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Quantitative measures are at the center of our strategy for workplace change, because--

- **Parallelism**: Quantitative measures make workforce diversity look and feel like other goals managers are used to achieving.

- **Motivation**: Measurement can document unconscious bias which employers often do not recognize.

- **Implementation**: Managers deliver what they are held accountable for.

- **Direction**: Measures define the problem, which then defines the solution.
Legally-mandated measures (Table 1) are often not well matched to today’s predominant workplace discrimination problems.

- In many workplaces, 1967’s “inexorable zero” has given way to 2007’s “diversity without inclusion.”

- Encapsulated actions can meet representation goals without ensuring sustainability.

- Piecemeal analysis leads to group-specific solutions which are often divisive and ineffective (e.g., promotional goals and timetables, “mommy track”).

- **Fundamental Issue:** These measures treat employee diversity as the problem, not as symptoms of an underlying problem: lack of organizational inclusion.
Table 1. Representation of one racial minority group in one unit of an upscale restaurant chain, 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Employees on 6/30/06</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Employees</td>
<td>Minority %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Server</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busser</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Diagnosis: To measure inclusion at one firm, we first identified all characteristics which might divide in-groups from out-groups. Ingroups are defined by modal values.

Modal Cultural & Personal Characteristics
- White
- Male
- Age 36-55
- Grew up in US or Europe
- US or European citizen
- English native language
- Married w/ dependents

Modal Education & Experience Characteristics
- English native language
- Degrees from 20 “core” universities
- No degrees outside business
- Outside experience < 8 years
- All outside work in same industry
- With firm > 8 years
- < 1 career shifts within firm
Diagnosis: Negative coefficients in multiple cells show barriers to inclusion at this firm are **systemic**, not group-specific or process-specific.

*Multiple regression coefficients controlling for productivity-related characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out - Group Characteristics</th>
<th>Annual Earnings</th>
<th>Probability is a Manager</th>
<th>Probability of Inter-Dept. Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
<td>-40.4%</td>
<td>-79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational &amp; Experience Characteristics</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
<td>-26.8%</td>
<td>-89.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation: The same measures can be used to train managers to focus on the firm’s inclusion, not employee diversity.
Implementation: The measures can also be used to hold individual managers accountable.
Implications for “Launching Diversity Science”

- Launch “Inclusion Science.”

- Companies – and society – have a major stake in correct workforce diversity management.

- Behavioral science contributions, which are key to sustainable inclusion, are currently under-utilized or mis-utilized.
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