

# **Increasing Minority Employment: Are You Ready to Recruit?**

**Mary Lou Egan & Marc Bendick, Jr.<sup>1</sup>**

**April 2017**

## **Introduction**

When organizations seek to increase their number of employees from specific demographic groups in the name of diversity, the first strategy they typically employ is to go outside the organization and recruit. At most, employers couple recruiting with a nod to retention by offering minority recruits mentoring or training to learn the organization's "rules of the game." However, a few years after such initiatives, diversity numbers typically remain low or even decrease, turnover among recruits from the sought-after group remains high, and diversity initiatives are threatened by their recurrent costs.<sup>2</sup> In spite of such failures to make diversity self-sustaining, the cycle begins again with the same complaints of how few "really talented" minorities are available "in the pipeline" and renewed searches for additional places to recruit recent graduates.

This paper is about the need for employers to break this fruitless cycle by thinking more strategically about how to increase diversity representation among its employees.

## **Breaking the Cycle**

Although recruiting is an important part of any HR diversity strategy, it is not the place to start. Before bringing more minorities or other outgroups into a workplace, the first question to ask is: What happens to minorities once they are hired?

Research is clear that the answer begins with the organization itself, specifically, with the organizational climate or "what people see and report happening to them and others in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc., Alexandria, VA, USA, <http://www.bendickegan.com>, [marcandmarylou@bendickegan.com](mailto:marcandmarylou@bendickegan.com). This paper is an expanded version of a presentation given at a roundtable, "Attracting and Retaining US Minorities: Solutions from Employer Partnerships," held at the World Bank on Nov. 17, 2010. The authors thank Julia Oyegun for her support but remain solely responsible for all findings and conclusions.

<sup>2</sup> van Dijk, H. & van Engen, M., 2009; Kochan et al., 2003.

organization.”<sup>3</sup> Climate is one of the most important aspects of a workplace because it strongly influences a variety of highly-sought individual and organizational outcomes. At the individual level, it influences satisfaction, commitment, performance, absenteeism and retention.<sup>4</sup> At the organizational level, it influences customer/client service and satisfaction, financial performance, and organizational effectiveness.<sup>5</sup>

Individuals’ perceptions are formed through their own workplace experiences and those of their fellow employees. Often, the metaphor used to describe the differing perceptions among employees in the same workplace is that individuals experience workplace processes such as leadership practices, organizational justice, and workplace relationships through their own lenses.<sup>6</sup>

These perceptions of organizational policies, practices and procedures are real, measurable, and influence how employees react and behave.<sup>7</sup> For example, in 2003, the World Bank inclusion report<sup>8</sup> confirmed that “out-group” characteristics -- both visible and invisible -- strongly predicted staff members’ employment outcomes. That statistical analysis documented adverse employment outcomes for demographic groups targeted in the Bank Group’s employment goals for 2005. For example, salaries averaged 5.1% lower for women, 3.2% lower for Blacks, and 2.5% lower for holders of developing country passports than they would receive if they had the same qualifications but “in-group” demographic characteristics.<sup>9</sup> It is no wonder that different demographic groups see themselves working for different organizations.

If the organizational climate is perceived by minorities as not inclusive, then these employees tend to leave, or worse, stay but be less engaged and less productive.<sup>10</sup> Thus it is in

---

<sup>3</sup> Major et al., 2010: 73; McKay & Avery, 2005.

<sup>4</sup> Ostroff et al., 2003; Kozlowski & Hults, 1987; Jackofsky & Slocum, 1988.

<sup>5</sup> Schneider & Bowen, 1985; Schneider et al., 1998; Borucki & Burke, 1999; Zohar, 2000; Lindell & Brandt, 2000.

<sup>6</sup> Major et al., 2010: 84.

<sup>7</sup> Hayes et al., 2002. The perceptions typically focus on specific features, such as the climate for advancement. They often vary among levels of the organization, and there can be multiple climates within a single organization.

<sup>8</sup> Egan et al., 2003.

<sup>9</sup> Egan et al., 2003: 3.

<sup>10</sup> Haskett et al., 2008; Rucci et al., 1998 ; Towers Perrin, 2008.

an organization's best interests to create an organizational climate that is inclusive in the eyes of all its employees. This means creating an organizational climate which, through informal processes and formal rules, ensures that every employee has equal access to opportunities, resources, jobs throughout the organization, career paths, promotions, and equal pay for equal qualifications and performance.

Without an inclusive organizational climate that will retain and fully utilize minority employees, simply recruiting more minorities will not lead to the benefits sought by the organization.

### **Is Your Organization Ready to Start Recruiting?**

How might an organization know that it has important work to do on its organizational climate before it is ready to begin minority recruitment? Six "red flags" often strongly hint that an organization is probably not yet ready to recruit.

*Red Flag #1: Does your organization have multiple analyses stretching over a period of years concerning the lack of minorities? Do the reports describe the same basic issues and outcomes?*

Organizations often respond to their lack of diversity by studying the reasons why they have not been able to make diversity sustainable. These studies may vary in format and quality but generally include analyses of employee complaints, focus groups, climate surveys, and/or statistical analyses. Once completed for the cycle at hand, these studies often simply go on the shelf. However, they offer important information that the organization could ill afford to ignore.

As a first step, it is insightful to notice simply the number of reports completed over multiple years. Next, it is important to consider whether similar themes occur year after year. Finally, it is useful to tabulate whether similar issues are raised by multiple outgroups within the organization. If the answer to these questions is yes, then that is a strong signal that the organizational climate is *not* inclusive.

We completed such a "counting" as part of our inclusion analysis of the World Bank in 2003. We discovered 16 diversity reports prepared for the Bank between 1992 and 2002, an average of nearly two reports a year for over a decade.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Egan et al., 2003: Appendix C: 92. There is at least one more report since that time; see Walden & Edwards, 2009. Thus the total today is at least 18.

The reports addressed a range of diversity concerns; involved a variety of race, gender and nationality groups; examined different parts of the organization in different time periods; and employed a variety of research methodologies. However, when these studies were examined side by side, they demonstrated that multiple demographic groups had recurrently raised similar issues. Of the 21 diversity concerns raised in these studies, only three topics (14%) were of concern for only one of the three demographic groups examined, whereas the remaining 86% of issues were of concern to either 2 or 3 groups.<sup>12</sup>

By itself, the fact that an issue was examined in a study does not prove that a group suffered inequities. However, it does signal that the issue was considered relevant to that group, either because members of the group complained or others were concerned on their behalf. It also signals something about how the organization is progressing in addressing organizational climate issues. If a compilation of reports surface similar problems year after year, then it is reasonable to presume that the systemic problems of lack of inclusion have not been effectively addressed.

*Red Flag #2: Does the organization hire African Americans for openings and career paths that begin and end in the Africa division? Does the same “race matching” operate for other demographic groups?*

In many organizations, the business case for diversity assumes that ethnic matching of minority employees and clients is beneficial to clients, minority employees and organizational productivity. To reach this conclusion, employers reason that minority employees “instinctively” or through life experiences are able to form better relationships with persons from their own group than with other demographic groups. As a result, the client is supposed to feel more comfortable and understood, and organizational productivity will improve.

However, empirical research of both consumer sales and business-to-business sales confirms that, in most circumstances,<sup>13</sup> customers or clients are not particularly concerned about the racial match between themselves and sales representatives.<sup>14</sup> Instead, customers report that the key to sales effectiveness is a sales staff’s ability to understand, communicate with and

---

<sup>12</sup> Egan et al., 2003: Table 2.1: 20. The “outgroups” examined in this analysis were women, Blacks and under-represented nationalities.

<sup>13</sup> However, suggesting exceptions to this generalization, Hekman et al., 2010: 37, found that “customer satisfaction judgments were susceptible to systemic and predictable racial and gender biases.”

<sup>14</sup> Leonard et al., 2004 ; Lichtenthal & Tellefsen, 2001; Sengupta et al., 2000.

develop trust with them, regardless of how that is achieved.<sup>15</sup> The limited importance consumers attach to simple race matching has also been documented for single-dimension matching on other visible demographic characteristics such as gender,<sup>16</sup> age,<sup>17</sup> and ethnicity.<sup>18</sup>

Application of this faulty but common “business case” logic leads many employers to apply a single demographic as a proxy for a bundle of work-related skills when making employment decisions about individual employees. This reasoning represents stereotypical thinking that “all minorities are alike.”<sup>19</sup>

The fallacy of using race rather than job skills as a predictor of job performance and customer/client satisfaction has been demonstrated in numerous studies across a number of industries.<sup>20</sup> For example, a large drug store chain in the United States routinely assigned African American pharmacists to manage inner city stores with large numbers of African American customers. The chain assumed that simply being African American meant that minority customers would identify with the managers and that the managers would have local neighborhood knowledge, language skills and a similar appearance. In reality, this thinking was completely wrong about a variety of assumed matches. In terms of education, the managers were college graduates and neighborhood residents on average had no more than secondary school level educations. There was a broad income gap between managers who earned an average of \$61,801 and neighborhood residents who averaged under \$40,000. Ninety-five percent of store managers did not live in the local neighborhood of their stores and so did not share daily life experiences or personal networks. Finally, as many as 60 percent of the residents in the neighborhoods the company labeled “African American” were from other racial groups.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> For example, Martin, 2005, found that African-American and Caucasian salespeople do not exhibit significant differences in terms of their customer relationship effort and overall performance

<sup>16</sup> Dwyer et al., 1998.

<sup>17</sup> Kang & Hillery, 1998.

<sup>18</sup> Comer & Nicholls, 2000.

<sup>19</sup> Diversity is not properly understood as involving a single demographic characteristic but rather a complex mix of visible and invisible differences. For example, John is a Ph.D. economist, African American, grew up in Bolivia, and a father of three. Because aspects of a person’s “diversity” is situation– specific, at work John’s training as an economist should be a more salient aspect of his diversity than his race or marital status. See Bucher, 2008: 23-49.

<sup>20</sup> Bendick et al., 2010.

<sup>21</sup> Bendick et al., 2010: 474.

The employment consequences for the managers were severe.<sup>22</sup> Not only did matching limit the range of stores they were assigned, but these stores were “career killers.” The inner city stores they managed were smaller and had lower store volumes, which resulted in smaller bonuses for their managers. The stores also had higher rates of crime which forced assistant managers into longer working hours and thereby reduced their opportunities to complete training needed for promotion to store manager. Consequently, African American managers on average earned less, took longer to be promoted, and voluntarily quit the company sooner than their white counterparts.

Multinational organizations are not immune to this same reasoning and its deleterious consequences. A complaint often heard is that Black staff is hired for assignments in Black geographic regions, and that is where they stay. Our World Bank diversity study in 2003 documented that while non-Black staff moved around the organization relatively freely, Black staff did not have the same mobility. Compared to equally-qualified persons of any other race, being Black was associated with a 6.5% reduction in the probability of changing corporate departments each year.<sup>23</sup>

Concurrently with limiting career opportunities for minorities, the practice of race matching reduces the diversity benefits for the organization employing them. These benefits include expanding the choice of job candidates by considering individuals from all segments of the labor force and enhancing organizational creativity by mixing such employees with employees of other backgrounds.<sup>24</sup>

*Red Flag #3: Are few or no managers trained in the skills that reduce unconscious bias and stereotyping in everyday functions – skills such as behavioral interviewing, basing employment decisions on explicit criteria, and writing unbiased performance appraisals?*

In many workplaces today -- especially in sophisticated, professional organizations -- blatant sexism and racism are infrequently expressed. However, that silence does not mean that discrimination has disappeared.<sup>25</sup> Social psychologists have identified more subtle forms of

---

<sup>22</sup>For a description of similar race matching in the advertising industry, see Bendick & Egan, 2009.

<sup>23</sup> Egan et al., 2003: 42.

<sup>24</sup>Kochan et al, 2003; Mannix & Neale, 2005.

<sup>25</sup>Dipboye & Halverson, 2004.

prejudice and bias called “unconscious prejudice” or “implicit bias.”<sup>26</sup> A particular danger of implicit biases is that they appear even in workplaces where the organization and its employees are free of conscious bias against identifiable groups and therefore believe themselves completely bias-free.

The powerful, unconscious psychological and social processes of implicit bias tend to result in important differences in treatment of groups or individuals. Often, these differences are not dramatic in magnitude and therefore are sometimes referred to as “microinequities.” For example, average salary increases for members of one group might differ from that for members of other groups by only a few hundred dollars; wording in performance evaluations for members of the groups might differ only in degree of enthusiasm; or individuals in one group might sometimes be included in informal, network-building socializing but less frequently than co-workers from other demographic groups.

However, the relatively small size of individual microinequities is belied by their cumulative effect.<sup>27</sup> As individuals’ careers develop over years and decades, the ways they are perceived and treated, and what opportunities are open to them at each moment tend to be shaped by the track record they have accumulated prior to that moment. Thus, each microinequity has both an immediate effect and a “ratcheting” effect as decision-makers react to an employee’s past record and the cumulative effects of past judgments. The significance of microinequities is not just their immediate impact but rather that they place and keep minorities on different, lower career paths than their non-minority counterparts who began with equal qualifications.

Adverse behavior based on implicit bias can be controlled when individuals have the motivation to do so, such as when an individual experiences anti-bias social pressure from fellow employees or when promotions, raises or other professional success depends on unbiased behavior. But in addition to motivation, individuals need to be equipped with skills and tools. Some tasks managers perform routinely are particularly prone to implicit bias, including performance reviews, hiring decisions, interviewing, and coaching. Skill training, supported by human resource management procedures that set up the best possible situations for bias to be controlled, can reduce microinequities substantially.<sup>28</sup> And these procedures are not rocket science. However, managers, can not realistically be assumed to follow these procedures of their own accord, or even be aware of them, if they have never been trained.

---

<sup>26</sup>For a review of the literature, see Quillian, 2006; Greenwald et al., 2009. To test your own implicit biases, go to Project Implicit at Harvard University, <https://implicit.harvard.edu>.

<sup>27</sup>Valian, 1998.

<sup>28</sup> Bielby, 2008; Reskin, 2000; Bendick et al., 2001; Egan & Bendick, 2008.

*Red Flag #4: Is there no regular monitoring at the organizational level to find systemic differences in pay, promotions, attitudes and job opportunities among employee groups?*

Regular monitoring and analysis help to identify problems correctly so that the organization can design appropriate solutions, be assured that the solutions are being implemented, and determine if the efforts are achieving the desired objectives.<sup>29</sup> For example, suppose that Jill learns that her male colleagues earn more than she does for similar work and goes to her manager with that information. The manager's first reaction might be to simply raise Jill's salary to that of her male colleagues at the time of her complaint. Assuming that Jill is equally qualified and as productive as her male colleagues, this might be an adequate response to an isolated incident, such as one manager's mistake in an otherwise inclusive organization. However, if biases are systemic, then after the one time raise, Jill would start to fall behind again. In addition, other women would remain underpaid in relation to their male colleagues. Therefore, Jill's manager should first know the answers to the following questions before implementing a solution. Is Jill less qualified or less productive compared to her male colleagues and deserves lower pay? Is Jill receiving a lower salary because she is being discriminated against? Is Jill's lower salary part of a wider pattern against women in the organization?

How can an organization answer such questions? Simple techniques, such as comparing responses to employee surveys from members of different demographic groups, can offer the organization a low cost but insight-rich initial clue into how various groups perceive the organization. Are different groups in effect working for different organizations? If this is the case, then systemic bias may be the cause.

However, to measure systemic bias rigorously requires multivariate statistical techniques such as multiple regression analysis.<sup>30</sup> These analytical tools allow organizations to answer essential questions that cannot be answered definitively from more subjective sources such as attitude surveys or focus groups. Multivariate analysis is particularly effective in detecting systemic bias in an age of subtle microinequities; it can define "outgroups" to reflect today's definition of diversity as a combination of visible and invisible differences; and it can accurately compare individuals whose qualifications are complex and multidimensional.

In 2003, we analyzed employment outcomes for 4,711 World Bank staff at mid-level and senior level professional grades. We created 16 metrics as explanatory variables, along with "human capital" variables representing employees' education, experience and other job-related

---

<sup>29</sup> Shaw et al., 1998.

<sup>30</sup> Multivariate statistical analysis allows for the simultaneous observation and analysis of more than one statistical variable. Thereby, for example, the effect of race and gender on salaries can be accurately separated from the effect of employees' qualifications and productivity.



qualifications. Our statistical analysis using multiple regression found that both visible and invisible out-group characteristics significantly affected staff members' employment outcomes such as salaries, promotions, and lateral mobility. This procedure provided evidence of systemic bias against women, racial minorities, and other outgroups. For example, in comparison to equally-qualified persons of any other race, being Black was associated with a 3.2% lower annual salary and a 36.3% reduction in the probability of being in a managerial grade.<sup>31</sup>

*Red Flag #5: Is individual managerial accountability for inclusion outcomes lax or non-existent? Are there real consequences for managers who ignore their employer's inclusion goals? Real consequences refer to high stakes employment decisions such as promotions, bonuses, or even firing.*

Organizational structures that embed accountability, authority, and expertise increase the likelihood of achieving real and sustainable results.<sup>32</sup> Lax managerial accountability signals that diversity and inclusion are not part of the core mission of the organization and are not a priority for senior management. In other words, lax accountability suggests that diversity and inclusion outcomes are only a residual or “nice but not essential” aspect of managers' performance. Indications of this latter approach to diversity and inclusion are seen when managers who are particularly good at valued core business functions are given a “free pass” on diversity and inclusion goals. The approach is also evident if, when diversity and inclusion conflict with core business goals, they are sidelined while managers attend to the “real business at hand.”

If creation of a diverse workforce and an inclusive organizational climate are seriously valued as essential to an organization's success, then these inputs are tracked, measured and managed.<sup>33</sup> Some have suggested that accountability for inclusion be considered similar to accountability for workplace practices that ensure physical safety – they are essential, apply to everyone, and must be practiced all the time.

Accountability for inclusion results is not a new or particularly complex idea to implement. Instruments and procedures are readily available to hold employees accountable through performance evaluations, bonuses, incentives or promotions.<sup>34</sup> What is rarer are

---

<sup>31</sup> Egan et al., 2003: 42.

<sup>32</sup> Kalev et al., 2006; Kilian et al., 2005; Reskin, 2003.

<sup>33</sup> Thomas, 2004.

<sup>34</sup> Digh, 2001; Rosenfeld et al., 2003.

organizations willing to enforce accountability as though it is truly an essential aspect of their core business.

*Red Flag #6: Does the recruitment strategy for increasing minorities focus on entry level hiring without minority hiring at mid and senior levels?*

If none of the first five red flags appears, then one more flag must be considered before recruiting begins. Do the organization's plans for enhanced minority recruiting also include hiring at the middle and senior levels?

When non-minorities are recruited at all levels of the organization and minorities are not, Red Flag #6 raises questions about implicit stereotypes about minorities. The common phrase associated with minority recruitment is "increasing the talent pipeline." That approach generally is interpreted as going outside the organization to fill entry level jobs. Recruitment efforts do not seek to fill the entire pipeline from entry levels to senior management. They also commonly overlook internal minority candidates who are bumping against glass ceilings.<sup>35</sup>

When organizations limit minority recruitment to entry level jobs, the process implies that the organization believes that there is not a professional, talented cohort of minority middle and upper level managers comparable in quality to non-minority applicants. Implicitly, this assumption reflects a more general view -- a stereotype -- that all minorities are inexperienced or ill-prepared.<sup>36</sup> In this case, that assumption translates into a belief that the best way to "build talent" is to hire recent graduates and through special programs and training, eventually bring the minority employees "up to the organization's standards" and mold them to fit the corporate culture. It implies that only through careful selection, and by being trained while still malleable, will minorities develop the skills necessary to equal non-minority candidates and eventually move up the corporate ladder.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Elliott & Smith, 2004; James, 2000.

<sup>36</sup> Wilder, 1981; Yzerbyt et al., 1994.

<sup>37</sup> Not recruiting minorities for upper level positions may also say something about the fear of minorities in more powerful positions within the organization, namely that increased diversity might actually spark organizational change. This is a sign that the organization is recruiting minorities for political or moral reasons but really does not believe that diversity will contribute positively to the organization. See Bajdo & Dickson, 2001; Ragins, 1995.

## Conclusion

While recruiting is an important part of any diversity strategy, without an inclusive organizational climate, employee diversity and its benefits will not be sustainable. *For most organizations, recruitment is not the place to start; making the organizational climate inclusive is.*

Once appropriate organization development initiatives are in place and have had an opportunity to affect the organizational climate, then the time for enhancing minority recruitment may be at hand. However, at that point, special minority recruitment might not even be necessary. When major employers change their workplace cultures to become more inclusive, word gets around fast.<sup>38</sup>

## References

- Bajdo, L. and Dickson, M. (2001), "Perceptions of organizational culture and women's advancement in organizations: A cross cultural examination", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 45, pp. 399-414.
- Bendick, M. & Egan, M. (2015), "Using information regulation to enhance workplace diversity, inclusion and fairness", *Argumenta Oeconomica Cracoviensia*, Vol. 10, pp. 59-77.
- Bendick, M. & Egan, M. (2009), *Research Perspectives on Race and Employment in the Advertising Industry*, Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc., Washington, DC.
- Bendick, M., Egan, M., and Lanier, L. (2010), "The business case for diversity and the perverse practice of matching employees to customers", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 39, pp. 468-486.
- Bendick, M., Egan, M., and Lofhjelm, S. (2001). "Diversity training: From anti-discrimination compliance to organization development", *Human Resource Planning*, Vol. 24, pp. 10-25.
- Bielby, W. (2008), "Promoting racial diversity at work: Challenges and solutions", in Brief, A. (Ed.), *Diversity at Work*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Borucki, C. and Burke, M. (1999), "An examination of service related antecedents to retail store performance", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 20, pp. 943-62.
- Bucher, R. (2008), *Building Cultural Intelligence (CQ)*, Pearson, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

---

<sup>38</sup> Bendick & Egan, 2015.

- Comer, L. and Nicholls, J. (2000), "Communication between Hispanic salespeople and their customers, a first look", *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 1-20.
- Digh, P. (2001), "The next challenge: Holding people accountable," The Center for Association Leadership, accessed 12/7/2010 at <http://www.asaecenter.org> .
- Dipboye, R. and Halverson, S. (2004), "Subtle (and not so subtle) discrimination in organizations", in *The Dark Side of Organizational Behavior*, Griffin, R. and O'Leary-Kelly, A. (Eds.), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Dwyer, S., Orlando, R., and Shepherd, C. (1998), "An exploratory study of gender and age matching in the salesperson - prospective customer dyad, testing similarity performance predictions", *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 55-69.
- Egan, M. and Bendick, M. (2008), "Combining multicultural management and diversity into one course in cultural competence", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 7, pp. 387-393.
- Egan, M., Bendick, M., and Miller, J. (2003), *Enhancing Inclusion at the World Bank Group: Diagnosis and Solutions*. The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Elliott, J. and Smith, R. (2004), "Race, gender, and workplace power", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 69, pp. 365-386.
- Greenwald, A., Poehlman, T., Uhlmann, E., and Banaji, M. (2009), "Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: Meta-analysis of predictive validity", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 97, pp. 17-41.
- Haskett, J., Sasser, W., and Wheeler, J. (2008), "Boost your employee OQ". Excerpted from *The Ownership Quotient: Putting the Service Profit Chain to work for Unbeatable Competitive Advantage*, Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, MA.
- Hayes, B., Bartle, S., and Major, D. (2002), "Climate for opportunity: A conceptual model", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 12, pp. 445-68.
- Hekman, D., Quino, R., Owens, B., Mitchell, T., Schilpzand, P., and Leavitt, K. (2010), "An examination of whether and how racial and gender biases influence consumer satisfaction", *Academy of Management Journal*. In press.
- Jackofsky, E. and Slocum, J. (1988), "A longitudinal study of climates", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 8, pp. 319-34.
- James, E. (2000), "Race-related differences in promotions and support: Underlying effects of human and social capital", *Organization Science*, Vol. 11, September-October, pp. 493-508

- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., and Kelly, E. (2006), "Best practices or best guesses? Diversity management and the remediation of inequality", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 71, pp. 589-617.
- Kang, J. and Hillery, J. (1998), "Older salespeople's role in retail encounters", *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 39-53.
- Kilian, C., Hukai, D., McCarty, E. (2005), "Building diversity in the pipeline to corporate leadership", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 24, pp.155 - 168
- Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., and Jehn, K. (2003), "The effect of diversity on business performance, report of a feasibility study of the Diversity Research Network", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 42, pp. 3-22.
- Kozlowski, S. and Hults, B. (1987), "An exploration of climates for technical updating and performance", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 40, pp. 539-63.
- Leonard, J., Levine, D., and Joshi, A. (2004), "Do birds of a feather shop together? The effect on performance of employee's similarity with one another and with customers", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 25, pp. 731-54.
- Lichtenthal, J. and Tellefsen, T. (2001), "Toward a theory of business buyer-seller similarity", *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*", Vol. 21, pp. 1-14.
- Lindell, M. and Brandt, C. (2000), "Climate quality and climate consensus as mediators of the relationship between organizational antecedents and outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 331-48.
- Major, D., Davis, D., Sanchez-Hucles, J., Downey, H., and Germano, L. (2010), "Myths and realities in the IT workplace: Gender differences and similarities in climate perceptions", in *Women and Minorities in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics*, Burke, R. and Mattis, M. (Eds.) Edward Elgar, Northampton, MA.
- Mannix, E. and Neale, M. (2005), "What differences make a difference? The promise and reality of Chinese teams in organizations", *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol. 6, pp. 31-55.
- Martin, C. (2005), "Racial diversity in professional selling: An empirical investigation of the differences in the perceptions and performance of African-American and Caucasian salespeople", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 20, pp. 285 – 296.
- Mckay, P. and Avery, D. (2005), "Warning! Diversity recruitment could backfire", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 14, pp. 330-336.

- Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A., and Tamkins, M. (2003), "Organizational culture and climate", in Borman, W., Ilgen, D., and Klimoski, R. (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 12, Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley & Sons.
- Quillian, L. (2006), "New approaches to understanding racial prejudice and discrimination", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 32, pp. 299-328.
- Ragins, B. (1995), "Diversity, power and mentoring in organizations: A cultural, structural, and behavioral perspective", in Chemers, N., Costanzo, M., and Oskamp, S. (Eds.), *Diversity in Organizations: New Perspectives for a Changing Workplace*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Reskin, B. (2003), "Including mechanisms in our models of ascriptive inequality: 2002 presidential address", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 68, pp. 1–21.
- Reskin B. (2000), "The proximate causes of employment discrimination", *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 29, pp. 319–328.
- Rosenfeld, P., Landis, D., and Dalsky, D. (2003), "Evaluating diversity programs", in Edwards, J., Scott, J., and Raju, N. (Eds.), *The Human Resources Program-Evaluation Handbook*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Rucci, A., Kim, S., and Quinn, R. (1998), "The employee customer profit chain at Sears", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 2, pp. 1-30.
- Schneider, B. and Bowen, D. (1985), "Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks: Replication and extension", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp. 423-33.
- Schneider, B., White, S., and Paul, M. (1998), "Linking service climate and customer perceptions of service quality: Test of a causal model", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83, pp. 150-63.
- Sengupta, S., Krapfel, R., and Pusateri, M. (2000), "An empirical investigation of key account salesperson effectiveness", *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. 20, pp. 253-61.
- Shaw, J., Delery, J., Jenkins, G., and Gupta, N. (1998), "An organization-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover", *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41, pp. 511-525.
- Thomas, D. (2004), "Diversity as strategy", *Harvard Business Review*, Sept., pp. 1-10.
- Towers-Perrin (2008), "Case study: Employee engagement underpins business transformation", Accessed at <http://www.towersperrin.com> .

Valian, V. (1999), *Why So Slow?* MIT Press, Cambridge.

van Dijk, H. and van Engen, M. (2009), "More than meets the eye: A meta-analysis of work group diversity and performance", submitted to *Psychological Bulletin*. Accessed at [awopsgmdiversity.webs.com/Dijk%20van%20Engen%20van%20Knippenberg\\_fp.pdf](http://awopsgmdiversity.webs.com/Dijk%20van%20Engen%20van%20Knippenberg_fp.pdf).

Walden, S. and Edwards, B. (2009), *Racial Discrimination at the World Bank: A Review of the Treatment of Black Employees in Recruitment, Retention and Justice Decisions*, Government Accountability Project, Washington, DC.

Wilder, D. (1981), "Perceiving persons as a group: Categorization and intergroup relationships", in Hamilton, E. (Ed.), *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.

Yzerbyt, V., Schadron, G., Leyens, J., and Rocher, S. (1994), "Social judgeability: The impact of meta-informational cues on the use of stereotypes", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 66, pp. 48-55.

Zohar, D. (2000), "A group-level model of safety climate: Testing the effect of group climate on microaccidents in manufacturing jobs", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 587-96.