenge has become even more complex with the unprecedented coexistence of four to five distinct generational cohorts within the workforce. Such heightened diversity can significantly influence key organizational outcomes, particularly employee engagement. In this context, human resource (HR) practices play a pivotal role as strategic tools for managing diversity. This paper therefore examines the specific impact of high-performance work systems (HPWS) on the relationship between gender and generational diversity and employee engagement.

Design/methodology/approach – A quantitative study was carried out using a sample of 285 employees from industrial organizations in a region of Spain. To test our hypothesis, the partial least squares statistical analysis program was used.

Findings – Evidence obtained indicates that HPWS exert a moderating effect on the relationship analyzed, showing that correct management of HPWS is necessary so that employees, regardless of the diversity group to which they belong, can show good levels of engagement.

Originality/value – The paper's originality lies in, firstly, analyzing the relationship between diversity-oriented HR practices and engagement from a synergistic and systematic approach (HPWS) but not individual; secondly, trying to answer a question not addressed before about the moderating or mediating effect of HPWS and thirdly, including in the study the generational diversity, because its current effect on organizations cannot be ignored along with gender diversity, a research field analyzed little.

Keywords HRM, Gender diversity, Generational diversity, HPWS, Engagement, Diversity management, Talent retention, SEM

Paper type Research article

1. Introduction

Diversity management is increasingly recognized as a foundational element in building a strong employer brand, which is essential for attracting and retaining talent – particularly when high levels of employee engagement are achieved (Parry and Urwin, 2021; Elamin *et al.*, 2024). Despite its importance, research exploring the link between diversity management and employee engagement remains limited (Alshaabani *et al.*, 2022). One notable exception is the study by Downey *et al.* (2015), which provides early insights into this relationship.

© M. Carmen Saorín-Iborra and Beatriz Cámara-Campos. Published in *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at [Link to the terms of the CC BY 4.0 licence](#).

Conflict of interest: The authors state that there is no conflict of interest.



European Journal of Management and
Business Economics
Emerald Publishing Limited
e-ISSN: 2444-8494
p-ISSN: 2444-9451
DOI 10.1108/EJMBE-05-2023-0144

HR practices are recognized as a key lever for effective diversity management (Wieczorek-Szymańska, 2020; Redondo-Cano and Saorín-Iborra, 2021), with potential implications for employee engagement. However, existing research has largely examined the impact of HR practices on diversity management from an individual rather than a synergistic perspective, and has primarily concentrated on gender diversity.

For the first time in history, organizations are navigating a workforce that may include up to four or five distinct generational cohorts (Becker *et al.*, 2022) - a reality that must be carefully considered in the design and implementation of HR practices. From our perspective, it is no longer feasible to analyze the effects of gender diversity in isolation, without accounting for the generational differences in skills, competencies, knowledge, and values. The interplay between gender and generational diversity significantly amplifies the complexity of diversity management, as it creates a wide array of possible configurations and workplace dynamics. Even when gender diversity is held constant, its intersection with multiple generations results in a diverse and multifaceted set of scenarios that organizations must understand and manage effectively. Therefore, incorporating generational diversity into the analysis is not only a managerial imperative but also represents a necessary evolution from previous research approaches.

In response to the identified gaps in the literature, this study addresses three key research questions. The first objective is to examine the specific role of HPWS in shaping the relationship between workplace diversity (gender and generational) and employee engagement. We posit that the influence of diversity on engagement is contingent upon the design and implementation of HR practices – specifically, how diversity is managed through these practices. Rather than considering HR practices in isolation, we advocate for a synergistic and systemic approach to diversity management, consistent with the HPWS framework (Appelbaum *et al.*, 2000; Han *et al.*, 2020).

While extensive evidence supports the effectiveness of HPWS in enhancing HR management outcomes, their application in the context of diversity management and its impact on engagement remains underexplored. Thus, this study introduces a novel perspective by integrating HPWS into the analysis of diversity management, addressing a critical and largely overlooked area in the existing research.

The second research objective of this study is to determine whether the role of HPWS in the relationship between diversity and employee engagement functions as a moderating or mediating mechanism. And the third objective is to assess whether this identified effect – whether moderating or mediating – varies depending on the type of diversity being addressed, specifically gender or generational diversity.

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, an empirical study was conducted using structural equation modeling, with participation from employees in industrial organizations. The findings are considered to offer valuable insights for both academic research and professional practice.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 Employee engagement

Engagement is considered in HRM literature as a key factor for business success and, therefore, requires analysis and management (Saks, 2022). It is a relevant indicator of individual performance and is often seen as the opposite of job burnout (Schaufeli and Salanova, 2014). Engagement carries a positive connotation and is linked to employee involvement, passion, enthusiasm, effort, and energy. According to Downey *et al.* (2015), it is a persistent affective-cognitive state characterized by increased dedication to work.

Research associates engagement with three core components: vigor, dedication, and absorption, as well as the achievement of business goals (Schaufeli and Salanova, 2014; Vargas telled *et al.*, 2014). Additionally, earlier studies highlight several dimensions of engagement: positive emotions at work, positive work self-concept, perceived social support, and resilience (Aguilar and Dipp, 2014).

According to [Aguilar and Dipp \(2014\)](#), *positive emotions at work* (PEW) refer to the affective states or personal reactions that foster employee well-being and motivation—such as enthusiasm, sustained energy throughout the workday, and pride in one’s accomplishments. These emotions increase employees’ willingness to stay engaged, even when tasks require extra effort or time. *Positive work self-concept* (PWSC) encompasses the set of thoughts, feelings, and images that shape an individual’s self-perception in their professional role, enabling them to feel competent, take initiative, and embrace new challenges. *Perceived social support* (PSS) involves the social relationships an employee believes they have at work, especially the perception that colleagues and supervisors provide useful information, assistance, and emotional support. This fosters trust and collaborative relationships. Finally, *resilience at work* (RW) refers to an individual’s ability to adapt to workplace challenges. It reflects a form of positive competitiveness that enables employees to cope effectively with adversity.

Engaged employees invest greater physical, cognitive, and emotional effort in their work, which translates into increased initiative, higher job satisfaction, stronger organizational commitment, and reduced turnover intentions ([Hapsari et al., 2019](#); [Saks, 2022](#)). Moreover, engagement fosters positive emotional experiences and contributes to better psychological and physical health ([Banihani et al., 2013](#)). It also enhances employees’ motivation to learn and embrace challenges, thereby improving task performance and work quality ([Alshaabani et al., 2022](#)).

Consequently, employee engagement has significant strategic implications for organizational attitudes and behaviors. It is associated with elevated organizational commitment, reduced job turnover, increased personal initiative – particularly in generating new ideas – and lower absenteeism due to improved health outcomes ([Schaufeli and Salanova, 2014](#); [Hapsari et al., 2019](#)). Furthermore, engagement positively impacts both individual and organizational performance, leading to higher productivity, greater job effectiveness, enhanced product or service quality, and increased innovation ([Alshaabani et al., 2022](#); [Elamin et al., 2024](#)).

2.2 Generational diversity and gender diversity

Workplace diversity has prompted organizations to develop management strategies and create supportive work environments aimed at attracting and retaining high-potential talent, thereby fostering broad organizational diversity ([Sifatu et al., 2020](#)). This study focuses specifically on two key dimensions of diversity: gender and generational diversity.

For the first time in history, up to five generations coexist in the labor market: “Traditionalists” (1900–1944), “Baby Boomers” (1945–1964), “Generation X” (1965–1979), “Generation Y” or Millennials (1980–2000), and “Generation Z” (2001–present). Each generation brings distinct leadership and communication styles, as well as varying work ethics ([Woodward et al., 2015](#); [Becker et al., 2022](#)). They also differ in terms of values, identity, and behavior ([Singh et al., 2020](#)).

[Woodward et al. \(2015, p. 9\)](#), defines generational diversity as “cohorts of individuals who have grown up in the same historical and social context, whose shared formative experiences instill in them beliefs, values and general dispositions that differ from those of others born and raised in different contexts and time periods”. Generation is a social construct ([Mannheim, 1952](#)); as such, generational diversity is shaped by the shared experiences of individuals within a particular cohort. These shared experiences create a collective framework of emotions, attitudes, and behaviors that influence how individuals develop and interact within their generation, ultimately giving rise to generational differences ([Tamunomiebi and Adim, 2019](#)).

There is no clear consensus on the impact of generational diversity within organizations. On one hand, studies grounded in social identity theory ([Tajfel et al., 2004](#)) and similarity-attraction theory ([Byrne, 1997](#)) suggest a negative impact, arguing that individuals tend to prefer interactions with those from similar demographic groups. As a result, generational

diversity may lead to challenges in cohesion and integration, as well as increased competition and conflict rooted in perceived group differences. On the other hand, more recent research highlights a growing preference for working in intergenerational teams, emphasizing their potential to generate synergistic benefits and enhance organizational outcomes (Becker *et al.*, 2022).

Gender diversity refers to the presence of both women and men within an organization (Brouwer *et al.*, 2012). According to Barberá Heredia (2005), fostering gender diversity is not only a strategy for promoting the principle of equality in the labor market but also a means of optimizing an organization's human resources. There is broad consensus that gender diversity positively impacts organizations, as it enriches the workforce and provides a competitive advantage. It also offers valuable insights into the differing needs of male and female employees and consumers (Ali, 2016). Furthermore, this diversity enhances the coexistence of varied knowledge and skills, which can lead to increased creativity, greater innovation, and improved decision-making processes (Ali, 2016; Sánchez-Teba *et al.*, 2021).

However, it is noteworthy that while prior research has extensively examined the impact of gender diversity on organizational performance, generational diversity has received considerably less attention. Moreover, there is a lack of studies that explore the combined effects of both forms of diversity, despite their growing coexistence in today's organizations. Additionally, existing research that addresses gender and generational diversity separately has rarely focused on their influence on employee engagement – a critical factor for gaining competitive advantage.

Nowadays, it is increasingly imperative to address not only gender diversity but also generational diversity. The coexistence of these dimensions represents a prevalent and complex reality within modern workplaces. However, managing such multifaceted diversity poses a significant organizational challenge, as it inherently increases the complexity of fostering synergistic outcomes while mitigating potential conflicts arising from intergroup differences (whether based on gender, generation, or the various intersections between the two).

As outlined by identity theory (Tajfel *et al.*, 2004) and similarity-attraction theory (Byrne, 1997), greater perceived differences among group members are likely to lead to heightened challenges in terms of cohesion, mutual understanding, and social identity. In this regard, the potential for conflict escalates as diversity within teams broadens.

Gender diversity alone introduces variations in leadership styles, decision-making processes, and attitudes toward risk and competition (Ali, 2016; Redondo-Cano and Saorín-Iborra, 2021). When combined with generational diversity – which entails differences in communication preferences, technological proficiency (Lester *et al.*, 2012; Gursoy *et al.*, 2013), work motivation and preferred job characteristics (Lester *et al.*, 2012; Gursoy *et al.*, 2013), career expectations (Becton *et al.*, 2014), and work-related values and attitudes (Hansen and Leuty, 2011) – the complexity of diversity management increases substantially.

Consequently, organizational leaders are confronted with the formidable task of navigating these intersecting dimensions of diversity. Successfully doing so is critical not only to minimizing interpersonal conflicts but also to enhancing employee engagement and unlocking the potential synergistic benefits that diverse teams can offer.

2.3 HPWS, diversity and engagement

Gender and generational diversity contribute to variations among employees in areas such as knowledge, experience, leadership styles, and decision-making approaches. Drawing on social identity theory and similarity-attraction theory, such differences are argued to increase the likelihood of misunderstandings and interpersonal conflicts, potentially undermining both individual and organizational performance. When organizations fail to acknowledge and address these diverse needs, employee outcomes – such as commitment, satisfaction, motivation, and engagement – may be adversely affected (Alshaabani *et al.*, 2022).

Thus, effective management of diversity becomes essential, not only to mitigate potential negative outcomes but also to unlock possible synergistic benefits. However, a direct positive relationship between diversity and employee engagement cannot be assumed. As noted by [Nguyen et al. \(2024\)](#), diversity represents a double-edged sword, capable of generating both constructive and detrimental effects. Therefore, the critical factor lies not in the mere presence of diversity, but in how it is managed. Proper diversity management does not inherently guarantee positive outcomes, but it is fundamental in minimizing conflicts and enhancing the potential for positive intergroup dynamics.

From the perspective of institutional theory, [Bizri \(2018\)](#) argues that diversity management involves organizational rules and norms aimed at shaping employee behavior. More recently, [Provasi and Harasheh \(2021, p. 129\)](#) define diversity management as “a managerial technique to empower each individual by enhancing the differences of the various members to improve working conditions and increase the effectiveness and organizational efficiency.” One key mechanism for implementing diversity management is through HR practices, which can be developed from either an individual or a systemic perspective, such as HPWS. In this context, diversity management is a core function of the HR department, with inclusion in the workplace as its primary objective ([Elamin et al., 2024](#)).

HPWS are integrated sets of HR practices designed to enhance employee knowledge, skills, motivation, and flexibility through the creation of supportive work structures and processes ([Han et al., 2020](#)). These systems aim to foster employee participation in decision-making, strengthen organizational commitment, and improve both individual competencies and interpersonal relationships within the workplace ([García et al., 2012](#); [Li et al., 2021](#)). Therefore, HPWS are characterized by the alignment and mutual reinforcement of their component practices, emphasizing their implementation as coherent systems rather than isolated initiatives ([Han et al., 2020](#)). While the literature offers various configurations of HR practices, this study adopts the framework proposed by [García et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Zhang et al. \(2014\)](#), identifying key components of HPWS as recruitment, selection, and orientation processes; employee training; career development; performance appraisal; and both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational strategies.

From a synergistic perspective, HPWS serve as effective tools for promoting inclusion and diversity within organizations. Both elements are crucial for fostering organizational development by integrating employees and enhancing their overall well-being ([Harrison et al., 2018](#)). Proper implementation of HPWS can drive social change, strengthen relationships between employees and employers, and build greater trust among all members of the organization ([Kloutsiniotis and Mihail, 2020](#)), ultimately enhancing employees’ perception of inclusion ([Lu et al., 2015](#)).

However, although there is evidence regarding the impact of specific HR practices on employee engagement, research focusing explicitly on HPWS remains relatively limited. Additionally, while some studies have examined the role of individual HR practices in managing gender diversity ([Alshaabani et al., 2022](#)), there is a notable scarcity of research addressing the intergenerational adaptation of HR practices ([Parry and Urwin, 2021](#)). Moreover, the potential influence of diversity-oriented HPWS on employee engagement has yet to be thoroughly explored.

From our perspective, HPWS can play a crucial role in enhancing employee engagement and participation by fostering motivation, recognizing contributions, managing diversity, and strengthening employees’ capabilities ([Bashir et al., 2012](#)). Drawing on social exchange theory, employees who perceive organizational support and attention to individual differences are more likely to develop higher levels of engagement ([Ghasempour Ganji et al., 2020](#)). Diversity-oriented HPWS can enhance perceptions of inclusion, strengthen interpersonal relationships within teams, and contribute to a supportive work environment.

Such perceptions not only shape employees’ interactions but also directly influence their engagement ([Patrick and Kumar, 2012](#); [Atmaja and Dewi, 2024](#)). When HR practices are systematically designed to promote inclusive, communicative, and trusting environments—

especially across gender and generational lines – they facilitate greater collaboration and knowledge sharing. In this context, we argue that fostering a climate of reciprocity (social exchange theory), can mitigate the negative effects of social categorization and in-group bias described by social identity theory and similarity-attraction theory. Ultimately, this enables greater cohesion and the realization of synergistic outcomes across diverse employee groups.

Based on the preceding arguments, we expect that HPWS can influence the relationship between diversity and employee engagement. But how exactly? Specifically, we propose the following hypotheses to examine the potential moderating effect – where HPWS may strengthen or weaken the positive or negative relationship between types of diversity and employee engagement – and the possible mediating effect – where the implementation or management of HPWS varies according to the existing diversity within the organization, thereby affecting the level of employee engagement.

- H1. HPWS exert a moderating effect on the gender diversity-engagement relationship.
- H2. HPWS exert a moderating effect on the generational diversity-engagement relationship.
- H3. HPWS exert a mediating effect on the gender diversity-engagement relationship.
- H4. HPWS exert a mediating effect on the generational diversity-engagement relationship.

3. Methodology

3.1 Sample and data collection

The study sample comprised 285 employees from industrial organizations in Spain's Valencian Region. Although a larger sample would have been ideal, COVID-19-related constraints limited data collection, making it necessary to focus on nearby areas to ensure participation. Despite these limitations, the sample provided valuable insights into the understudied link between diversity management and employee engagement.

Moreover, the sample size meets the minimum threshold recommended by [Hair et al. \(2017\)](#), which in our case is 50 participants. Given that the analysis was conducted using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), it is worth noting that authors such as [Barroso-Castro et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Ringle et al. \(2012\)](#) consider a sample of 30–100 cases sufficient for this method. While larger samples improve parameter estimation, our sample size falls well within the acceptable range for PLS-SEM.

After screening organizations in the SABI database based on geographic and sectoral criteria, four companies agreed to participate in the study, though their names are withheld for confidentiality. The focus on industrial and technological sectors ensured access to firms with sizable workforces – suitable for examining gender and generational diversity – and with established HR departments capable of implementing HPWS practices. As noted by [Martin \(2011\)](#), companies with at least 30 employees typically have formal HR structures. Organizations were first contacted by phone, followed by an email including a cover letter detailing the study's objectives, methodology, and questionnaire. [Table 1](#) indicates the main sample's descriptive statistics.

Data collection was carried out using a digitally developed questionnaire, distributed to all employees within the participating organizations, with the support of HR managers and CEOs. This collaboration ensured broad access and participation. The questionnaire comprised four sections covering control variables (experience, age and department), gender and generational diversity, HPWS, and employee engagement. After analyzing the responses, brief videoconference interviews were conducted with HR managers and CEOs to triangulate and validate the quantitative findings.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics: gender and generational diversity

Gender	Percentage
Women	48.4%
Men	51.6%
Generation	Percentage
Baby boomers	6.3%
Generation X	62.1%
Generation Y	31.6%
Source(s): Own elaboration	

3.2 Variables and measurement scales

Building on previous research, generational diversity was measured using age ranges corresponding to different generations (Woodward *et al.*, 2015). Gender diversity was assessed based on the proportion of men and women within the organizations studied, categorizing individuals into two groups: male and female. Additionally, the Blau index – a widely recognized and reliable measure of heterogeneity (Joo *et al.*, 2023) – was employed to quantify gender diversity. This index indicates maximum diversity at a value of 0.5, reflecting an equal representation of both genders (García and Vargas, 2019).

$$B = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^k p_i^k$$

Employee engagement was measured using items from the *IMET Work Engagement Measurement Inventory* (Aguilar and Dipp, 2014). This questionnaire is organized into four sections, each corresponding to a key component of engagement: positive emotions at work, positive work self-concept, perceived social support, and resilience at work.

To assess HPWS, we employed the scale developed by García *et al.* (2012), which is an adaptation of the scales by Sun *et al.* (2007) and Zhang *et al.* (2014). These instruments enabled the measurement of various HPWS dimensions, including recruitment, selection and orientation processes, employee training, career development, performance appraisal, and both internal and external employee motivation.

Additionally, several control variables were included in the analysis (experience, age and department) to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the organizations and the profiles of the employees who completed the questionnaires.

3.3 Analysis and results

The hypotheses were tested using variance-based structural equation modeling (Partial Least Squares, PLS). This technique is particularly suitable for prediction-oriented analyses and for research areas where theoretical development is still limited, as is the case in this study (Jöreskog and Wold, 1982). The analysis follows a two-stage process, beginning with the evaluation of the measurement models – depending on whether reflective, formative, or both types of models are present – and subsequently assessing the structural model (Hair *et al.*, 2017).

To ensure the reliability of the questionnaire scales used in this study, a reliability analysis was conducted using SPSS. The results indicated high reliability across all scales, as detailed in Table 2.

An analysis of employee engagement was conducted, revealing overall high engagement levels, with a mean score of 5.84%. In terms of gender diversity, the Blau index reached its maximum value of 0.5, indicating a balanced distribution and thus the presence of gender

Table 2. Reliability analysis of scales

HPWS		Engagement	
Alfa de Cronbach	N of elements	Alfa de Cronbach	N of elements
0.959	16	0.951	44
Source(s): Own elaboration			

diversity within the sample. Engagement levels associated with gender diversity were also high, matching the overall score of 5.84%. Similarly, engagement levels related to generational diversity were slightly higher, at 5.86%.

Subsequently, the results were analyzed using PLS-SEM, a variance-based technique. This analysis was conducted in two stages: first, by evaluating the measurement models, and second, by assessing the structural model.

Regarding the measurement model assessment, we used the analysis of formative models, where the convergent validity was analyzed, first, followed by the collinearity between the indicators (VIF values) and the magnitude and significance of the weights of the indicators. The values obtained were satisfactory and were included within the indices established in both our moderation and mediation models.

As can be seen in [Table 3](#), the correlations between the latent variables show the convergent validity in the formative constructs ($path \geq 0.7$) ([Hair et al., 2017](#)).

Based on the recommendation of [Hair et al. \(2017\)](#), the analysis of multicollinearity led us to eliminate an item when it presented a $VIF \geq 3.3$, specifically a dimension of engagement (PEW). Thus, the final values of the VIF were those indicated in [Table 4](#).

Finally, a *Bootstrapping* process was carried out to analyze the magnitude and significance of the external weights of the indicators. All of them obtained a significance level of $p < 0.05$ except in the case of the PWSC and RW dimensions of engagement. However, as noted by [Hair et al. \(2017\)](#), when an indicator's weight is not statistically significant but its loading is, the indicator should still be retained. Based on this criterion, the quality of the constructs can be considered satisfactory ([Table 5](#)).

Focused on the structural model assessment, the analysis of the internal collinearity of the structural model (VIF values), as well as the analysis of the coefficients R^2 and the size of the effects f^2 were carried out, where all the results were found within the indices established for both the moderation and mediation model. Likewise, the predictive relevance of the model (value) Q^2 was also evaluated, having results of high predictive relevance.

No internal collinearity problems of the structural model were identified since the VIF values were below the threshold of 5 ([Hair et al., 2017](#)) ([Table 6](#)).

The value obtained from the R^2 of the endogenous latent variables of engagement was 0.729, while in relation to the effects of the size f^2 , the HPWS showed a large effect size ($f^2 \geq 0.35$) on engagement (0.745). As indicated in [Table 7](#), the rest of the relationships with

Table 3. Convergent validity: correlation between latent variables

	Engagement	Generation	Gender	HPWS
Engagement	1.000	−0.390	−0.128	0.867
Generation	−0.390	1.000	0.061	−0.359
Gender	−0.128	0.061	1.000	−0.058
HPWS	0.867	−0.359	−0.058	1.000
Source(s): Own elaboration				

Table 4. VIF values

	VIF
PWSC	2.085
PSS	1.833
RW	2.160
Generational diversity	1.000
Gender diversity	1.000
Performance appraisal	2.658
Training	2.051
Motivation	3.125
Career development	2.300
Selection	2.450
Control variables	1.000
Source(s): Own elaboration	

Table 5. Results of the significance tests of the external weights of the formative constructs

Formative constructs	Formative indicators	External weights (external loading)	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value (weights)	<i>p</i> -value (loading)	Confidence interval (2.5–97.5%)	Significant ($p < 0.05$)
Engagement	PWSC	0.372	2.649	0.008	0.000	(0.089; 0.646)	Yes
	PSS	0.584	4.320	0.000	0.000	(0.343; 0.882)	Yes
	RW	0.180	1.035	0.301	0.000	(–0.170; 0.510)	No
HPWS	Training	–0.061	0.510	0.610	0.000	(–0.329; 0.141)	No
	Career development	0.034	0.253	0.800	0.000	(–0.218; 0.305)	No
	Selection	0.346	1.946	0.052	0.000	(0.010; 0.708)	Yes
	Performance appraisal	0.176	1.148	0.251	0.000	(–0.113; 0.475)	No
	Motivation	0.605	3.598	0.000	0.000	(0.236; 0.895)	Yes
Source(s): Own elaboration							

Table 6. Structural model VIF values

	Engagement
Generational diversity	2.486
Gender diversity	1.088
Engagement	
HPWS	4.039
Control variables	2.383
Source(s): Own elaboration	

Table 7. Effect sizes f^2

	Engagement
Generational diversity	0.012
Gender diversity	0.017
Engagement	
HPWS	0.745
Source(s): Own elaboration	

engagement showed small effects ($0.02 \leq f^2 < 0.15$). All this according to the thresholds proposed by Hair *et al.* (2017).

Looking at the total effects on the importance of the exogenous constructs, it can be observed that the largest effects on engagement occur in the relationship between HPWS and engagement (0.904) (Table 8).

Finally, in the evaluation of the structural model, the predictive relevance (Q^2 value) was analyzed through a *blindfolding* process. The Q^2 value for engagement obtained of 0.492 indicated a large predictive relevance ($Q^2 < 0.35$) based on the recommendation of Hair *et al.* (2017).

We examined the moderating effect of HPWS on the relationship between gender and generational diversity and employee engagement (Hypotheses 1 and 2). The results confirmed the presence of significant moderating effects of HPWS on these relationships (Table 9). At the same time, no direct effects were observed between either type of diversity and engagement (Table 10). However, the analysis revealed that HPWS exert a significant direct influence on employee engagement.

Regarding the mediating effects, no direct effects were observed between the different types of diversity and engagement, therefore, indirect mediation was analyzed where the indirect effect was significant, but the direct one was not. Indirect effects were found between HPWS and engagement, but no significant indirect effect was evidenced in the gender

Table 8. Total effects

	Engagement
Generational diversity	−0.092
Gender diversity	−0.070
Engagement	
HPWS	0.904
Source(s): Own elaboration	

Table 9. Moderating effects

	Path coefficients	t-value	p-value
Generation*HPWS → Engagement	0.114	2.001	0.045**
Gender*HPWS → Engagement	0.136	2.338	0.019**
Note(s): * $p < 0.05$ /** $p < 0.01$ /***/ $p < 0.001$			
Source(s): Own elaboration			

Table 10. Direct effects between different types of diversity and engagement

	Path coefficients	t-value	p-value
Generation → Engagement	−0.092	1.106	0.269
Gender → Engagement	−0.070	1.164	0.244
HPWS → Engagement	0.904	7.697	0.000***

Note(s): * $p < 0.05$ /** $p < 0.01$ /***($p < 0.001$)
Source(s): Own elaboration

diversity-HPWS relationship. Therefore, it could not be established that HPWS exert a mediating effect on this relationship.

Finally, in terms of generational diversity and engagement, no significant direct effects were found. Significant effects on indirect and total effects were obtained, although it is true that these effects are not valid because the confidence intervals are less than 0. Therefore, it was also not possible to establish a mediating effect of HPWS on the relationship between generational diversity and engagement, which means that [hypotheses 3](#) and [4](#) were not support ([Table 11](#)).

Therefore, the results obtained supported [hypotheses 1](#) and [2](#), but not [hypotheses 3](#) and [4](#).

4. Discussion

This work contributes to HR management and diversity literature by focusing on the gaps found. Specifically, and as highlighted by [Alshaabani et al. \(2022\)](#), previous works have not focused their attention on the possible relationship between diversity management and employees' engagement, and therefore it is a question that remains unanswered.

4.1 Theoretical and practical implications

The findings of this study carry several theoretical implications. First, they challenge the assumption of a direct relationship between gender or generational diversity and employee engagement. Instead, the results indicate that HR practices, when designed and implemented as part of a coherent and synergistic system (HPWS), play a moderating rather than mediating role in this relationship. This shifts the theoretical focus from diversity as a direct driver of engagement to the strategic role of integrated HR systems in shaping diversity outcomes. While these results partially align with [Downey et al. \(2015\)](#) conclusions – that diversity management enhances engagement – they extend existing theory by emphasizing the importance of treating HR practices as an interconnected system rather than analyzing their individual effects in isolation. In line with [Lu et al. \(2015\)](#), this study underscores that the effective management of diversity must be grounded in systemic HR design.

Additionally, these theoretical insights align with [Nguyen et al.'s \(2024, p. 93\)](#) assertion that a “diverse workforce can be seen as a double-edged sword.” Given the dual potential of diversity to generate both positive and negative outcomes, organizations must adopt a strategic and coherent approach to managing associated differences.

An interesting result is the fact that certain dimensions of engagement showed non-significant results. We understand that this could be a consequence of the type of work performed by the employees or their perception of the lack of resources (in the case of RW) or insufficient recognition of the work performed and its value by superiors (in relation to PWSC). This is why we consider it even more important that, in view of the existence of gender and generational diversity, the design of HPWS is oriented towards promoting the perception of inclusion, support and the desire to satisfy the needs and interests of employees.

Table 11. Mediating effects of HPWS

Gender diversity – engagement															
Total effect			Indirect effect			Direct effect			Indirect effect			Specific indirect effect			
Gender → engagement			Gender → engagement			Gender → engagement			Gender → HPWS a) HPWS → Engagement b)			Gender → HPWS → Engagement			
Coef	t-value	p-value	Coef	t-value	p-value	Coef	t-value	p-value	Coef	t-value	p-value	Coef	t-value	p-value	Interval
–0.109	1.009	0.313	–0.025	0.283	0.777	–0.084	1.321	0.187	a)–0.027	0.275	0.703	–0.025	0.283	0.777	–0.186/0.162
									b)0.925	6.097	0.000				
Generational diversity – engagement															
Total effect			Indirect effect			Direct effect			Indirect effect			Specific indirect effect			
Gener. → engagement			Gener. → engagement			Gener. → engagement			Gener. → HPWS a) HPWS → Engagement b)			Gener. → HPWS → Engagement			
Coef	t-value	p-value	Coef	t-value	p-value	Coef	t-value	p-value	Coef	t-value	p-value	Coef	t-value	p-value	Interval
–0.377	1.957	0.050	–0.342	2.022	0.043	–0.036	0.390	0.696	a)–	2.028	0.043	–0.342	2.022	0.043	–0.676/–0.221
									0.369						
									b)0.925	6.097	0.000				
Source(s): Own elaboration															

Furthermore, given that it is currently common to find both gender and generational diversity in organizations, comparing to previous works, we propose that both must be considered when designing and implementing HPWS, because they must be managed simultaneously. Otherwise, the correct management of a single type of both diversities would not avoid negative impacts on employees' engagement.

Gender and generational diversity can pose challenges to communication, coordination, and, ultimately, organizational integration and cohesion (Byrne, 1997; Tajfel *et al.*, 2004; Lu *et al.*, 2015). Individuals from different generations and genders often hold distinct values, interests, and attitudes, which can manifest in divergent behaviors, potentially leading to misunderstandings and conflicts. As such, adapting HR practices to accommodate these differences is crucial to fostering a sense of inclusion among employees (Lu *et al.*, 2015; Parry and Urwin, 2021; Elamin *et al.*, 2024). When employees perceive that their unique needs and identities are acknowledged and respected, they are more likely to feel satisfied, motivated, and engaged (Ghasempour Ganji *et al.*, 2020). In this way, effective diversity management becomes essential for cultivating employee engagement and, in turn, enhancing organizational performance (Saks, 2022).

While not the primary focus of this study, our findings provide a foundation for future research on how HPWS can be adapted to simultaneously address gender and generational diversity in promoting employee engagement. We suggest that certain configurations of HR practices may better accommodate diverse needs depending on gender and generational differences. Prior research, for instance, has identified challenges such as rigid work schedules affecting work-life balance, or differing preferences in training formats across demographic groups. For example, women and men with family responsibilities (Redondo-Cano and Saorín-Iborra, 2021), alongside millennial employees who value informal communication and leisure time (Woodward *et al.*, 2015), may benefit from flexible work arrangements and telecommuting, coupled with diverse, online training options. These practices could form part of a broader HPWS strategy that aligns with varied employee expectations. Nonetheless, we emphasize the need for a contingent approach to HPWS design, tailored to the specific context of each organization, rather than assuming universally applicable solutions.

In short, theoretically this study addresses the complex challenge of examining two forms of diversity – gender and generational – simultaneously, and it explores how HPWS can be leveraged to effectively manage these diversities to enhance employee engagement. Notably, the link between diversity management and engagement has received limited scholarly attention to date (Alshaabani *et al.*, 2022), underscoring the relevance of this contribution.

Practically, the findings provide actionable insights for managers by highlighting the strategic role of synergistic HR practice design in fostering an inclusive environment that promotes engagement. As Saks (2022) suggests, engaged employees are a source of competitive advantage, and this study reinforces the notion that effective diversity management – through tailored HR practices – is key to achieving this outcome. Successful management of gender and generational diversity requires a nuanced understanding of group-specific needs and expectations. HR professionals should therefore adopt a contingent approach, implementing differentiated career development paths, training programs, and motivational strategies (e.g. task variety, individual versus team-based work) that are responsive to the distinct preferences of each demographic group.

4.2 Limitations and future research

It is worth mentioning that this work is not free of limitations that, in turn, constitute great opportunities for future research. The first is the fact of carrying out the analysis through the exclusive participation of industrial organizations. From a contingent approach, future research should analyze the intersectoral effect on the design and implementation of HPWS focused on the diversity and its possible repercussions on the employees' engagement. Second, and related to it, another avenue for research could be the study of the role played by

organizational culture in the moderating effect of HPWS in the diversity-engagement relationship.

Cross-cultural impact should also be the focus of future research. Since generation is a social construct (Mannheim, 1952), age criteria can be misleading in identifying different generations. Identification according to country culture can be based on different aspects (Parry and Urwin, 2021). This is a field of research with great potential that should be addressed in light of increasing globalization and highly multinational workforces. In addition, the impact of country culture can also lead to differences in gender roles (masculinity vs. femininity dimension) and, therefore, the needs of women and men may differ depending on the country. Therefore, incorporating the possible effect of national culture into the analysis of the relationships studied in this work opens up a range of interesting research questions to be answered in the future.

Likewise, with a view to possible future lines of research, we believe it is necessary to continue delving into generational diversity and how it can impact the organization, as well as not only in the management of practices focused on this type of heterogeneity, but also in the possible interaction with those practices aimed at gender diversity. It is an unexplored field of research and, consequently, there are still many questions to be answered.

We also understand that it is interesting to delve into how to design HPWS according to the characteristics of a greater number of types of organizational diversity, as well as analyze the effect of the predominance of some type of diversity over the rest.

In addition, as a possible interesting future line of research, in our view, it is also fitting to study how organizations manage HPWS in order to achieve a strong HR system, that is, how they are developed, how practices are communicated to employees and the way in which they are implemented, what is known as HRM system strength (Bowen and Ostroff, 2004) and whether this has an impact on the management of diversity and its impact on the level of engagement.

All future lines of research proposed would enrich the understanding of diversity management through HPWS and the achievement of engaged employees. This work is a first step, but there is still a long way to go.

Ethical statement

All procedures performed in this study were in accordance with the ethical standards of the Academy of Management (aom.org/about-aom/governance/ethics).

Informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from the firm analyzed in the study.

Data availability

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are available from the authors on reasonable request.

References

- Aguilar Cárdenas, T. and Dipp Jaik, A. (2014), "Inventario para la medición del Engagement (ilusión por el trabajo). Un estudio instrumental", *Psicogente*, Vol. 17 No. 32, pp. 294-306, doi: [10.17081/psico.17.32.457](https://doi.org/10.17081/psico.17.32.457).
- Ali, M. (2016), "Impact of gender-focused human resources management and performance: the mediating effects of gender diversity", *Australian Journal of Management*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 376-397, doi: [10.1177/0312896214565119](https://doi.org/10.1177/0312896214565119).
- Alshaabani, A., Hamza, K.A. and Rudnák, I. (2022), "Impact of diversity management on employees' engagement: the role of organizational trust and job insecurity", *Sustainability*, Vol. 14 No. 1, p. 420, doi: [10.3390/su14010420](https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010420).

- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., Kalleberg, A.L. and Bailey, T.A. (2000), *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High-Performance Work Systems Pay off*, Cornell University Press, New York.
- Atmaja, D. and Dewi, N. (2024), "Impact of diversity management on employee engagement through the role of organizational trust and motivation", *International Journal of Research and Review*, Vol. 11 No. 7, pp. 335-352, doi: [10.52403/ijrr.20240735](https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20240735).
- Banihani, M., Lewis, P. and Syed, J. (2013), "Is work engagement gendered?", *Gender in Management*, Vol. 28 No. 7, pp. 400-423, doi: [10.1108/GM-01-2013-0005](https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-01-2013-0005).
- Barberá Heredia, E. (2005), "Diversidad de género, igualdad de oportunidades y entornos laborales", *CIRIEC – España, Revista de Economía Pública, Social y Cooperativa*, Vol. 50, pp. 37-54.
- Barroso Castro, C., Cepeda-Carrión, G. and Roldán Salgueiro, J.L. (2021), "Investigar en Economía de la Empresa: ¿Partial Least Squares o modelos basados en la covarianza?", *XXX ACEDE Annual Conference*, 28th-30th June.
- Bashir, M., Jianqiao, L., Ghazanfar, F. and Abrar, M. (2012), "The effect of perception of existence of HPWS on employee's organizational commitment: a test of social exchange relationship and contingency perspective to implement HPWS in universities of China and Pakistan", *Advances in Asian Social Science*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 87-98.
- Becker, K.L., Richards, M.B. and Stollings, J. (2022), "Better together? Examining benefits and tensions of generational diversity and team performance", *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 442-463, doi: [10.1080/15350770.2020.1837708](https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2020.1837708).
- Becton, J.B., Walker, H.J. and Jones-Farmer, A. (2014), "Generational differences in workplace behavior", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 175-189, doi: [10.1111/jasp.12208](https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12208).
- Bizri, R. (2018), "Diversity management and OCB: the connection evidence from the Lebanese banking sector", *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 233-253, doi: [10.1108/EDI-03-2017-0059](https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-03-2017-0059).
- Bowen, D.E. and Ostroff, C. (2004), "Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: the role of the strength of the HRM system", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 203-221, doi: [10.5465/amr.2004.12736076](https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2004.12736076).
- Brouwer, P., Brekelmans, M., Nieuwenhuis, L. and Simons, R.J. (2012), "Communities of practice in the school workplace", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 346-364, doi: [10.1108/09578231211223347](https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231211223347).
- Byrne, D. (1997), "An overview (and underview) of research and theory within the attraction paradigm", *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 417-431, doi: [10.1177/0265407597143008](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407597143008).
- Downey, S.N., Van der Werff, L., Thomas, K. and Plaut, V.C. (2015), "The role of diversity practices and inclusion in promoting trust and employee engagement", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 35-44, doi: [10.1111/jasp.12273](https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12273).
- Elamin, A.M., Aldabbas, H. and Ahmed, A.Z.E. (2024), "The impact of diversity management on innovative work behavior: the mediating role of employee engagement in an emerging economy", *Frontiers in Sociology*, Vol. 9, 1441109, doi: [10.3389/fsoc.2024.1441109](https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2024.1441109).
- García, A.M. and Vargas, M. (2019), "La Diversidad de Género en las Empresas del Índice de Precios y Cotizaciones en la Bolsa Mexicana de Valores", *Revista de Economía and Administración*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 15-33.
- García, R., Neira, D. and Varela, C. (2012), "Percepciones de los sistemas de trabajo de alto rendimiento e intención de marcha. Un análisis multinivel", *Investigaciones Europeas de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 206-215, doi: [10.1016/j.i.edee.2012.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.i.edee.2012.06.001).
- Ghasempour Ganji, S.F.G., Nia, F.R., Ahanchian, M.R. and Syed, J. (2020), "Analyzing the impact of diversity management on innovative behaviors through employee engagement and affective commitment", *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 649-667, doi: [10.22059/IJMS.2020.307781.674164](https://doi.org/10.22059/IJMS.2020.307781.674164).

- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G.-Q. and Karadag, E. (2013), "Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 32, pp. 40-48, doi: [10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.04.002).
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M., Sarstedt, M., Castillo, J., Cepeda, G. and Roldán, J.L. (2017), *Manual de Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, 2a ed, Omnia Publisher S.L.
- Han, J., Sun, J.M. and Wang, H.-L. (2020), "Do high performance work systems generate negative effects? How and when?", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 30 No. 2, 100699, doi: [10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100699](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100699).
- Hansen, J.-I.C. and Leuty, M.E. (2011), "Work values across generations", *Journal of Career Assessment*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 34-52, doi: [10.1177/1069072711417163](https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711417163).
- Hapsari, C., Stoffers, J. and Gunawan, A. (2019), "The influence of generational diversity management and leader-member exchange on innovative work behaviors mediated by employee engagement", *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 125-139, doi: [10.1080/10599231.2019.1610684](https://doi.org/10.1080/10599231.2019.1610684).
- Harrison, J.A., Boekhorst, J.A. and Yu, Y. (2018), "HPWS and climate for inclusion: a moral legitimacy lens", *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, Vol. 37 No. 5, pp. 491-505, doi: [10.1108/EDI-12-2016-0112](https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-12-2016-0112).
- Joo, M.K., Lee, J.Y., Kong, D.T. and Jolly, P.M. (2023), "Gender diversity advantage at middle management: implications for high performance work system improvement and organizational performance", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 62 No. 5, pp. 765-785, doi: [10.1002/hrm.22159](https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22159).
- Jöreskog, K.G. and Wold, H. (1982), *Systems under Indirect Observation – Casualty Structure Prediction*, North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Kloutsiniotis, P.V. and Mihail, D.M. (2020), "Is it worth it? Linking perceived high-performance work systems and emotional exhaustion: the mediating role of job demands and job resources", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 565-579, doi: [10.1016/j.emj.2019.12.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.12.012).
- Lester, S.W., Standifer, R.L., Schultz, N.J. and Windsor, J.M. (2012), "Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: an empirical examination", *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 341-354, doi: [10.1177/1548051812442747](https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051812442747).
- Li, Y., Li, X. and Liu, Y. (2021), "How does high-performance work system prompt job crafting through autonomous motivation: the moderating role of initiative climate", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 1-15, doi: [10.3390/ijerph18020384](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18020384).
- Lu, C.M., Chen, S.J., Huang, P.C. and Chien, J.C. (2015), "Effect of diversity on human resource management and organizational performance", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 857-861, doi: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.11.041](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.11.041).
- Mannheim, K. (1952), "The problem of generations", in Kecskemeti, P. (Ed.), *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 276-322.
- Martín, C. (2011), "Gestión de recursos humanos y retención del capital humano estratégico: análisis de su impacto en los resultados de empresas innovadoras españolas", Phd dissertation, Universidad de Valladolid, Spain.
- Nguyen, C.N., Tho, A. and Nguyen, T.B. (2024), "Understanding generation Z's job engagement and performance in generationally diverse workplace", *Journal of Science-Economics and Business Administration*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 93-108, doi: [10.46223/HCMCOUJS.econ.en.14.2.2633.2024](https://doi.org/10.46223/HCMCOUJS.econ.en.14.2.2633.2024).
- Parry, E. and Urwin, P. (2021), "Generational categories: a broken basis for human resource management research and practice", *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 857-869, doi: [10.1111/1748-8583.12353](https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12353).
- Patrick, H.A. and Kumar, V.R. (2012), "Managing workplace diversity: issues and challenges", *Sage Open*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 1-15, doi: [10.1177/2158244012444615](https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244012444615).

- Provasi, R. and Harasheh, M. (2021), "Gender diversity and corporate performance: emphasis on sustainability performance", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 127-137, doi: [10.1002/csr.2037](https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2037).
- Redondo-Cano, A. and Saorín-Iborra, M.C. (2021), "La reorientación de las prácticas de RRHH hacia la diversidad de género", in Revuelto-Taboada, L., Balbastre-Benavent, F. and Canet-Giner, T. (Eds), *La dirección de recursos humanos frente los retos de la sostenibilidad y la sociedad de la información*, Tirant lo Blanch, Valencia, pp. 147-164.
- Ringle, C.M., Sarstedt, M. and Straub, D.W. (2012), "Editor's comments: a critical look at the use of PLS-SEM in MIS Quarterly", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. iii-xiv, doi: [10.2307/41410402](https://doi.org/10.2307/41410402).
- Saks, A.M. (2022), "Caring human resources management and employee engagement", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 32 No. 3, 100835, doi: [10.1016/j.hmr.2021.100835](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hmr.2021.100835).
- Sánchez-Teba, E.M., Benítez-Márquez, M.D. and Porras-Alcalá, P. (2021), "Gender diversity in boards of directors: a bibliometric mapping", *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market and Complexity*, Vol. 7 No. 1, p. 12, doi: [10.3390/joitmc7010012](https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010012).
- Schaufeli, W.B. and Salanova, M. (2014), "Burnout, boredom and engagement at the workplace", in Peeters, M.C.W., De Jonge, J. and Taris, T.W. (Eds), *An Introduction to Contemporary Work Psychology*, John Wiley y Sons, New York, pp. 293-320.
- Sifatu, W.O., Sjahruddin, H., Fajriah, Y., Dwijendra, A. and Santoso, A. (2020), "Innovative work behaviors in pharmacies of Indonesia: role of employee voice, generational diversity management and employee engagement", *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 725-734, doi: [10.31838/srp.2020.2.105](https://doi.org/10.31838/srp.2020.2.105).
- Singh, V., Verma, S. and Chaurasia, S. (2020), "Intellectual structure of multigenerational workforce and contextualizing work values across generations: a multistage analysis", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 470-487, doi: [10.1108/IJM-04-2019-0207](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-04-2019-0207).
- Sun, L.-Y., Aryee, S. and Law, K.S. (2007), "High-performance human resource practices, citizenship behavior, and organizational performance: a relational perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 558-577, doi: [10.5465/amj.2007.25525821](https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.25525821).
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J.C., Austin, W.G. and Worchel, S. (2004), "An integrative theory of intergroup conflict", in Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (Eds), *Organizational Identity: A Reader*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 56-65.
- Tamunomiebi, M.D. and Adim, V. (2019), "The nexus between employee cyberloafing and generational diversity : implications for contemporary managers", *Management and Human Resource Journal*, Vol. 8 No. 12, pp. 29-41.
- Vargas Téllez, J.A., Soto Patiño, J.C. and Rosas Ambriz, K.L. (2014), "La relación del Compromiso Organizacional con el nivel de estudios, la edad y el género en trabajadores de la industria del calzado en el León, Guanajuato", *Observatorio Iberoamericano del Desarrollo Local y la Economía Social*, No. 16, available at: <https://www.eumed.net/rev/oidles/16/sociodemografia.pdf>
- Wieczorek-Szymanska, A. (2020), "Gender diversity in academic sector – case study", *Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 41-61, doi: [10.3390/admsci10030041](https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci10030041).
- Woodward, I.C., Vongsawasdi, P. and More, E.A. (2015), "Generational diversity at work: a systematic review of the research", INSEAD Working Paper No. 2015/48/OB, doi: [10.2139/ssrn.2630650](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2630650).
- Zhang, M.M., Di Fan, D. and Zhu, C. (2014), "High-performance work systems, corporate social performance and employee outcomes: exploring the missing links", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 120 No. 3, pp. 423-435, doi: [10.1007/s10551-013-1672-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1672-8).

Corresponding author

M. Carmen Saorín-Iborra can be contacted at: carmen.saorin@uv.es