

**INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION
PAPERS**

29

**The documentation and evaluation of anti-
discrimination training in the United States**

**M. Bendick, Jr.
M. L. Egan
S. Lofhjelm**

**Bendick & Egan Economic Consultants, Inc.
Washington, D.C.**

Conditions of Work Branch

International Labour Office Geneva

Note: The publication of this paper is meant to stimulate discussion
and critical comment

**INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION
PAPERS**

29

**The documentation and evaluation of anti-
discrimination training in the United States**

**M. Bendick, Jr.
M. L. Egan
S. Lofhjelm**

**Bendick & Egan Economic Consultants, Inc.
Washington, D.C.**

Conditions of Work Branch
International Labour Office Geneva

Table of contents

Foreword	vii
1. Introduction	1
2. The context of this study	2
2.1. Migrants, minorities, and other groups in the workplace	2
2.2. The continued presence of workplace discrimination	2
2.3. The evolving forms of workplace discrimination	6
2.4. Psychological and organizational bases of more subtle discrimination	8
2.5. Societal attitudes toward discrimination	11
2.6. Employers' motives for addressing discrimination	12
3. Research design and sample description	16
3.1. Literature survey of prior research	16
3.2. The ILO research design	20
3.3. Telephone survey	22
3.4. Case studies	26
4. Documentation of training activities	27
4.1. A profile based on ILO profile sheets	27
4.2. An overview of training providers	34
4.3. An overview of training clients	37
4.4. An overview of training courses	38
4.5. An overview of the context surrounding training	41
5. Descriptive summaries of case studies	43
5.1. The role of these summaries	43
5.2. Advantica Restaurant Group, Inc.	43
5.3. Fleet Financial Group, Inc.	45
5.4. General Motors Corporation	48
5.5. Hewlett Packard Corporation, Boise Facility	51
5.6. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Engineering Directorate	53
5.7. Manpower, Inc.	55
5.8. Methodist Health Systems, Inc.	58
5.9. Microsoft Corporation	60
5.10. The Nationwide Insurance Enterprise	61
5.11. Owens Corning	63
5.12. Pacific Enterprises, Gas Transmission Division	65
5.13. United Food and Commercial Workers International Union	68
5.14. The United States Coast Guard	70
5.15. United Technologies, Tyler Plant	73
6. Evaluation of training activities	76
6.1. The evidence for moderately positive effects	76
6.2. When does training have negative effects?	79
6.3. Eight benchmarks for effective training	80
6.4. The relationship between benchmarks and impact	84
7. Recommendations for improving anti-discrimination training	87

Bibliography	89
--------------------	----

Annex: Profile sheets	95
Profile Sheet 1: The Trainers	95
Profile Sheet 2: Target Group of the Training	96
Profile Sheet 3: The Training Courses	98

Tables

1. Selected employment outcomes by race/ethnicity and gender, civilian labour force in the United States, 1994	3
2. Selected measures of educational achievement by race/ethnicity and gender, persons age 25 and above in the United States, 1994	5
3. 108 respondents to the telephone survey, by sampling strata	23
4. Characteristics of organizations providing anti-discrimination training	35
5. Characteristics of individuals leading anti-discrimination training sessions	36
6. Characteristics of the client organizations of anti-discrimination training	37
7. Characteristics of individuals receiving anti-discrimination training	38
8. Characteristics of the delivery of anti-discrimination training	39
9. The content of anti-discrimination training courses	40
10. Relationships between training and other anti-discrimination activities	42
11. The effects of training estimated by training providers	77
12. The relationship between overall impact and conformity to benchmarks	85
13. The relationship between overall impact and training type	86

Figure

1. A typology of anti-discrimination training	21
---	----

International Migration Papers	113
---	-----

Foreword

This is a paper of the ILO's Migration Programme, located within the Conditions of Work Branch. The objectives of the Programme are to contribute to (i) the formulation, application and evaluation of international migration policies suited to the economic and social aims of governments, employers' and workers' organizations, (ii) the increase of equality of opportunity and treatment of migrants and the protection of their rights and dignity. Its means of action are research, technical advisory services and co-operation, meetings and work concerned with international labour standards. Under the Programme the ILO also collects, analyses and disseminates relevant information and acts as the information source for its constituents, ILO units and other interested parties.

The ILO has a constitutional obligation to protect the 'interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own'. This has traditionally been effected through the elaboration, adoption and supervision of international labour standards, in particular the Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97); the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111); the Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143); and the non-binding Recommendations supplementing them. International legal instruments of this kind are designed to influence national legislation and regulations in each country which has ratified these Conventions; and in this way they aim at changing not only legislation but the actual practices as well.

The key concern of ILO standards for migrant workers is non-discrimination or equality of opportunity and treatment. Many countries broadly adhere to this objective in the economic and social spheres. Some countries ratify ILO Conventions¹ and do their level best to fulfil the obligations deriving from them. One might expect, therefore, that discrimination would no longer be part of the legislation or practices of these countries. Unfortunately, a great deal of circumstantial evidence exists that this assumption does not hold in certain respects and especially not at the workplace in private or public enterprises; and such evidence also exists for countries not having ratified ILO Conventions.

In 1993, the ILO launched a global programme to combat discrimination against migrant workers and ethnic minorities in the world of work. This programme, which focuses on industrialized migrant receiving countries, aims at tackling discrimination by informing policy makers, employers, workers and trainers engaged in anti-discrimination training on how legislative measures and training activities can be rendered more effective, based on an international comparison of the efficacy of such measures and activities. The programme covers four main components: (i) empirical documentation of the occurrence of discrimination; (ii) research to assess the scope and efficacy of legislative measures designed to combat discrimination; (iii) research to document and to evaluate training and education in anti-discrimination or equal treatment; (iv) seminars to disseminate and draw conclusions from the research findings.

¹Forty one in the case of Convention No. 97, one hundred and thirty in the case of Convention No. 111, and eighteen in the case of Convention No. 143.

This paper reports on the documentation and evaluation of anti-discrimination training activities in the United States. It is the first large scale empirical research effort ever carried out in this country into the scope and effects of such, essentially voluntary, anti-discrimination measures.

After documenting the training activities offered by a representative sample of 108 training providers, a detailed profile of the different types of training currently proposed to the gatekeepers of the labour market (i.e. personnel staff and line managers in private and public sector employers, trade union officials and shop stewards; and staff connected with job centres, labour exchanges and private employment agencies) is drawn up. Subsequently, the training efforts of 14 employment organizations are evaluated in separate case studies. Based on both the quantitative material compiled during the documentation phase of the research and the qualitative information gathered in the case studies, the paper ends with substantiated recommendations for improving the content and effectiveness of anti-discrimination training.

It is hoped that both training providers and client organisations will take note of the findings of this research and its recommendations as to training approach, methodology and the wider institutional context required for training to result in a lasting reduction in discrimination among the gatekeepers to the labour market. Judging by the findings of earlier ILO research into the occurrence of discrimination in access to employment in the United States² there is a considerable need for such truly effective training to be imparted to all persons involved in employment-related decision making.

The financial support of the Russell Sage Foundation, New York, towards the carrying out of this study is gratefully acknowledged.

November 1998

F.J. Dy-Hammar
Chief
Conditions of Work Branch

² M. Bendick, Jr.,: *Discrimination against racial/ethnic minorities in access to employment in the United States: Empirical findings from situation testing*. Geneva, International Labour Office, 1996.

1. Introduction¹

In recent years, anti-discrimination training in the workplace has come under increased scrutiny in the United States. In the two decades following passage of major federal legislation against employment discrimination starting in 1964, such training became a typical component of many employers' employment practices, particularly among larger employers. However, the training consisted primarily of straightforward presentations informing employees of what behaviour is required and what is forbidden under federal and state anti-discrimination laws. The laws that were being explained were sometimes controversial, in that they raised sensitive issues of equal opportunity, affirmative action, interpersonal relationships, and personal values. However, the act of providing training on these laws was not.

In the 1980's, and even more in the 1990's, however, such training itself came more into the spotlight. Partially this attention developed because the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies that the training covered were becoming increasingly controversial. But primarily it reflected the evolution of this training from a simple explanation of laws into a *strategic tool for human resource management*.

This study examines the prevalence, content, methods and effects of anti-discrimination training in the workplace as it is practiced in the United States in the late 1990's. The goal of the research is both *descriptive documentation* of that training and *evaluation* of its effects.

The study is part of a multi-stage, multi-national research programme on employment discrimination in market-oriented industrial nations organized by the International Labour Organization (ILO). At the center of ILO's interest are the experiences of recent immigrants and ethnic minorities in the workplace. Accordingly, these groups are a principal focus of this study. However, in the United States, both law and employment practices tend to intertwine issues of discrimination against those groups with the same issues for other groups protected under anti-discrimination laws, including women, older workers, and persons with disabilities. Because these activities are so inter-related, this report often reflects anti-discrimination training with respect to these other groups as well.

Chapter 2 of this report describes the workplace context in the United States in which anti-discrimination training operates in the late 1990's. Chapter 3 reviews prior research on this topic and describes the methodology by which this study adds to that research. Chapter 4 provides a statistical profile of anti-discrimination training, and Chapter 5 presents 14 case studies of such activities. Chapter 6 evaluates the impacts of anti-discrimination training. Finally, Chapter 7 summarizes the findings of the study and suggests their implications for public and private action against discrimination in the workplace.

¹The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Russell Sage Foundation, research assistance by E. Bachman, and insightful comments from R. Zegers de Beijl, E. Wanner, and the Russell Sage Foundation's Cultural Contact Working Group.

2. The context of this study

2.1. Migrants, minorities, and other groups in the workplace

The workforce in the United States displays a striking degree of demographic diversity.¹

In part, this diversity reflects multiple waves of immigration over more than 300 years since the first European settlement in North America. The consequence of this long history is that the current population of 260 million encompasses: 74 per cent persons of European ancestry, 12 per cent persons of African ancestry, 10 per cent persons of Hispanic ancestry, three per cent of persons of Asian ancestry, and one per cent of Native Americans. Immigration to the United States continues to the present, with nearly 26 million persons — about 10 per cent of current residents — having been born outside the United States. Among these recent immigrants, the largest proportion consists of Hispanics (32 per cent) and Asians (25 per cent).

Intermingling with diversity of race and ethnicity is that of gender. Women, who have sought paid employment in increasing numbers throughout the past several decades, now account for 46 per cent of the workforce in the United States. Even among married women with children under age six, a group that in former decades often were full-time homemakers, more than 62 per cent are in paid employment.

Age is a third key dimension of diversity in the workforce. More than 30 per cent of workers in the United States are age 45 or older, and this proportion will increase rapidly over the upcoming decades as the “baby boom” generation born after World War II passes through middle age. At the other end of the age distribution, persons under age 25 currently constitute nearly 11 per cent of the labour force.

Finally, disability status is a commonly-recognized dimension of diversity in the workplace, especially since passage in 1990 of federal legislation, the Americans with Disabilities Act, requiring employers to provide “reasonable accommodation” in employment to persons with disabilities. Approximately 10 per cent of the population of the United States suffers from a disability preventing employment or limiting their ability to work.

2.2. The continued presence of workplace discrimination

One well-known characteristic of the United States’ labour market is that employment outcomes are far from equally distributed across the dimensions of diversity just described. To illustrate this point, Table 1 presents 10 indicators of labour market outcomes, ranging from unemployment rates to earnings and other measures of job quality. For each indicator, the table provides, in **bold type**, the ratio between the indicator's value for white males and five other

¹Statistical data in this section are based on United States Bureau of the Census (1995), pp. 19, 52, 386, 402, and 406. As is discussed later in this paper, anti-discrimination training in the United States often addresses dimensions of diversity beyond those described here, including religion, sexual orientation, family status, employment history, or even personality and personal learning styles.

Table 1. Selected employment outcomes by race/ethnicity and gender, civilian labour force in the United States, 1994

Employment Outcome	White Males	White Females	African-American Males	African-American Females	Hispanic Males	Hispanic Females
Labour force Participation	75.9% 1.00@	58.9% .78	69.1% .91	58.7% .77	79.2% 1.04	52.9% .70
Unemployment Rate	5.4% 1.00	5.2% .96	12.0% 2.22	11.0% 2.04	9.4% 1.74	10.7% 1.98
% university graduates in professional or managerial occupations^	66.6% 1.00	70.5% 1.06	56.4% .85	68.3% 1.03	--	--
% with only secondary school diploma in a service occupation^	8.3% 1.00	19.2% 2.32	19.1% 2.30	32.9% 3.96	--	--
% represented by a trade union	17.2% 1.00	12.1% .70	23.2% 1.35	18.1% 1.05	15.5% .90	12.1% .70
% using a computer in their employment#	48.7% 1.00	--	36.2% .75	--	29.3% .60	--
% allowed flexibility in work schedule#	15.5% 1.00	--	12.1% .78	--	10.6% .68	--
% covered by a pension plan	41.8% 1.00	37.5% .90	35.6% .85	37.5% .90	24.4% .58	25.4% .61
% paid at or below statutory Federal minimum wage#	6.1% 1.00	--	6.5% 1.07	--	8.6% 1.41	--
Median annual earnings	\$28,444 1.00	\$21,216 .75	\$20,800 .73	\$7,992 .63	\$7,836 .63	\$15,860 .56

@ Figures in **bold** are the ratio of the reported figure to the corresponding figure for white males.

^ Data not available for Hispanics.

Data not available by gender.

Source: Adapted from Bendick (1997), p. 3, based on United States Bureau of the Census (1995).

race/ethnicity and gender categories.¹ If employment outcomes were not related to workers' race/ethnicity and gender, then the bold figures would be approximately 1.0 throughout Table 1. However, that is clearly not the case. For example, the unemployment rate for African American males is 2.22 (that is, 222 per cent) that for white males; median annual earnings for Hispanic females are .56 (56 per cent) those for white males; and white females with only a high school diploma are 2.32 (232 per cent) as likely as corresponding white males to be employed in a service occupation.

¹Table 1 is adapted from Bendick (1997), p. 3, based on data from United States Bureau of the Census (1995).

Such differences in labour market outcomes are so well documented that their existence is not controversial.¹ However, controversies abound concerning the causes of these differences. Roughly, the positions in this debate can be divided into explanations that are *employer-focused* and those that are *worker-focused*.

In employer-focused explanations, the predominant cause of group differences such as those in Table 1 is discrimination, conscious or unconscious, by the individuals and institutions that are gatekeepers of employment opportunities. Analytically, discrimination in employment is defined as differences in treatment or outcomes in the labour market experienced by individuals who have equal productivity-related qualifications (such as education, experience, skills, or strength) but differ in demographic characteristics (such as ethnicity, gender, or age) (Ehrenberg and Smith, 1997, p. 418). The gatekeepers potentially engaging in discrimination include employers, educational and training institutions, trade unions, job placement services, providers of services supporting employment, employees' co-workers, and even the news and entertainment media that shape attitudes and perceptions.

The second, worker-focused, explanation typically acknowledges that discrimination does sometimes occur. However, this interpretation commonly argues that the predominant explanation for differences in employment outcomes is the behaviour of workers themselves, such as the employment qualifications they have acquired. For example, to explain differences in earnings such as are reported in the final row of Table 1, this interpretation emphasizes differences in educational qualifications such as are illustrated in Table 2.² The latter table indicates that the educational credentials of white males consistently exceeds that of the other race/ethnic and gender group examined. For example, the proportion of African American males who are university graduates is .49 (that is, 49 per cent) of the corresponding proportion for white males.³

Similarly, in analyzing the demographic characteristics of persons in different occupations, worker-focused explanations emphasize differences among groups in *occupational interests*. To the extent that workers select jobs and careers to match personal preferences, then differences in occupational distributions might reflect workers' choices rather than employers' discrimination. For example, according to the 1990 census of the United States' population, women constitute 94.3 percent of registered nurses, but only 20.7 percent of physicians. This pattern may reflect discrimination, past or present, against women in admission to medical schools. But proponents of worker-focused explanations typically argue that it reflects women's preferences as well. Specifically, they maintain that women on average have a greater desire than

Table 2. Selected measures of educational achievement by race/ethnicity and gender, persons age 25 and above in the United States, 1994

¹For additional documentation, see Ehrenberg and Smith (1997), chap.12 and Bendick (1996b).

²Table 2 is adapted from Bendick (1997), p. 5, based on data from United States Bureau of the Census (1995).

³Group differences parallel to these in formal education prevail in more subtle employment qualifications as well. For example, in hiring entry-level employees, employers in the United States particularly value such "soft skills" as dependability, honesty, the ability to communicate orally and in writing, and the ability to relate to co-workers and supervisors (Holzer, 1996; Murnane and Levy, 1996; SCANS, 1992). Proponents of worker-focused explanations often attribute the poor employment outcomes of such groups as racial/ethnic minorities and recent immigrants to lack of qualifications on these dimensions (Thernstrom and Thernstrom, 1997, chap. 13; Wilson, 1996).

Educational Achievement	White Males	White Females	African-American Males	African-American Females	Hispanic Males	Hispanic Females
% graduated from secondary school	82.1% 1.00@	81.9 .99	71.7 .87	73.8 .90	53.4 .65	53.2 .65
% graduated from university	26.1% 1.00	20.0 .77	12.8 .49	13.0 .50	9.6 .37	8.6 .33

@ Figures **in bold** are the ratio of the reported figure to the corresponding figure for white males.

Source: Adapted from Bendick (1997), p. 5, based on United States Bureau of the Census (1995).

men for jobs requiring less educational investment and imposing less work pressure, so that they can more easily pursue child-rearing.¹

In reality, differences in qualifications and occupational interests explain part, but not all, of the differences in labour market outcomes among demographic groups in the United States. In numerous research studies covering a variety of race/ethnic, gender, age, and other demographic groups, when differences in qualifications and interests are accounted for, differences in wages, occupational position, and other employment outcomes reduce substantially. However, in virtually no cases do they drop to zero, and in most cases, they are not close to zero. This repeated finding makes clear that, even in the 1990's, discrimination continues to affect the labour market to a very important extent.

More direct evidence on this point is provided by "testing" studies using carefully-matched pairs of job applicants. When pairs of job seekers with identical qualifications apply simultaneously for the same job vacancy, African American, Hispanic or older applicants are treated less favorably than their white, non-Hispanic, or younger counterparts by a substantial fraction of employers. In the case of African-American job applicants, discrimination is encountered from approximately *20 per cent of employers*, while for Hispanics the rate is approximately *33 per cent of employers*.² In the case of older workers and women, the rate of discrimination exceeds *40 percent of employers*.³

Numerous statistical studies echo and reinforce these findings. For example, when salaries of women are statistically compared to those of men with similar education and work experience, men's earnings typically average approximately 10 to 15 per cent more than those of equally-qualified women.⁴ After accounting for differences in education and experience, racial/ethnic minorities remain under-represented in higher-level occupations and over-represented in lower-

¹Becker (1965); Schultz and Peterson (1992); Jacobsen (1994), chap. 5.

²Bendick(1996a), p. 38. See also Bendick, Jackson and Reinoso (1994), Bendick, Jackson, Reinoso and Hodges (1991), and Fix and Struyk (1993).

³Bendick (1998); see also Bendick, Brown, and Wall (1997), Bendick, Jackson, and Romero (1996), and Neumark (1996).

⁴Blau (1998); Ehrenberg and Smith (1997), chap.12; Egan and Bendick (1994);

level occupations.¹ And as employees acquire additional experience, wages for younger workers increase but for older workers decline.²

2.3. The evolving forms of workplace discrimination

While demonstrating the continuing presence of employment discrimination in the United States, empirical research also documents an ongoing evolution in its predominant form and style. In particular, that research suggests a major shift over the past several decades from discrimination that is *explicit* and *deliberate* to that which is more frequently *implicit* and *unconscious*.

Before major anti-discrimination laws were enacted starting in the mid-1960's, discrimination in an explicit and deliberate style was common throughout the labour market, as well as other aspects of national life such as housing, education, and social relationships. Especially in the Southeastern region of the country, where slave-holding of African Americans was legal until the Civil War which ended in 1865, racial segregation of African Americans was often imposed by state and local "Jim Crow" laws. In regions near the border between the United States and Mexico, including states such as California and Texas, similar laws sometimes restricted the educational and employment opportunities of Hispanics. More pervasively, both in those regions and across the country, social custom and socially-sanctioned personal prejudice maintained the same divisions. For example, memberships in trade unions in the skilled construction crafts, seats on boards of directors of large corporations, and employment in most executive, managerial, supervisory, professional, and technical positions in both the public and private sectors tended to be all-white enclaves.

These same enclaves were also typically all-male. Prior to the 1960's, newspaper advertising routinely separated job vacancy announcements into sections labeled "Help Wanted - Male" and "Help Wanted - Female." Social consensus supported employers' assumptions that women were interested in or "suited for" only certain occupations, primarily lower-paid, support and service positions. Women often received lower wages than men performing the same duties, a practice sometimes rationalized with assumptions that men were responsible for supporting families but women were not. In employment interviews, employers commonly quizzed female job applicants, but not their male counterparts, about their marital status and plans for child-bearing. Sexually provocative pictures, sexually-based humor, and sexual harassment on the job were often considered harmless and tolerated or ignored.

Prior to the mid-1960's, many of these differences in employee treatment explicitly based on demographic characteristics were not illegal. For example, a firm could legally impose a mandatory retirement age — most commonly, age 65 — that involuntarily separated older workers from jobs even if they wished to remain employed and continued to perform satisfactorily. A vivid example involved airline flight attendants, at that time all female, who were typically required by their employers to cease in-flight work at age 35 on the grounds that they were no longer attractive enough to please the predominantly-male flying public.

Starting in the mid-1960's, federal and state laws -- including the federal Equal Pay Act (1963), Civil Rights Act of 1964 (1964, significantly amended in 1972 and 1991), Age Discrimination in

¹Gill (1989); see also Abelda (1986).

²Wanner and McDonald (1983). For other instances in which the same credentials yield different payoffs for different demographic groups, see Egan and Bendick (1994).

Employment Act (1967), Pregnancy Discrimination Act (1978), and Americans with Disabilities Act (1991) -- began to forbid such practices (Rutherglen, 1994). These statutes are enforced through administrative procedures by government agencies and litigation brought by either public agencies or private attorneys, as well as reinforced by the changing social norms that had led to their enactment. The combined effect of these forces over three decades has been that the prevalence of socially-tolerated practices that explicitly treat workers in different demographic groups differently has dramatically diminished.¹

Of course, explicit, conscious discrimination has by no means disappeared from the labour market in the United States. Its continued presence is documented by several types of evidence:

- C *Legal actions:* Each year, federal and state courts receive thousands of suits alleging employment discrimination, many of which are subsequently resolved in favour of plaintiffs. In 1988, for example, 8,563 suits were received by the federal courts alone.² In that same year, 50,477 administrative charges alleging employment discrimination based on racial, ethnic, or national origin were filed with the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and its counterpart state and local government agencies. Many of these complaints allege deliberate, explicit discriminatory behaviour ranging from racial epithets and interpersonal hostility to dramatic differences in hiring, assignments, compensation, training and advancement, or discipline and dismissal.
- C *Personal experiences:* Many members of groups protected by employment discrimination laws report that they personally have experienced discrimination in employment as well as other aspects of daily life (Feagin and Sikes, 1994; Cose, 1993). These same patterns are echoed in surveys covering random samples of the public. For example, in a survey of recent immigrants from Cuba to the United States, 25 per cent of respondents stated that they had personally experienced discrimination in their new homeland (Portes and Bach, 1985). Many of the incidents described in these studies involve the workplace and explicit, deliberate mistreatment.
- C *Statistical studies:* While many statistical studies focus on implicit, unconscious discrimination, some document the prevalence of deliberate discrimination as well. An example is provided by a survey of newspaper employment advertising which found that 9 percent of job vacancy announcements contained discriminatory wording, such as specifying the age or gender of desired applicants (Kohl, 1989).

Although such blatant discrimination has not been eliminated, its prevalence has certainly diminished over the past several decades. In consequence, the discrimination that is more commonly encountered in the workplace today has somewhat more subtle forms. For example:

- C In former decades, it was common to see men and women receive different pay while performing identical jobs. Since passage of the federal Equal Pay Act, that circumstance has become relatively rare. However, occupation segregation remains common, and it

¹Smith and Welch (1989); Ehrenberg and Smith (1997), chap.12.

²Blumrosen (1993), p. 166. For accounts of two such cases, see Watkins (1997) and Roberts and White (1998).

remains common to see men and women receiving different pay for performing jobs that have different titles but are similar.¹

- C In former decades, it was common to observe many categories of employment where women and minorities were entirely absent (the "inexorable zero"). Situations of total exclusion have become relatively rare. However, it remains common to observe positions where women or minorities are present in very small numbers ("tokens") and are under-represented in comparison to their availability among persons qualified for the positions. For example, among the 500 largest publicly-owned corporations in the United States, 84 per cent have at least one woman on their board of directors, but only 36 per cent have more than one (Catalyst, 1997).
- C In former decades, it was common for women or minorities to be refused the opportunity to interview for many job vacancies. Such automatic exclusion from being considered for employment is now relatively rare. However, it remains common for white males to receive job offers after being interviewed at a much higher rate than women or minorities who are interviewed for the same positions (Bendick, Jackson, & Reinoso, 1994; Bendick, 1996b, section 7).
- C In former decades, it was common for minorities or women to be passed over for promotion even when they are as qualified as white men. Such preferential behavior between equally-qualified candidates is now relatively rare. However, it remains common for white males to be given greater access to job assignments which provide the experience, training, or visibility that makes them better qualified than their minority and female counterparts (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995; Bendick, 1996b, section 14).

2.4. Psychological and organizational bases of more subtle discrimination

The common element in these four examples is that, in the processes of discrimination leading to unequal outcomes, the employment decision-makers who are discriminating could do so without being aware that they are treating members of different demographic groups differently. Indeed, if challenged, they often vociferously deny it.

One psychological mechanism underlying such unconscious differences in treatment is *stereotypes* shaping perceptions about workers' qualifications and performance. Psychologists define stereotypes as cognitive frameworks suggesting that individuals belonging to a demographic group all share certain traits or characteristics.² For example, a member of a racial/ethnic minority may be assumed to be poorly educated because that group, on average, has less education than non-minorities; a 65 year old worker may be assumed to lack the energy, strength, motivation, or quickness of mind to work as productively as a 25 year old; or a woman may be assumed to be uninterested in advancement to a position involving more responsibility.

¹For example, in a recent employment discrimination case, plaintiffs alleged that, among building maintenance workers, women were classified as Custodians, a position with median annual earnings of \$13,699, while comparably-qualified men performing comparable duties were classified as Maintenance Laborers, with median annual earnings of \$15,002, about 10 per cent more (*Workman et al. v. J. R. Simplot, Inc., et al.* , United States District Court for the District of Idaho, CIV 91-0105-S-EJL). See also Aaron and Lougy (1986).

²Greenberg and Baron (1993), p. 50. Economists refer to this same process as "statistical discrimination" (Aigner & Cain, 1977).

Under the less pejorative label of “generalizations,” reliance on stereotypes is a common mechanism of human thought. However, it is not harmless and neutral. Social psychological research has established that individuals tend to misperceive and misremember information in ways that reinforce social prejudice. That is, information supportive of a stereotype is more readily noticed and remembered than information inconsistent with the stereotype (Greenberg and Baron, 1993, p.50). This pattern is illustrated in a research study in which two groups of university students were shown different videotapes concerning a school-age girl. One group observed the girl living in a low-income, inner city neighborhood, while the other group saw her living in an affluent suburb. Both groups were then shown the same videotape of the girl taking an academic achievement test. Students who had previously observed the girl's “high class” background judged her to be of higher ability *and remembered her obtaining a higher test score* than did students who had observed her “low class” background.¹

Such modes of thinking can exercise an important influence in workplace situations *without the individuals involved being aware of that influence*.² For example, when supervisors evaluate workers for hiring or promotion (Greenberg and Baron, 1993, p. 50):

Consider a male manager who possesses a well-developed stereotype for women. On one occasion, he observes a female member of his department crying. Because of his stereotype, his attention is called to this event, and he remembers it very clearly. Now, six months later, he is asked to evaluate her performance. Again the stereotype comes into operation. As a result, he remembers the incident vividly -- much more vividly than many other actions that are more directly relevant to job performance. Finally, his memory of this event leads him to infer that she is not ready for increased responsibility, and he down-rates her for this reason [compared to how he would rate a comparable male].

Stereotypes play a particularly destructive part in workplace discrimination because of the negative content of widely-held beliefs in the United States about racial and ethnic minorities and other groups traditionally encountering discrimination in the workplace. Opinion polls and in-depth interviews with samples of employers, as well as with samples of the general public, reveal that African Americans and Hispanics are often viewed, relative to non-minorities, as less intelligent, more lazy, less honest, less able to communicate, and more prone to violence (Smith, 1990; Neckerman and Kirchenman, 1991). Women are commonly assumed to be emotional rather than rational, followers rather than leaders, and family-oriented rather than professionally-committed (Bendick, 1996b, section 2). Older workers are seen as lacking energy and motivation, obsolete in terms of skills and incapable of learning new ones, and difficult to supervise (AARP, 1989; Rosen, 1978).

A second psychological mechanism that often plays a role in unconscious discrimination is *ingroup bias*. This term refers to the tendency of individuals to favour members of the groups with whom they identify. For example, in one study, experimental subjects were divided into groups

¹Darley and Gross (1983); see also Krueger and Rothbart (1988).

²Social psychology research demonstrates that stereotypes are particularly influential on how an individual is judged when the person making the judgment has limited prior contact with, and information about, the individual being judged. Such circumstances are common in employment decisions. For example, in hiring entry-level non-professional employees, an employers' information is often limited to a one-page written application and an in-person-interview averaging only 20 minutes (Bendick, Jackson, and Reinoso, 1994).

based on which of two modern abstract artists they favored. Although the subjects never even met the other members of their groups, when asked to divide 15 points representing monetary rewards between the groups, the experimental subjects typically allocated 9 or 10 points to their own group and 5 or 6 to the other one.¹

If such artificial divisions can so influence a decision-maker's willingness to reward other individuals, then it is not hard to imagine that more visible demographic divisions, such as racial/ethnic identities, can do so as well. The effect of such tendencies on workplace decisions is illustrated in a social psychological experiment in which white university students interviewed African American and white job applicants. When the applicant was African American, the interviewers sat further away, terminated the interview 25 percent sooner, and made 50 percent more speech errors than when the applicant was white. Then, in a second stage of the experiment, interviewers deliberately duplicated the behaviour characteristic of the previous interviews. The interview performance of white job applicants subjected to the "African American" treatment was rated by neutral judges as more nervous and less effective than that of whites subjected to the "white" treatment (Word, Zanna, and Cooper, 1974).

While the concepts of stereotypes and ingroup bias focus on individual gatekeepers' perceptions and attitudes, employment decisions are often made in groups such as committees, task forces, and review panels. There, a third social psychology mechanism -- *group think* -- often plays an important role. This term refers to a mode of decision-making in which a collection of individuals with a strong sense of cohesiveness focuses on maintaining the group's like-mindedness, so that deviant opinions, outside information, and critical thinking disruptive of cohesiveness are suppressed, and inappropriate decisions are reached (Greenberg and Baron, 1993, pp. 558-560).

For example, consider a typical process for selecting workers for promotion to first-level supervisors. In this process, applicants are interviewed individually by members of a selection panel, and then the panel meets to compare their assessments and form a joint recommendation. Suppose further that, while racial/ethnic minorities are present among the applicants for promotion, the selection panel is drawn from current first-level supervisors, who are all white. A decision to promote racial/ethnic minorities might be resisted to preserve the homogeneity that promotes group cohesion. It might also be controversial and appear to question past decisions that failed to select minorities. In these circumstances, group think could invisibly promote recommendations perpetuating the all-white compositions of the supervisory ranks, regardless of the qualifications of the minority candidates interviewed.

Even when decisions are not literally made in a group, the perceptions and decisions of individual decision-makers are inevitably influenced by the *corporate culture* of their work organization. This concept is defined as the interdependent system of beliefs, values, and ways of behaving that are common to a workplace. This system tends to perpetuate itself through social forces, frequently subtle and implicit, through which employees learn the norms and values of their workplace, are rewarded when they accept them, and are ostracized when they do not. Informally, the concept can be defined as "the way things are done around here" (Harvey and Brown, 1996, p. 67).

A corporate culture can either promote or discourage discrimination. As will be discussed in Chapters 4 through 6, some workplaces in the United States have a culture in which discrimination would be rare because it would be startlingly discordant with the prevailing atmosphere. In other

¹Myers (1990), pp. 345-346; see also Thomas (1991) and Jackson (1992).

workplaces, discriminatory attitudes and behaviour are not only tolerated but implicitly or explicitly condoned. In most employment situations, however, the signals from the corporate culture are more mixed. For example, virtually all large employers in the United States have formal, written policies requiring equal employment opportunity, but these policies are given widely varying degrees of priority in different workplaces. Widely-circulated reputations suggest that some companies are much better places to work than others for minorities, recent immigrants, women and similar groups traditionally facing discrimination (Johnson, 1998; Branch, 1998; Levering and Moscovitz, 1993).

A comprehensive discussion of the mechanisms of unintentional discrimination is beyond the scope of this paper.¹ However, the discriminatory problems that are prevalent in many parts of the labour market in the United States in the late 1990's seem to involve such mechanisms, rather than the consciously discriminatory practices more typical of discrimination a generation ago. As will be discussed throughout this report, that circumstance is one of the most important influences shaping anti-discrimination training.

2.5. Societal attitudes toward discrimination

One venue in which the developments described in the previous two sections has important consequences is public attitudes toward efforts to address discrimination in the workplace.

In general, throughout the early years of the civil rights movement in the United States, there was widespread societal consensus on the moral correctness of efforts to end discrimination. During the 1960's, images of violent physical attacks on peaceful civil rights demonstrators helped to cement national support for legislation ending *de jure* segregation against racial minorities, especially African Americans. The same political support led to legislation forbidding *de facto* discrimination and leading to creation of enforcement agencies such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission at the federal level and counterpart agencies in state and local government. In the decades since that time, the norm of equal opportunity has become established theme of school-based education as well as a shared value repeatedly expressed in the mass media and political rhetoric. By the 1990's, there is widespread societal consensus among the majority of persons in the United States on the fundamental correctness of non-discrimination, as well as widespread public understanding of the illegality of discrimination in its most blatant forms (Bendick, 1998).

As discussed in Section 2.3, this shared social value has by no means ended all blatant discrimination. However, it has pushed such behaviour primarily into isolated social situations, or at least shamefaced furtiveness. Consider, for example, two legal cases that were widely discussed in the mass media during 1996 and 1997. In one, senior executives at the giant oil producer Texaco were secretly tape-recorded allegedly discussing racial minority employees unfavorably and using racial epithets (Roberts and White, 1998). In the other, male assembly-line workers at an automobile assembly plant of the Mitsubishi Corporation were alleged to have engaged in widespread, aggressive sexual harassment of female co-workers. While such allegations might have passed unnoticed three decades ago, in the late 1990's they created nationwide sensations, including extensive news coverage, angry denouncements by public officials, and threats of consumer boycotts.

¹The discussion here has not even mentioned such important additional concepts as social networks (Powell and Smith-Doerr, 1994), communication styles (Tannen, 1994), and cultural contact (Allport, 1954).

However, this strong social consensus often does not encompass the more subtle discrimination discussed in Sections 2.3. and 2.4. The unconscious form of such discrimination is often echoed in widespread public unconsciousness about its nature and prevalence. Thus, in public opinion polls in the United States, a majority of persons not in groups traditionally experiencing discrimination identify discrimination as a problem of the past and deny that it continues to operate to a significant extent. For example, in one nation-wide survey, only 37 per cent of whites thought that an African American applicant who is as qualified as a white would be less likely to be hired for a job that both want, and only 41 per cent thought that the chances of an African American to win a supervisory or managerial position are more limited than those of counterpart whites. In contrast, more than 80 per cent African American respondents agreed with the first statement, and 62 per cent agreed with the second.¹

2.6. Employers' motives for addressing discrimination

The owners and managers who control employment decisions in the workplace generally share the moral attitudes of their society and therefore have become more concerned about discrimination as society as a whole has become more concerned. Comments made to the authors throughout this study repeatedly reminded us that many employers have initiated efforts against discrimination in no small part "because it is the right thing to do."

However, to sustain expensive efforts² on a substantial scale over an extended period -- such as the anti-discrimination training profiled in the present study -- typically requires motivation beyond broad ethical concerns. This section describes three additional principal motives.

Anti-discrimination laws and their enforcement

Concerns about federal and state laws against discrimination in the workplace represent one such motive. Federal law forbids public and private organizations with 15 or more employees from discriminating on the basis of race, color, ethnicity, national origin, gender, age, and several other demographic characteristics. These protections apply to essentially all aspects of employment, including hiring, compensation, training, promotion, on-the-job treatment, discipline, and dismissals. Violators of these laws are subject to civil suits with financial penalties and (in extreme cases) criminal sanctions. Organizations with 100 or more employees (50 or more if they are government contractors) must report the composition of their workforce annually to a federal agency (the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or, for federal contractors, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance) and are subject to audits of their employment practices. Additionally, public agencies and private firms that are government contractors are required to implement, and other employers may voluntarily implement, affirmative action programmes that reach beyond equal treatment to promote the hiring and advancement of groups traditionally subject to discrimination (Rugtherglen, 1994).

Such laws have now been in force for as long as 30 years and have become incorporated into the routine employment practices of virtually all large and medium-sized employers, and many smaller firms as well. Typically, such firms have written policies requiring equal opportunity in employment, have standard procedures for handling discrimination complaints, and routinely describe themselves in employment advertising as "an equal opportunity employer." These

¹Harris (1989); see also Kluegel and Smith (1986).

²Typical daily fees charged by diversity consultants and trainers range from less than \$200 to more than \$10,000 and average about \$2,000 (*Wall Street Journal*, 1994, p. B1).

employers often include brief discussions of anti-discrimination laws in employee training on a variety of subjects (for example, in classes on supervisory skills for inexperienced managers). Concerns about legal liability continue to motivate employers' anti-discrimination activities in the 1990's. However, in reality, government enforcement of equal opportunity laws is often limited, and only a small fraction of illegal discriminatory acts results in formal complaints or litigation. Furthermore, many legal requirements can be satisfied through compliance with simple procedures (such as filing reports and adopting policies) and do not require aggressive anti-discrimination efforts (Clark, 1989). For many employers, avoidance of legal problems alone are not likely to justify extensive, expensive anti-discrimination activities such as the training described in Chapters 4 through 6. Instead, these efforts must also be justified by contributions to other employer goals, such as efficiency, growth, and profitability.

Productively employing a diverse workforce

The first form these contributions can take is to assist employers in increasing productivity from a workforce that is increasingly diverse. Particularly since the release a decade ago of a report by the federal Department of Labor entitled *Workforce 2000* (Johnston and Packer, 1987), employers in the United States have widely recognized that the number of prime-age, non-handicapped white males among their employees is growing much less rapidly than virtually any other group. The consequence has been seen first in entry-level employment. In many localities, particularly large urban centers, the vast majority of lower-level positions such as bank tellers, retail sales clerks, building maintenance workers, and health care aides are women, minorities, older workers, or other groups traditionally subject to discrimination. More slowly, these same groups have been appearing in increasing numbers in supervisory, managerial, technical, and professional positions, where their performance is often particularly important to their employers' success. In many workplaces, such employees are now too numerous and occupy too many important positions for employers to prosper if the potential productivity of these workers is not fully mobilized.

Discrimination is linked to productivity in many different ways:

- C *Turnover:* In many industries, employers are very concerned about employee turnover because experienced employees are more productive than newly-recruited ones, the costs of recruitment and training replacement staff are substantial, and some employees may be very difficult to replace. Such concerns affect positions ranging from entry-level jobs in fast food restaurants (where turnover often exceeds 100 per cent per year) to specialized positions in high technology industries (where competitive bidding for software designers can be intense). Excessive turnover sometimes reflects employee dissatisfaction based in discrimination.
- C *Creativity:* Organizational development consultants often assert that heterogeneous work groups are more productive, especially at tasks involving creative problem-solving, than homogeneous ones.¹ In circumstances ranging from research and development laboratories in high technology industries to the sales efforts of firms seeking to establish themselves in new markets, many organizations are eager to harness this creative potential, which could be lost if discrimination reduces the

¹See Gordon (1992) and Jackson, May and Whitney (1998), p. 14, as well as the discussion of "groupthink" in Section 2.4.

range of employees employed by a firm or prevents individuals from participating effectively in work processes.

- C *Customer service:* In service industries, which now account for about 77 per cent of private sector employment in the United States, the quality of individual interaction between staff and customers is a major component of what firms are selling (Kotler, 1994, chap.18). The quality of this interaction is often difficult to control because it is difficult to standardize and frequently cannot be closely supervised. Employees that are discouraged or disgruntled by discrimination are unlikely to provide service that customers will find attractive.
- C *Worker quality:* Many industries are currently reorganizing their work processes to delegate more decision making and autonomy to their front-line, non-supervisory employees.¹ Such arrangements depend on workforces that are capable, motivated, and well-trained, even at the entry level. No longer can such organizations perform satisfactorily with employees selected on bases other than merit, such as discrimination.

Serving increasingly diverse customers

A second link between workplace discrimination and employers' goals is created by the changing characteristics of the clients and customers employers serve. Nearly every private-sector firm or government agency in the United States is affected by one or more of the following trends:

- C *The changing domestic consumer market:* Decades ago, many firms perceived their potential customers within the United States as a relatively homogeneous group. Now virtually all major firms producing for consumer markets are vividly aware that the nation's population is highly diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, age, gender, family status, and many characteristics that affect their tastes and purchasing patterns. Furthermore, they realize that many "less traditional" niches within this diverse population are among the fastest growing and have the most unmet consumer demand. Consider, for example, a large firm in food retailing, such as a supermarket chain. The market research department of such a firm would describe many suburban, white, middle class communities -- where most supermarkets have been developed during the past several decades -- as saturated and might suggest African American or Hispanic neighborhoods as more likely locations for profitable expansion.² If the firm's managerial staff includes no racial or ethnic minorities, this firm might be hampered in identifying and operating in many lucrative potential markets. If the firm's sales clerks and service representatives cannot deal well one-on-one with customers of many different backgrounds, then customers will take their business to competitors who are more welcoming (Wentling and Palma-Rivas, 1977, p. 15).
- C *The internationalization of the economy:* As recently as the 1960's, the economy of the United States was largely internally-directed, with less than 5 per cent of its Gross

¹This development is sometimes labeled the *high performance workplace*, and it is estimated to have been implemented, to at least some degree, in as many as 50 per cent of workplaces in the United States (Osterman, 1994; Committee for Economic Development, 1996).

²Bendick and Egan (1993). The Hispanic market within the United States is particularly fast-growing, and it currently encompasses 26 million individuals in eight million households (Paulin, 1998, p. 6).

National Product consisting of imports and exports. By the 1990's, that proportion has risen to 20 per cent, and it continues to increase. Virtually all large and medium-sized firms, and many small ones as well, now routinely serve internationally-diverse clients and customers,¹ and the culturally-homogeneous workforces developed while focusing on domestic markets may no longer suffice.

- C *The increasing importance of inter-organizational relationships:* To operate in the increasingly competitive, rapidly changing, and often global markets they face in the 1990's, many firms in the United States now routinely engage in subcontracting, joint ventures, work sharing, strategic alliances, and similar inter-firm arrangements (Kotler, 1994, pp. 86-87). As minorities and women come to occupy more managerial positions in domestic firms, and as more of these relationships involve partners from outside the United States, firms whose management is not demographically diverse and comfortable in dealing with individuals from diverse backgrounds are at a disadvantage in forming and maintaining these important relationships.

A new label for anti-discrimination activities

As employers' motivation for anti-discrimination activities has broadened from moral and legal concerns to encompass productivity, customer relations, and other business goals, the terminology used to describe such activities has also been evolving. In the 1990's, the term *managing diversity* has come into common use in the business community to refer to activities ranging from traditional efforts to eliminate discrimination (including training in the requirements of anti-discrimination law) to broader, proactive efforts to create and utilize diverse, flexible workforces. This term appears throughout this report, sometimes as a synonym for anti-discrimination efforts but more often to suggest activities with this broader motivation.

3. Research design and sample description

3.1. Literature survey of prior research

Prior to the present study, only limited empirical research has examined anti-discrimination training activities in the United States. As was noted in Chapter 1, for several decades "straightforward" anti-discrimination training -- briefings for employees on legal requirements -- has been common in many employers' human resource management practices but was never studied.

¹The following data illustrate the current importance of international markets to the United States (Czinkota and Ronkainen, 1995, p. 10) :

One out of every four farm acres in the United States is producing for export.

One out of every six manufacturing jobs in the United States is producing for export.

One out of seven dollars of sales by firms in the United States is to someone abroad.

One out of three cars and nine out of 10 television sets sold in the United States is imported.

Travel and tourism is the number one source of foreign exchange in the United States

One of every four dollars of government bonds issued in the United States is sold to buyers outside the United States

Estimates of prevalence

By the 1990's, those activities began to attract researchers' attention by virtue of their volume. Although no definitive estimate is available of the extent of this activity, a series of somewhat broadly-based surveys suggests the order of magnitude:¹

- C *Very large firms:* A 1995 survey of the 50 largest industrial corporations in the United States found that 70 per cent had "formal diversity management programmes" in place (typically including training as a component), and an additional eight per cent were developing such programmes (Lynch, 1997, p. 7).

- C *Large firms:* The American Society for Training and Development is the United States' largest association of professional employees specializing in workplace training. In a survey of human resource managers at the 1,000 largest industrial firms in the United States in 1991, 34 per cent of respondents reported that their organizations provided "cultural diversity training" within broader training programmes, and an additional 28 per cent provided separate training programmes devoted to that subject. These figures together total 62 per cent of respondents (ASTD, 1991).

- C *Medium-sized and large firms:* The Society for Human Resource Management is the United States' largest association of professional employees specializing in human resource management, with its members most typically employed by medium-size and large for-profit firms. According to a 1994 survey, 33 per cent

¹Several additional studies not listed here are reviewed in Wentling and Palma-Rivas (1996b). Their findings are consistent with the conclusions stated here.

of this society's members are employed by organizations currently providing training on "workforce diversity."¹

- C *Medium-size and large firms:* In a 1995 survey of human resource management specialists in organizations with at least 200 employees, 18 per cent of respondents stated that "diversity training" was provided to employees in 80 per cent or more of the jobs in their organization. This can be contrasted to 45 per cent stating that their organization conducted statistical studies to monitor minority representation in 80 per cent or more of the jobs in the organization, and 31 per cent stating that goals and timetables for employment of females and minorities were applied to 80 per cent or more of those jobs (CCH, 1995, p.7).
- C *Small, medium-size and large firms:* A 1995 survey of 983 for-profit firms that are members of the American Management Association found that 50 per cent of respondents had formal programmes in "managing diversity" (within which training is usually a principal component). This figure had risen from 46 per cent in 1992 (AMA, 1996, p.6).
- C *Small, medium-size and large firms:* In 1994, one of the largest employment placement and temporary services firms in the nation surveyed 723 private sector employers in the United States and Canada. Some 31 per cent of their respondents reported conducting "diversity training" programmes for their managerial employees, a figure that had risen from 24 per cent in a parallel survey two years before (Olsten, 1994, p.3).

Taken together, these surveys suggest that anti-discrimination training is a common but not universal activity in workplaces in the United States. It is implemented by the vast majority of very large firms, by a substantial proportion of medium-size firms, and a minority of small firms. It appears to be provided somewhat more commonly to managerial employees than non-managerial ones.

Hypotheses concerning training's effects

¹Rynes and Rosen (1995). This rate compared to other common types of workplace training as follows (SHRM, 1994, p. 2):

<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>% offering</u>	<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>% offering</u>
Orientation	87	Quality	51
Basic Computer skills	72	Company history/culture	43
Managerial development	71	Executive development	42
Supervisory skills	69	Sales training	35
Workplace safety	68	Workforce diversity	33
Communications	61	Clerical skills	31
Customer service	59	Personal/life skills	26
Advanced computer skills	58	Skilled trades	25
		Basic literacy/math	21

A second reason that anti-discrimination training began to be examined by researchers in the 1990's is its evolution, described in section 2.6, from routine explanations of anti-discrimination laws into complex attempts to change corporate cultures and promote organizations' strategic business objectives. This more ambitious activity has sparked writing often redolent with controversy.

On one side of this debate are writings arguing the continuing need for, and the effectiveness of, anti-discrimination training in the workplace. Some of these writings emphasize the benefits for employees traditionally facing discrimination and describe anti-discrimination training and other diversity management activities as important complements to anti-discrimination laws and affirmative action. Other writings emphasize the benefits for employers in terms of the productivity and marketing objectives discussed in Section 2.6. Combining both these lines of arguments, one of the pioneers of the diversity management field has written (Thomas, 1990, p. 108):

Getting hired is not the problem -- women and blacks who are seen as having the necessary skills and energy can get *into* the work force relatively easily. It's later on that many of them plateau and lose their drive and quit or get fired. It's later on that their managers' inability to manage diversity hobbles them and the companies they work for....I don't think that affirmative action alone can cope with the remaining long-term task of creating work settings geared to the upward mobility of *all* kinds of people, including white males...Managing diversity... means enabling every member of your work force to perform to his or her potential.

A scholar of organizational development, focusing specifically on the role of training within anti-discrimination efforts, concurs in predicting positive results (Cox, 1994, pp. 236-237):

The most commonly utilized starting point for organizational development work on managing diversity is some type of employee education programme....There is a considerable base of knowledge and expertise associated with understanding the effects of diversity on organizations....Even elementary educational efforts do have positive effects on perceptions and attitudes. Most experts agree that education is a crucial first step.

Equally adamant in predicting the opposite outcomes, other writing asserts that anti-discrimination training and related diversity initiatives are counter-productive for employees and employers alike. Some of these authors reject the activity as a new, disguised version of social philosophies that they oppose. For example, one critic of affirmative action has written (Lynch, 1997, p. 325):

The ambitious organization change masters astride the diversity machine have far more in mind than limited reform. They are extending affirmative action's top-down hiring campaign into a broader multi-cultural revolution in the American workplace and beyond. Both the ends and the means of this policy movement pose a substantial threat to the values of the generic liberalism enshrined in modern American law and culture: free speech; individualism; nondiscrimination on the basis of ethnicity, gender, or religion; [and] equality of opportunity.

Other authors reject diversity training less on such ideological grounds than because they view it as ineffective or harmful in practice. For example, a team of management consultants has written (Hemphill and Haines, 1997, pp. 3-5):

The initial purpose of diversity training was to help women and minorities, some placed in organizations as the result of affirmative action, adjust to the workplace culture -- and to help the workplace culture adjust to them....In 1995 alone, there were as many as 5,000 self-proclaimed experts selling their wares as diversity trainers and consultants....In spite of its positive intent, it is unrealistic to think that with three to five hours of diversity training, complex sociological and cultural principles could be clearly understood, much less applied to all interpersonal relationships...Social conflict was created from the attempt to deal publicly with sensitive social and personal issues better dealt with elsewhere....Because a large number of diversity trainers were women and members of minority groups, many personal agendas, minority platforms, and social conflicts were frequently major portions of the programme....White males report that they are tired of being made to feel guilty in every discussion of diversity. They are tired of being cast as the oppressors....In addition members of the group that already felt oppressed left the diversity programme feeling even more vulnerable and victimized.

Whether supportive of anti-discrimination training or critical of it, virtually all these writings share two deficiencies from the point of view of the present study. First, most of them address anti-discrimination/diversity management initiatives broadly, rather than focusing on the *training* component of these activities that is our specific subject. Second, to the extent that these writings are based on empirical evidence, that evidence is usually not broadly-based or systematically gathered. It consists largely of personal observations, unstructured interviews, and anecdotal descriptions gathered at a small number of workplaces not selected through an explicit sampling procedure. Thus, this literature is more useful for generating hypotheses for empirical research than in rigorously testing these hypotheses.

Formal evaluations

Only two studies have proceeded beyond the level just described to something even approximating systematic empirical evaluations of the effects of anti-discrimination training.

The first of these studies, conducted by Rynes and Rosen (1995), is based on a structured mail survey responded to by 785 members of the Society for Human Resource Management. Respondents whose organizations had provided such training (which was 32 per cent of the sample) were asked to provide a single rating, on a five point scale, of the success of these efforts. Some 33 per cent of respondents rated them "extremely successful" or "quite successful," 50 per cent rated them as having "neutral or mixed" success, and 17 per cent rated them "largely unsuccessful" or "extremely unsuccessful." Thus, on average, their responses are modestly more favourable than unfavourable. Perceived success was found to be statistically associated with mandatory attendance for managers (but not for non-managerial employees), long-term follow-up evaluations of training, perceived top management support for diversity, explicit managerial rewards for increasing diversity, and adoption of a broad definition of diversity. Success was not statistically associated with training that was longer or more comprehensive.

The second study, by Sonnenfeld and Ellis (1992), examines three large for-profit firms (one in transportation, one in telecommunications, and one in computer manufacturing) at which diversity training had been implemented. At the computer manufacturing firm, post-training questionnaires were received from 922 employees in one department, many of whom had either attended the company's voluntary one-day diversity training programme or had been exposed to comparable material through other workshops. Respondents who had been exposed to diversity training

material were found to be substantially more supportive of diversity, and perceived their employer to be more supportive of diversity, than those without such exposure.

3.2. The ILO research design

The study reported in this document was undertaken to expand this limited body of research. It was conducted as part of a multi-national research programme organized by the International Labour Office (ILO). To enhance the comparability of results from individual country studies within this programme, ILO provided a standardized research methodology, set forth in Wrench and Taylor (1993). That methodology is described in this section; its implementation in the present study is then described in Sections 3.3. and 3.4.

The ILO methodology involves nine stages. It starts with a mapping of the issues through initial contact with key informants (stage 1) and a literature survey (stage 2). The national research team then documents training activities through a structured telephone survey of training providers (stage 3); ideally, responses to this survey are to be obtained from 60 respondents, equally divided among those providing training to three target groups: personnel staff and line managers in private and public sector employers; trade unions officials and shop stewards; and staff connected with job centres, labour exchanges, and private employment agencies. The results of this survey are then summarized in statistical profiles of training activities (stage 4) and a descriptive overview of training activities (stage 5). The research next evaluates the impact of training activities. In stage 6, 21 training courses are selected, divided as equally as possible among the three target groups examined in the documentation stage. In stage 7, semi-structured interviews are conducted in each of the case study programmes, encompassing both trainers and trainees, and in stage 8, the results of the interviews are summarized in both case studies and a generalized overview. Finally, in stage 9, the research is summarized and conclusions drawn from it.

The research process followed in the United States conformed to this structure. Our interviews with key informants are noted in Section 3.3. Our literature survey is presented in Section 3.1. The telephone survey was conducted, with the resulting statistical profile presented in Section 4.1 and the Annex, and the descriptive overview presented in Sections 4.2 through 4.5. The evaluative case studies are presented in Chapter 5, and the generalized overview of the evaluation is presented in Chapter 6. The conclusions of the study are presented in Chapter 7.

The following adaptations of this methodology to the circumstances in the United States should also be noted:

- C The sample in the telephone survey was expanded beyond 60, to include a total of 108 respondents

- C For reasons discussed in Section 4.1, it was not possible to obtain 20 respondents to the telephone survey whose training targets trade unions and 20 whose training targets job centres. A total of 11 responses were obtained in the former group and three in the latter.¹

¹This outcome is similar to that obtained by research teams in other nations implementing the same study design. In particular, neither the study in the United Kingdom (Taylor, Powell, and Wrench, 1997) nor that in the Netherlands (Abell, Havelaar, and Dankoor, 1997) obtained 20 respondents for trade unions or job centers.

- C In the telephone survey, questions were added to supplement those specified in the study design. The responses to these additional questions are incorporated in the descriptive overview presented in Sections 4.2 through 4.5 and the evaluation of training activities in Section 6.1.
- C Due to the extensive time and resources required to complete each case study, a total of 14 case studies were completed, rather than 21.¹
- C For reasons discussed in Section 4.1, it proved possible to complete only one case study involving a trade union and one case study involving a job centre.²

A central element of the ILO study design is a typology of training types in terms of which the variety of anti-discrimination training activities is to be organized (Wrench and Taylor, 1993, p 15). As is shown in Figure 1, this typology involves 12 categories, representing combinations of four training strategies (labelled A through D) and three types of training content (labelled 1 through 3). Among these 12 categories, eight are described in the study design as likely to be encountered; these eight are given a label in Figure 1 (for example, D3, diversity training). We utilize this taxonomy in the profile of anti-discrimination training activities presented in Section 4.1 and the Annex. Definitions for the three categories most commonly encountered in the United States are provided in Section 4.1.

Figure 1. A typology of anti-discrimination training

Content	1. Multi-Cultural	2. Anti-discrimination/ Anti-racist	3. Broader Issues
Strategy			
A. Information Provision	A1. Information Training	A2. Information Training	A3
B. Attitude Change	B1. Cultural Awareness Training	B2. Racism Awareness Training	B3
C. Behaviour	C1	C2. Equalities Training	C3. Equalites Training
D. Organizational Change	D1	D2. Anti-Racism Training	D3. Diversity Training

Source: Wrench and Taylor (1993), p. 15.

3.3. Telephone survey

The first empirical component of this study consists of the structured survey completed by telephone with 108 providers of anti-discrimination training.

¹This outcome is similar to that obtained by research teams in other nations implementing the same study design. In particular, only 15 case studies were completed in both the United Kingdom (Taylor, Powell, and Wrench, 1997, p. 29) and in the Netherlands (Abell, Havelaar, and Dankoor, 1997, p. 47).

²This outcome is similar to that in other nations. In the United Kingdom, the 15 case studies included one trade union and one job center (Taylor, Powell, and Wrench, 1997, p. 29), while in the Netherlands, the 15 case studies included three job centers and no trade unions (Abell, Havelaar, and Dankoor, 1997, p. 47).

No comprehensive list exists which identifies the universe of providers of anti-discrimination training in the United States to allow a nationally-representative sample to be drawn via random sampling. Accordingly, to obtain a sample that is at least broadly representative, respondents to our survey were identified by *stratified convenience sampling*. The process involved five steps. First, we defined 14 categories of training providers which could be hypothesized to differ from each other in important ways, and each category was accorded a sampling goal.¹ Second, potential respondents in each category were identified from a variety of sources, including: attendance lists at national conferences on discrimination or training, advertisements and articles in professional journals and the trade press,² industry directories,³ firms' internet sites, and word of mouth from other respondents. Third, within each category, individual organizations were selected to encompass a diversity of geographical locations,⁴ industries within the private sector, types of agencies within the public sector, and demographic focus (e.g., Hispanics, women). Fourth, these organizations were contacted by telephone, an appropriate individual to respond on behalf of the firm was identified, and the interview was completed.⁵ Fifth, organizations that could not be contacted or who refused to participate were replaced by another respondent with similar characteristics. We obtained a 73.0% interview completion rate.⁶ The resultant list of 108 respondents, organized by the 14 sampling strata, is presented in Table 3.

Each interview was conducted by telephone following a 338-item structured questionnaire and requiring between 30 and 60 minutes to complete. Respondents were promised that their individual responses would remain confidential.

Table 3. 108 respondents to the telephone survey, by sampling strata

Sampling stratum (type of provider)	Number of respondents	Training Provider	Headquarters
--	--------------------------	-------------------	--------------

¹These goals were: 30 for for-profit training/consulting firms of intermediate size; 10 each for in-house training staffs of trade unions, for-profit employers, and government agencies; 10 for small for-profit training/consulting firms; and five each for the 10 remaining categories.

²Especially useful here were *HR* (a magazine of the Society for Human Resource Management), *Training* (a magazine of the American Society for Training and Development), and two newsletters, *Mosaics* and *Diversity at Work*.

³For example, Institute for Corporate Diversity (1996).

⁴Respondents are headquartered in both urban and rural locations in 26 states spread across all four of the principal geographical regions (Northeast, Midwest, South, and West) defined by the United States Bureau of the Census.

⁵We requested to interview the most senior person in the organization with direct involvement in anti-discrimination training. In consulting firms, these individuals typically carried titles such as President, Principal, Senior Partner, or Practice Director; in trade unions, Director of Education or Director of Equal Opportunity; and in in-house staffs, Director of Diversity or Vice President for Training.

⁶We identified 148 training providers whom we wished to include. $108/148 = 73.0$ per cent. Among the 40 cases not included, we were unable to contact 19, and 21 refused to participate.

Individuals or very small for-profit training/consulting firms	11	Center for Managing Diversity, Inc. Chaos Management Common Ground Court Jesters Mr. George Crochet Dr. Mary Gentile Innovative Management Concepts Latino Diversity Training Dr. Carolyn Smiley-Marquez Sheldon Steinhauser & Associates Wolf Enterprises	Bethesda, MD Brattleboro, VT Natick, MA Denver, CO Boulder, CO Arlington, MA Prospect, KY Brighton, CO Hygiene, CO Denver, CO Longmont, CO
For-profit training/consulting firms of intermediate size	32	Advanced Management Research Consultants American Institute for Managing Diversity The Athena Group Bea Young Associates/Kaleidoscope Group Creative Cultural Changes, Inc. Cross-Cultural Communications Diversity Training Group Diversity Works, Inc. Equity Consulting Group Executive Diversity Services, Inc. Gardenswartz & Rowe Gatto Training Associates J. Howard and Associates Kaleel Jamison Consulting Group, Inc. Kochman Communications Consultants, Ltd. LGC and Associates Loden Associates Macro International, Inc. Merit's Consulting Services National Multi-Cultural Institute Pope and Associates Powell & Reese PRISM International Professional Development Group, Inc. R. Taylor O'Neale Associates Sharif, Belkin & Associates Simmons Associates, Inc. Souder, Betances & Associates, Inc- Tulin DiversiTeam Associates W. Brower & Associates The Yarbrough Group	Philadelphia, PA Atlanta, GA Denver, CO Chicago, IL Oakland, CA San Diego, CA Columbia, MD Wayne, PA Emeryville, CA Seattle, WA Los Angeles, CA Pittsburgh, PA Lexington, MA Washington, DC Oak Part, IL Kansas City, MO Tiburon, CA Calverton, MD Dublin, CA Washington, DC Cincinnati, OH Hyattsville, MD Deltona, FL Minneapolis, MN San Jose, CA Lakewood, CO New Hope, PA Chicago, IL Wyncote, PA Fayetteville, NC Boulder, CO

Sampling stratum (type of provider)	Number of respondents	Training Provider	Headquarters
--	--------------------------	-------------------	--------------

Large for-profit training/consulting firms	3	Harbridge House, a Division of Coopers & Lybrand Organization Resource Counsellors Watson Wyatt	Chicago, IL New York, NY New York, NY
Law firms	5	Sayfarth, Shaw, Fairweather & Geraldson Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker National Employment Law Institute Marx & Kramer Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe	Chicago, IL Washington, DC Washington, DC Washington, DC San Francisco, CA
Producers of training materials	4	BNA Communications Griggs Productions Innovations International Quality Media Resources	Rockville, MD San Francisco, CA Salt Lake City, UT Bellevue, WA
Government agencies	5	United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Arizona Office of the Attorney General Iowa Civil Rights Commission New York City Commission on Human Relations South Carolina Human Affairs Commission	Chicago, IL Phoenix, AZ Des Moines, IA New York, NY Columbia, SC
Non-profit organizations	5	American Association of Retired Persons Memphis Diversity Institute National Conference, DC Chapter National Training Laboratories Institute Women's Legal Defense Fund	Washington, DC Memphis, TN Washington, DC Alexandria, VA Washington, DC
Universities	5	Cornell University, Industrial and Labor Relations Kentucky State University, Cooperative Extension Service Queens College, Center on the New American Workforce University of Cincinnati, Institute for Managing Diversity in the Workplace University of Memphis, Department of Educational Psychology and Research	Ithaca, NY Frankfort, KY New York, NY Cincinnati, OH Memphis, TN
Trade or professional associations	1	The Conference Board	New York, NY
Internal training staffs or for-profit corporations	9	Amoco AT&T Brown & Root Fleet Financial Group Microsoft Public Service Company of Colorado Ralston Purina United Airlines Wackenhut Services, Inc.	Chicago, IL Somerset, NJ Houston, TX Boston, MA Redmond, WA Denver, CO St. Louis, MO Chicago, IL Aiken, SC

Sampling stratum (type of provider)	Number of respondents	Training Provider	Headquarters
Large for-profit training/consulting firms	3	Harbridge House, a Division of Coopers & Lybrand Organization Resource Counsellors Watson Wyatt	Chicago, IL New York, NY New York, NY
Law firms	5	Sayfarth, Shaw, Fairweather & Geraldson Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker National Employment Law Institute Marx & Kramer Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe	Chicago, IL Washington, DC Washington, DC Washington, DC San Francisco, CA
Producers of training materials	4	BNA Communications Griggs Productions Innovations International Quality Media Resources	Rockville, MD San Francisco, CA Salt Lake City, UT Bellevue, WA
Government agencies	5	United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Arizona Office of the Attorney General Iowa Civil Rights Commission New York City Commission on Human Relations South Carolina Human Affairs Commission	Chicago, IL Phoenix, AZ Des Moines, IA New York, NY Columbia, SC
Non-profit organizations	5	American Association of Retired Persons Memphis Diversity Institute National Conference, DC Chapter National Training Laboratories Institute Women's Legal Defense Fund	Washington, DC Memphis, TN Washington, DC Alexandria, VA Washington, DC
Universities	5	Cornell University, Industrial and Labor Relations Kentucky State University, Cooperative Extension Service Queens College, Center on the New American Workforce University of Cincinnati, Institute for Managing Diversity in the Workplace University of Memphis, Department of Educational Psychology and Research	Ithaca, NY Frankfort, KY New York, NY Cincinnati, OH Memphis, TN
Trade or professional associations	1	The Conference Board	New York, NY
Internal training staffs or for-profit corporations	9	Amoco AT&T Brown & Root Fleet Financial Group Microsoft Public Service Company of Colorado Ralston Purina United Airlines Wackenhut Services, Inc.	Chicago, IL Somerset, NJ Houston, TX Boston, MA Redmond, WA Denver, CO St. Louis, MO Chicago, IL Aiken, SC

Sampling stratum (type of provider)	Number of respondents	Training Provider	Headquarters
Internal training staffs of government agencies	9	City of Austin, Texas California State Training Center New York Governor's Office of Employee Relations University of California, San Diego University of Nebraska Medical Center University of North Carolina United States Coast Guard United States Department of State United States Department of Veterans' Affairs	Austin, TX Sacramento, CA Albany, NY San Diego, CA Omaha, NE Chapel Hill, NC Washington, DC Washington, DC Washington, DC
Internal training staffs of non-profit organizations	5	American Automobile Association-Mid Atlantic Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan National Geographic Society United Way of America YMCA	Philadelphia, PA Detroit, MI Washington, DC Alexandria, VA Chicago, IL
Internal training staff of trade unions	11	American Federation of Government Employees American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations International Union of Bricklayers Communications Workers of America International Association of Machinists International Union of Operating Engineers Laborers International Union National Education Association Service Employees International Union United Auto Workers United Food and Commercial Workers	Washington, DC Washington, DC Washington, DC Washington, DC Upper Marlboro, MD Washington, DC Washington, DC Washington, DC Washington, DC Detroit, MI Washington, DC
Internal training staff of job placement organizations	3	California State Employment Service Manpower, Inc. Michigan Jobs Commission	Sacramento, CA Milwaukee, WI Lansing, MI

3.4. Case studies

The telephone survey focused on respondents' typical experiences, reflecting their work with a range of clients and training programmes. In contrast, the second empirical component of this research, case studies, examined a series of specific training efforts with individual clients. Thus, the case studies complement the telephone survey's more comprehensive coverage with examples probed in some detail.

In all, 14 cases were studied from among the many activities of the 108 respondents to the telephone survey. The selections were made using two criteria. First, we wanted examples which, based on responses to the telephone survey, we hypothesized to be relatively extensive, sophisticated activities exemplifying “best practices.” Second, we wanted to include a variety of employment situations. The sample of 14 includes one trade union, one employment placement firm, one non-profit organization, one agency of the federal government, one agency of a state government, one regulated public utility, one high-technology firm in the services sector, one low-technology firm in the services sector, two for-profit firms in the financial sector, two high-technology manufacturing firms, and two low-technology manufacturing firms. The cases also encompass a range of training providers (in-house staff, for-profit consultants, and non-profit consultants) and a range of geographical locations (all major regions of the United States, both urban and rural). In terms of the taxonomy of training approaches presented in Figure 1, the sample includes one example of cultural awareness training (B1), six examples of equalities training (C2), and seven examples of diversity training (D3).

Data for each case study were gathered through a visit to the client firm, typically lasting one day. These visits included:

- C Semi-structured interviews with one or more members of the staff delivering training (whether in-house or outside consultants), focusing on what training was provided and how it was delivered.
- C Semi-structured interviews with one or more members of the organization’s diversity staff, focusing on where training fit within an overall approach to discrimination and diversity.
- C Semi-structured interviews with one or more senior executives of the client firm, focusing on the organization’s motivation for training and the role of diversity within their overall corporate strategy. Typical participants in these interviews carried the title of Chief Executive Officer, Plant Manager, or Vice President for Human resources.
- C Semi-structured interviews with at least two employees who had received the training, focusing on their experiences and their perceptions of its effects. These respondents were selected to offer different perspectives (e.g., a managerial employee and a front-line worker, a minority female and a white male, or an employee who liked the training and one who disliked it).
- C Examination of training materials such as course outlines, videotapes, and workbooks.
- C Examination of evaluations of the training or other measures of the effects of training, where available.

4. Documentation of training activities

4.1. A profile based on ILO profile sheets

This section presents an empirical description of anti-discrimination training based on the 108 responses to the telephone survey. The description is structured around three profile sheets specified by the ILO, which appear in the Annex.

Training providers

Profile Sheet 1 describes the providers of anti-discrimination training. As was explained in Section 3.3, participants in the telephone survey were selected by stratified sampling with different strata for different types of training providers. Thus, this profile represents what we sought to include rather than the results of a random sample. On the other hand, the strata were designed to encompass all major categories of training providers, and sampling quotas for the strata were roughly proportional to what we believe is the prevalence of providers among the different types. In that sense, Profile Sheet 1 is at least loosely representative of providers in the United States.

By documenting that anti-discrimination training is engaged in by a wide range of institutions, the profile confirms that such training is a well-established activity. A figure commonly appearing in journalistic accounts of anti-discrimination training is that 5,000 providers of these services operate in the United States¹ Our experience in selecting survey participants from long lists of conference attendees, many pages of professional advertising, and hundreds of non-repeating suggestions was not inconsistent with that estimate.

Independent training consultants constitute the largest group of providers tabulated on Profile Sheet 1, accounting for 56 of the 108 providers surveyed. Commercial consultants, which account for 94.6 per cent of this group, range from very small firms (including solo and part-time practitioners), to firms with a dozen employees whose sole product is diversity training, to globally-known human resource consulting firms with dozens of offices, hundreds of partners, and comprehensive product lines of which anti-discrimination training is only a small part.

The second largest category of training providers on Profile Sheet 1, is *in-house staff*. This category includes employers' internal training departments; it also encompasses 10 of the 11 trade unions included in the survey, where anti-discrimination was delivered by the union's internal staff. In most cases, internal trainers within large organizations are employed full time by the organizations' training departments or human resource departments. In some cases, however, they are employees of those organizations with other duties who also delivered anti-discrimination training as a temporary special assignment.² Furthermore, some organizations utilize both in-house staff and outside consultants to deliver different aspects of anti-discrimination training. For example, a firm might hire a consultant to train its executives and managers and to prepare in-house staff to deliver training to non-supervisory personnel.

Training providers not falling into either of the two previous categories account for the remaining proportion of survey respondents. This group encompasses a diverse range of organizations, including nonprofit institutions (both anti-racist organizations and others with different or broader agendas, such as professional associations), government agencies (at both the federal and state levels), and universities.

¹See, for example, Hemphill and Haines (1997), p. 4. The empirical basis of this estimate is not known.

²See, for example, the case studies of Advantica (Section 5.2) and Pacific Enterprises (Section 5.12).

Training targets

Profile Sheet 2 describes the recipients to whom training is targeted. As with Profile Sheet 1, these data reflect the stratified sampling procedure by which survey respondents were selected rather than the results of a random sample. Nevertheless, they confirm that anti-discrimination training is a well-established activity in the labour market, delivered in a wide range of industries to employees at a range of levels.

Employees of private sector firms are the target of 75.1 per cent of the training reported in our survey. This high proportion is consistent with the fact that the private sector represents approximately 85 per cent of employment in the United States (United States Bureau of the Census, 1995, p. 322).

According to Profile Sheet 2, among private sector firms, some anti-discrimination training is targeted to private sector firms of all sizes, from fewer than 100 employees to those with more than 5,000. However, the largest firms -- those with 5,000 or more employees -- account for 59.3 per cent of the activity. This figure is substantially larger than such firms' share of total employment in the United States, where firms with 500 or more employees account for only about 20 per cent of all private sector employment (United States Bureau of the Census, 1995, p. 550). Thus, anti-discrimination training is disproportionately targeted to larger employers.

Profile Sheet 2 suggests that training activities are broadly spread among a wide range of industries within the private sector. At least some training is reported targeted specifically to industries ranging from agriculture to retail trade. The largest proportion of industry targets of training fell within Profile Sheet 2's category of "other" or mixed industry targets, which further suggests their broad range of application.

A second category examined in Profile Sheet 2 is public sector organizations, which are the target of 12.0 per cent of the training activity reported in our telephone survey. As was true in the private sector, at least some training is targeted to a broad range of government organizations. Public agencies engaged in education is the largest single target, accounting for 30.8 per cent of public sector activity. Other common targets include agencies focusing on health, transportation, and "other" (such as law enforcement).

ILO's design for this study describes its focus as anti-discrimination training which targets "gatekeepers" -- persons (such as supervisors) or organizations that control hiring, work assignments, training, promotions, raises, and other employment opportunities. However, Profile Sheet 2 suggests that, in the United States, training is often *not* targeted to such gatekeepers. This pattern is signalled in these data in three ways:

- C Trade unions are one important type of gatekeeper institutions. These organizations are not so prominent a gatekeeper of employment opportunities as in some other industrial nations because only 15.5 per cent of the workforce force in the United States are union members (United States Bureau of the Census, 1995, p. 443). Nevertheless, within workplaces that are unionized, they often exercise considerable control over many aspects of employment opportunities, including selection of apprentices in craft unions and job referrals through hiring halls. Profile Sheet 2 reveals that we succeeded in interviewing 11 such organizations, making them 10.2 per cent of the sample in the telephone survey. However, we obtained those interviews only after very aggressive searching and numerous refusals to participate, and we believe that the 11 interviews represent a large proportion of the total universe of union activity. This experience contrasts

sharply with parallel efforts to interview commercial training providers, where we encountered few refusals to participate and had literally hundred of other potential interviewees we had not contacted by the end of the study. In addition, the types of activities described to us in interviews with unions was typically far more limited in scope and sophistication than was typical for employers.¹

- C Similar comments apply to the second category of gatekeeper organizations examined on Profile Sheet 2, job centers. These institutions play important gatekeeper roles in the labour market in the United States, and in the case of private employment agencies, that importance is growing.² The telephone survey includes one respondent from each of the three types of job centers listed on Profile Sheet 2 -- private employment staffing agencies, public labour exchanges, and vocational advisory services. However, to obtain even that minimal response required extensive searching and enduring a high rate of refusals, and the sample obtained may represent a substantial proportion of the universe of potential respondents. Furthermore, as with trade unions, the survey responses revealed training activities of much more limited scope and sophistication than was typical for the preponderance of respondents.³
- C The final section of Profile Sheet 2 focuses on the level of staff who are the recipients of anti-discrimination training. Senior managers/officials and middle managers/ officials typically exercise much more gatekeeper power in their activities -- for example, selecting new hires, assigning personnel to tasks, conducting performance appraisals, and allocating raises -- than “ordinary workers/junior staff.” According to the profile sheet, when training is targeted to a single level of employees, that level is about three times as likely to be managerial (accounting for 9.3 per cent plus 13.0 per cent, for a total of 22.3 per cent) than are non-managerial employees (accounting for 7.4 per cent). However, the profile sheet reveals that fully 70.3 per cent of training is targeted to “mixed groups,” meaning to employees at all level.⁴

Training courses

Profile Sheets 3A, 3B, and 3C provide information on training courses targeted to employers' personnel/management, trade unions, and job centres, respectively. Because of the limited number of observations in the latter two categories (11 unions, three job centers), comparisons among the groups are generally less revealing than findings common to all three groups.

¹See, for example the case study of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union (Section 5.14).

²Since 1972, temporary employment through for-profit employment agencies has grown at an annual rate of more than 11 per cent and now employs more than two million persons each work day (Segal and Sullivan, 1997, p. 117); see also Belous (1989).

³See, for example, the case study with Manpower (Section 5.7).

⁴ On the other hand, it is common for managerial employees to receive such training first and/or to receive more detailed, longer training. Among our 14 case studies, three involve training only managers, five involve approximately similar training to employees at all levels, and six involve training employees at all levels with managerial employees receiving training of greater duration or depth.

Among the latter type of findings revealed in Part 1 of the three profile sheets are the following.¹

- C Question (1): Except for in-house training staff (who, by definition, have only one client), all survey respondents on all three profile sheets have delivered training to 11 or more client organizations.
- C Question (2): All survey respondents on all three sheets have delivered training courses 11 or more times.
- C Question (3): Most survey respondents have been providing training courses for a substantial numbers of years. On all three profile sheets, more than half have been doing so more than five years.
- C Question (4): On all three profile sheets, more than 70 per cent of survey respondents typically deliver courses restricted to trainees from a single client organization. The remainder open their typical courses to participants from multiple organizations.
- C Question (5): A subject on which little consensus prevails among survey respondents is whether trainees should be required to attend training or whether they should attend voluntarily. For example, on Sheet 3A (referring to employers' personnel/ management), 28.7 per cent of respondents reported that their courses were typically voluntary, 34.0 per cent reported that they were typically compulsory, and 37.3 per cent reported that this response varied, usually depending on the client's request. On Sheet 3B (referring to trade unions), 36.4 per cent of respondents reported that their courses were typically voluntary, 18.2 per cent reported that they were typically compulsory, and 45.4 per cent reported that this response varied
- C Question (6): Across the three profile sheets, there is little consistency in the number of trainers utilized to deliver courses, which ranges from one to six or more. However, comments made during interviews suggest that each course session was typically led by either one or two instructors; the larger numbers refer to the entire team of trainers who typically work with one client company to cover hundreds or even thousands of trainees.
- C Question (7): Across the three profile sheets, between 88.3 per cent and 100.0 per cent of respondents reported that their trainers were sometimes, but not always, persons of minority, immigrant, or other protected group background. Comments during telephone interviews made clear that the staff employed by the majority of training providers was quite mixed. For example, an internal training department with half a dozen professional employees might include two whites, two African Americans, and two members of other minority groups, and three of these employees might be women. Many providers deliberately assign mixed teams to lead individual training classes.
- C Question (8): Across all three profile sheets, the most typical number of trainees in a course ranges between 21 and 29. For example, on Sheet 3A, 74.5 per cent of respondents fell in this range, while on Sheet 3B, 63.6 per cent did so. Comments made during the survey suggest that the most typical class size is 25.

¹Additional data on some of these points is provided in Sections 4.2 through 4.5.

- C Question (9): For the vast majority of training providers, the training they deliver that focuses on racial/ethnic minorities and recent immigrants is typically embedded within broader efforts -- training addressing discrimination against other groups (such as women, persons with disabilities, or older workers), comprehensive efforts at diversity management, or (in most such cases), both. Among all 108 training providers whose responses are reported on the three sheets together, only 10.8 per cent reported anything different from this response.¹
- C Question (10): Across all three profile sheets, the vast majority of courses are reported to last either one day or two days. For example, on Sheet 3A (referring to employees), 60.6 per cent of responses were the former, and 27.7 per cent were the latter; on Sheet 3B (referring to trade unions), 63.6 per cent of responses were the former, and 18.2 per cent were the latter.
- C Question (11): On all three profile sheets, in cases where courses are repeated for one client organization, the most typical number of repetitions is more than 11. Question (12) and comments made during the survey clarify that these repetitions most commonly occur when the same course is repeated to cover hundreds or thousands of employees in a large organization.
- C Question (13): On all three profile sheets, training is reported to be typically provided in the workplace by at least half of the survey respondents. Less frequently, it is provided at a training centre, but comments made during the survey clarified that such training centers are often simply another employer-owned facility near the work site.
- C Question (14): The anti-discrimination training profiled in this survey is very seldom associated with a formal qualification or diploma. Across all three profile sheets, only two (1.9 per cent) of respondents reported such linkages. These cases involved credit for "continuing education" which is required of workers in some occupations (such as attorneys or nurses) to maintain their occupational license.

The training approach

Part 2 of Profile Sheet 3 begins with a description of the content of training courses. According to Profile Sheet 3A (which represents 87 per cent of survey respondents),² three topics that are covered by virtually all training programmes: broader equal opportunity strategies (94 of 94 respondents); information on problems of racism (92 of 94); and "other" (92 of 94). Four other topics are covered by more than half of respondents: broader strategies such as diversity management (79 of 94); procedures for fair recruitment and selection (67 of 94); the legal context of discrimination (63 of 94); and cultural information on migrants, ethnic minorities, or other protected groups (57 of 94). Among the nine topics listed on the profile sheets, only language training is rarely provided; for example, it was provided by only three of the 11 trade unions reporting on Profile Sheet 3B.

Part 2 of Profile Sheets 3A, B and C describes training strategies. It is clear from survey responses that training providers typically embrace multiple strategies, with an emphasis on

¹This pattern is illustrated in 12 of our 14 case studies; the exceptions are Advantica Restaurant Group (Section 5.2) and the United Food and Commercial Workers (Section 5.13).

²For questions concerning the training approach, responses on sheets 3B and 3C closely parallel those on 3A.

changing individuals' behaviour (90 of 94 respondents on Sheet 3A), organizational change (85 of 94 respondents), and provision of information to raise awareness (82 of 94 respondents). Seeking change in individuals' attitudes was a less common strategy, but it was still embraced by more than half of training providers (55 of 94 respondents). Among the 11 trade unions profiled on Sheet 3B, either 10 or 11 respondents embraced all four of these objectives.

Profile Sheet 3 also examines classroom methods. Training providers' responses to the survey suggest an eclectic approach, with an emphasis on active learning. They reported use of: case studies (91 of 94 respondents on Sheet 3A; 1 out of 11 respondents on Sheet 3B; 3 out of 3 respondents on Sheet 3C), group exercises and discussion (87 of 94 on Sheet 3A, 11 of 11 on Sheet 3B, 3 out of 3 on Sheet 3C), and role playing and self-discovery exercises (87 of 94 on Sheet 3A, 10 of 11 on Sheet 3B, 2 of 3 on Sheet 3C), as well as traditional lectures (82 of 94 on Sheet 3A, 9 of 11 on Sheet 3B, 2 of 3 on Sheet 3C). Comments made during survey interviews made clear that these lectures tended to be short presentations (lasting no more than 15 minutes) interspersed among active learning exercises.

Finally, Profile Sheet 3 describes training materials. Survey respondents reported commonly using handouts of written information (91 of 94 providers on Sheet 3A, 11 of 11 on Sheet 3B, and 3 of 3 on Sheet 3C) and videotapes (65 of 94 on Sheet 3A, 9 of 11 on Sheet 3B, and 2 of 3 on Sheet 3C). Computerized learning was reported by only 10 (9.2 per cent) of all 108 respondents.

Taxonomy of training approaches

The ILO's research design calls for assigning each training provider to one of eight categories of training approaches based on the provider's training strategy and training content (Wrench and Taylor, 1993, pp. 14-19). More than 90 per cent of our 108 respondents fell into three of these categories:

- C *Equalities Training* accounts for 40.0 per cent of respondents on the three profile sheets combined (reflecting 38.3 per cent of respondents on Profile Sheet 3A and similar or slightly higher proportions on Sheets 3B and 3C). According to the design for this study (Wrench and Taylor, 1993, p. 17), this approach side-steps individuals' attitudes and emphasizes instruction in legally and professionally acceptable behaviour, defined in terms of appropriate norms, required interpersonal skills, and specific procedures for recruitment and selection.
- C *Diversity Training* accounts for 36.0 per cent of respondents on the three profile sheets combined (reflecting 39.3 per cent of respondents on Profile Sheet 3A and slightly smaller proportions on Sheets 3B and 3C). According to the design for this study (Wrench and Taylor, 1993, p. 18), this approach emphasizes broad organizational change, usually combining training with a cultural audit to reveal problems blocking the progress of protected groups and with reforms in organizational systems and processes. It is a strategy to tap the human resources potential of organizations with diverse workforces and facing diverse markets. It often assumes that individuals have different cultural styles, and that therefore fairness consists less in treating people identically than in treating people in ways appropriate to each. The objective is not to assimilate protected groups into the dominant white male organization but to create a dominant heterogeneous culture.

- C *Cultural Awareness Training* accounts for 16.0 per cent of respondents on the three profile sheets combined (reflecting 17.0 per cent of respondents on Profile Sheet 3A and smaller proportions on Sheets 3B and 3C). The design for this study (Wrench and Taylor, 1993, p. 17) describes this approach as providing cultural information about protected groups and engaging trainees in active exercises to change their attitudes toward these groups. Presentations by representatives of the protected groups, discussions of the non-minority culture, and discussions of “living/working together” also are included in this category.

Together, these three approaches describe 92.06 per cent of the 108 respondents to the telephone survey, including 94.6 per cent of respondents on sheet 3A, 63.6 per cent of respondents on sheet 3B, and 100.0 per cent of respondents on sheet 3C. They therefore represent the dominant modes of anti-discrimination training in the United States today.¹

4.2. An overview of training providers

The previous section profiled anti-discrimination training using questions and categories specified by the ILO, so that responses to these questions can be compared among participants in ILO’s multi-national study. In our telephone survey, questions to support these comparisons were supplemented with questions addressing topics of particular interest in the United States. This section and the three that follow it present a profile of anti-discrimination training drawing on these additional data.

Table 4 begins this profile with the characteristics of the organizations providing anti-discrimination training. As was explained in Section 3.3, these data largely reflect our sampling procedures and cannot be assumed to represent the likely findings from a random sample. However, as with the data presented in Section 4.1, Table 4 demonstrates that, in the United States, such training can be obtained from a variety of organizations. These providers prominently include private for-profit firms routinely serving businesses on a commercial basis -- training vendors, consultants, or lawyers -- that together account for 74.3 per cent of providers (excluding clients firms’ in-house training staff). The remaining one quarter of providers consists primarily of non-profit entities, including anti-discrimination organizations, universities, and trade and professional associations.

Table 4. Characteristics of organizations providing anti-discrimination training

Characteristic	Per cent of Respondents		
<u>Category</u>	<u>United States</u>	<u>United Kingdom</u>	<u>Nether-Lands</u>
Equalities Training (C2 & C3)	40.0%	58.9%	13.0%
Diversity Training (D3)	36.0	8.9	13.0
Cultural Awareness Training (B1)	16.0	3.6	46.3
<u>All Other Categories</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>27.7</u>
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹These proportions can be compared to those observed in the parallel studies in the United Kingdom (Taylor, Powell, and Wrench, 1997, p. 89, based on 56 of 57 respondents) and the Netherlands (Abell, Havelaar, and Dankoor, 1997, p. 82), as follows:

This comparison suggests that diversity training is more common in the United States than in these other countries.

Legal status*	
private for-profit firms	73.9
government agencies	15.1
private non-profit organizations	11.0
Total	100.0
Primary products and services*	
for-profit training firm	44.6
for-profit consulting firm	17.6
legal services	10.8
anti-discrimination services	12.1
degree-granting education	9.5
trade or professional association	5.4
Total	100.0
Geographic range of clientele	
entire United States	63.0
primarily one geographic region	37.0
Total	100.0
Years providing training	
fewer than 5	29.2
5-9	21.7
10 or more	49.1
Total	100.0
Number of clients to which have provided training*	
dozens	40.0
hundreds	44.0
thousands	16.0
Total	100.0
Number of staff members and associates senior enough to lead a training session	
1	13.9
2-10	52.8
>10	33.3
Total	100.0

* excludes responses of training providers who are in-house staff.

The table also suggests that about two-thirds of the training providers surveyed can reasonably be described as well-established operations with considerable resources and experience, while about one-third operate on a more limited scale. For example, 63.0 per cent of respondents operate across the entire United States rather than primarily in a local area; ¹ 70.8 per cent have been providing this training for at least five years; 60.0 per cent report that the clients they have served number in the hundreds or thousands; and 86.1 per cent can provide at least two trainers who are sufficiently senior to lead a training session independently.²

¹A few respondents reported providing anti-discrimination training outside the United States. In nearly all cases, that work involved extending to a client firm's overseas branches training which the respondents were delivering to firms in the United States

²Often a respondent's training staff consists of a limited number of full-time employees supplemented by standing relationships with consultants and associates who work temporarily on large projects; see, for example, the Kaleidoscope Group described in the case study of Owens Corning (Section 5.11).

Table 5 profiles the characteristics of the individuals from these organizations who conduct training sessions. As was discussed in Section 3.1, the literature on anti-discrimination training sometimes portrays such trainers as angry advocates of their own discriminated-against groups. However, Table 5 suggests that this circumstance is rare. It is true that many trainers are members of groups traditionally facing discrimination; only 8.4 per cent of survey respondents report that few or none of their staff come from a protected group background. However, since such backgrounds refer not only to racial/ethnic minorities and recent immigrants but also women, older workers, persons with disabilities, and others, such a pattern is not surprising. Furthermore, only 10.2 percent of respondents described their trainers as typically coming from a *single* background, for example a group of Hispanics or a group of women. Based on comments made during telephone interviews, we believe that fewer than half a dozen of our 108 survey respondents even remotely resemble the angry advocates of special interests sometimes portrayed.

Table 5. Characteristics of individuals leading anti-discrimination training sessions

Characteristic	Per cent of Respondents
Proportion of trainers from protected groups	
all or most	48.6
some	43.0
few or none	8.4
Total	100.0
When trainers are from protected groups, are they	
from a single group?	10.2
from multiple groups?	89.8
Total	100.0
Primary basis of trainers' expertise	
multiple or mixed	42.6
organizational development or training	23.1
business experience or business training	13.9
legal experience or training	13.0
personal experience in a protected group	7.4
Total	100.0

Instead, the most appropriate adjective for the trainers described to us is *business-like*. As Table 5 reports, only 7.4 per cent of survey respondents described the primary expertise of their staff as personal experience as members of protected groups. Instead, the trainers typically draw on professional education and experience in fields such as organizational development, workplace training, business management, human resource management, and law. The presence of protected groups on its staff may invest a training provider with an *appearance* of expertise on issues of discrimination and diversity.¹ However, the basis of the training they deliver is nearly always professionally-based rather than personal.

4.3. An overview of training clients

Table 6 describes the organizations that are the typical clients of the training providers in our survey. As was reported in Section 4.1, these clients come from a broad spectrum of economic sectors.

¹Enhancement of the persuasive power of a message by the characteristics of the individual delivering the message is sometimes referred to as a *source effect* (Kotler, 1994, p. 607).

Table 6. Characteristics of the client organizations of anti-discrimination training

Characteristic	Per cent of Respondents
Client organizations typically include+	
private for-profit firms	74.8
government agencies	58.0
non-profit organizations	52.3
trade unions	42.3
other	4.7
Private sector client firms typically includes firms with what number of total employees+	
less than 100?	30.9
100-499?	43.2
500-999?	53.1
1,000-4,999?	65.4
5,000 or more?	87.8
Private sector client firms typically include those from which industries+	80.2
services?	80.0
transportation?	73.8
manufacturing?	67.5
finance, insurance and real estate?	55.0
wholesale or retail trade?	30.0
construction?	
Composition of trainees in a single training group	
employees from a single firm	70.4
open session-multiple firms	11.1
varies	18.5
Total	100.0
What are important motivations for training for most or all client firms+	
to increase organizational productivity or improve customer relationships?	82.1
to comply with anti-discrimination laws or prevent litigation?	37.4
to improve the firm's ability to operate in international markets?	27.2
to meet the requirements of a litigation settlement?	4.8
+ Respondents could select more than one response	

Some 74.8 per cent of survey respondents reported that their clients typically include private, for profit firms; 58.0 per cent reported that they include government agencies; 52.3 per cent serve non-profit organizations; and 42.3 per cent report working with trade unions.¹ The respondents reported drawing private sector clients from a wide range of industries and firm sizes. However, larger firms are more frequent clients than smaller ones; while 87.8 per cent of respondents reported that they typically work with firms of 5,000 employees or more, only 30.9 per cent reported that they typically work with firms of 100 or fewer employees.

In Table 6, 70.4 per cent of respondents report that they typically deliver training to the employees of individual client organizations separately. In contrast, 11.1 per cent of respondents typically

¹Comments made during survey interviews clarified that a large proportion of the reported training of trade unions is training of union members and officials who are employees of unionized companies, within training programmes initiated by their employers.

operate through “public” sessions which are attended by personnel from different workplaces. This latter pattern is illustrated in our case study of Methodist Health Systems (Section 5.8), where the firm’s staff was trained in multi-employer training sessions of the Memphis Diversity Institute.

Section 2.6 of this report argued that employers’ goals in implementing anti-discrimination training derive not only from moral and legal concerns but also from practical concerns for staff productivity and customer responsiveness. The predominance of operational business goals among these motives is confirmed in the final section of Table 6, where 82.3 per cent of survey respondents report that organizational productivity or improved customer relationships is an important motivation for most or all of their typical client organizations. In contrast, only 37.4 per cent of respondents characterized a desire to comply with employment discrimination laws as an important motive.

Table 7 profiles the characteristics of the individuals who attend anti-discrimination training as trainees. Consistent with the discussion in Section 4.1, Table 7 reports that participation is often not limited to employees, such as managers and supervisors, with official responsibilities as employment gatekeepers. Some 78.7 per cent of survey respondents reported that their typical trainees include non-supervisory employees. On the other hand, mid-level managers and supervisors are the most common recipients of training, with 98.1 per cent of survey respondents describing them as typical trainees. Senior executives, who were reported as typical trainees by 83.1 per cent of survey respondents, are also frequent recipients of training.

Table 7. Characteristics of individuals receiving anti-discrimination training

Characteristic	Per cent of Respondents
Level of employees typically trained+	
mid-level managers and supervisors	98.1
senior executives	83.1
human resource staff	82.2
non-supervisory employees	78.7
others	11.2
Trainee enrolment is	
compulsory?	34.3
voluntary?	28.7
the policy varies	37.0
Total	100.0

+ Respondents could select more than one response.

4.4. An overview of training courses

Table 8 profiles the methods by which anti-discrimination training is delivered. It reports that the typical course consists of approximately 25 trainees meeting with either one or two instructors for an average of 10 instructional hours. In some cases, the trainees are drawn from many different levels in the organization, from senior executives to non-supervisory employees, while in other cases, the groups are more homogeneous.¹ As was reported in Section 4.1, the training methods

¹When different levels of employees are trained separately, training is usually tailored to each group. For example, one survey respondent offers three prototypical training packages: Diversity Strategy at the Organizational Level (a two-day course for senior executives); Tapping the Potential of Diversity (a day-and-a-half

utilized by instructors are an eclectic mix, with an emphasis on active learning exercises. In fact, 100.0 percent of survey respondents reported typically using at least one active learning method (for example, discussions of incidents from the workplace, case studies, or role playing).

Table 8. Characteristics of the delivery of anti-discrimination training

Characteristic	Per cent of Respondents	Average Response
Number of trainees in a typical training group		
optimal		23.9
maximum		43.6
minimum		4.2
Number of trainers per course		
1	44.1	
2	46.1	
>2	9.8	
Total	100.0	
Number of training hours in		
respondent's most frequently-provided course		10.0
respondent's longest course		20.1
respondent's shortest course		4.2
Hierarchical composition of trainee groups		
staff from a range of levels are trained together	43.3	
staff from different levels are trained separately	30.2	
the policy varies	26.4	
Total	100.0	
Training methods+		
written handouts	99.1	
group exercises	95.3	
lectures or mini-lectures	87.7	
discussion of actual incidents from the workplace	84.1	
case studies	75.7	
self-awareness exercises	73.6	
video tapes	70.4	
role playing	70.1	
interaction with trainees of different backgrounds	49.1	
other	38.7	

+ Respondents could select more than one response.

Table 9 describes the typical content of these anti-discrimination training courses.

One set of frequently-covered topics focuses on *awareness* of discrimination, its sources and mechanisms, usually on the assumption that increased awareness will change trainees' *attitudes* toward protected groups and anti-discrimination initiatives. These topics include: problems of discrimination in the workplace (typically covered by 97.2 per cent of respondents), the role of stereotypes (91.3 per cent), how a diverse workforce contributes to productivity (82.4 per cent), the content of stereotypes about different groups (65.4 per cent), white male backlash (64.9 per

course for mid-level managers and supervisors); and Valuing Diversity at the Interpersonal Level (a half-day course for non-supervisory employees).

cent), information on the cultures of different groups (61.1 per cent), and problems of discrimination outside the workplace (55.6 per cent).

Table 9. The content of anti-discrimination training courses

Characteristic	Per cent of Respondents
Topics typically covered ⁺	
problems of discrimination in the workplace	97.2
the role of stereotypes in discrimination	91.3
techniques for making different groups welcome in the workplace	84.3
how a diverse workforce contributes to productivity	82.4
the client organization's policies on discrimination	66.7
techniques for non-discriminatory employee evaluations/promotion	65.7
the content of stereotypes about different demographic groups	65.4
white male "backlash" against anti-discrimination or affirmative action efforts	64.9
techniques for promoting the retention and development of different groups	64.8
the provisions of equal employment opportunity law	61.1
information about the cultures of different demographic groups	61.1
techniques for non-discriminatory employee recruitment/hiring	58.3
problems of discrimination outside the workplace	55.6
Important goals of training ⁺	
to change the workplace behaviour of individual trainees	95.4
to promote organizational change	90.7
to increase trainees' awareness of discrimination issues	88.8
to decrease trainees' use of stereotypes	85.3
to change trainees' attitudes towards protected groups	61.7
to promote other goals	43.3
to make the content of stereotypes more positive	34.6

+ Respondents could select more than one response

One example of such consciousness-raising material, in use for three decades, is the so-called "blue-eyed, brown-eyed" exercise. The sales brochure for a 90 minute video based on this exercise describes it as follows:

Jane Elliott challenges a mixed race group of about 40 people in Kansas City to confront the racism which persists in our society and to experience its effects personally. She divides the group on the basis of eye colour and then subjects the blue-eyed people to a withering regime of humiliation and contempt. In just a few hours, we watch grown professionals become distracted and despondent, stumbling over the simplest commands. The people of colour in the group are surprised that whites react so quickly to the kind of discrimination they face every day of their lives. And Elliott points out that sexism, ageism, and homophobia can have similar effects....People who have experienced prejudice themselves, if only for a few hours in a controlled environment, are much less likely to discriminate against their fellow employees in the future. [Trainers use the video] to demonstrate how people of colour encounter subtle (and not so subtle) discrimination every day; reveal how even casual

¹This section of the table reports choices selected by at least 50 per cent of respondents. Two responses not meeting this criterion were "other" (48.5% responded yes) and language training (15.7% responded yes).

bias can have a devastating impact on personal performance, organizational productivity, teamwork, and morale; show how many white people unconsciously discriminate; illustrate that “colour blindness” can itself be a form of racism by not valuing the differences of others; identify culturally-biased codes of conduct within an organization that may be invisible to the majority; and help all participants realize that they have a personal responsibility for building an organizational culture which welcomes diversity.

A second set of topics common in anti-discrimination training focuses on trainee’s *behaviour*, typically including practical ideas for acting differently to generate non-discriminatory outcomes¹. Topics that fall within this group include: techniques for making different groups welcome in the workplace (typically covered by 84.3 per cent of respondents), techniques for non-discriminatory employee evaluations and promotions (65.7 per cent), techniques for increasing the retention and development of different groups (64.8 per cent), and techniques for non-discriminatory recruitment and hiring (58.3 per cent).

Table 9 reports that 95.4 per cent of survey respondents identified changing the workplace behaviour of individual trainees as an important goal of their training. Some 90.7 per cent identified promoting organizational change as a major goal. These two objectives, which emphasize changes in behaviour, were cited at a somewhat higher rate than the two goals most directly focusing on awareness and attitudes -- increasing trainees’ awareness concerning discrimination (88.8 per cent) and changing trainees’ attitudes (61.7 per cent).

Of course, to some extent, training providers whose courses focus on raising awareness and changing attitudes adopt this approach because they believe that changes in behaviour will follow. Nevertheless, there remains some inconsistency between training providers’ emphasis on behaviour as the target they seek to influence and the relative lack of explicit training devoted to behaviour itself. In comments made throughout both the telephone survey and our case studies,² many training providers stated that a priority in improving their training programmes is to strengthen their practical behavioural content.

4.5. An overview of the context surrounding training

An opinion shared virtually universally in the anti-discrimination community is that training should be part of a broader process addressing discrimination rather than an isolated initiative. Table 10 lists ten activities often undertaken to reinforce the effects of anti-discrimination training. Among these ten, 86.9 per cent of survey respondents characterized adoption by the client organization of formal policies against discrimination as a very important reinforcement to training. This activity was joined by: improving specific human resource management practices (82.2 per cent rated it as very important), disciplining or firing employees who discriminate (68.6 per cent), making equal opportunity part of managers’ performance evaluations (64.4 per cent), and providing an accessible discrimination complaint process (57.9). Fewer than half of survey respondents characterized the remaining four actions as very important. Notably, this latter group included establishment of numerical goals and timetables for employing protected groups, which

¹See, for example, the case studies of Advantica Restaurant Group (Section 5.2) and Fleet Bank (Section 5.3).

²See, for example, the work of the Memphis Diversity Institute described in the case study of Methodist Health Systems (Section 5.8).

is commonly viewed as the core approach of affirmative action; it was rated very important by 34.3 per cent of respondents.

Table 10. Relationships between training and other anti-discrimination activities

Question	Per cent of Respondents
To what extent is each of these a very important activity by client organizations	
to reinforce anti-discrimination training?+	86.9
adopting formal policies against discrimination or in favour of diversity	82.2
improving specific human resource management practices	68.6
disciplining or firing employees who discriminate	64.4
making equal opportunity part of managers' performance evaluations	57.9
providing an accessible discrimination complaint process	57.9
providing mentoring and similar staff development programmes	39.8
celebrating diversity in company publications	39.0
establishing a diversity advisory committee	34.3
establishing numerical goals for employing protected groups	33.0
employing full-time diversity staff	
+ Respondents could select more than one response	

Some activities complementary to training are closely related to training itself, such as organizational assessments conducted prior to training to identify issues that training should address. Training providers are commonly involved in such pre-training activities, although the depth of their involvement varies widely.¹ The involvement of training providers once training has been delivered is often more limited.² In our telephone survey, 61.3 per cent of respondents reported that their work typically does not involve substantial post-training activities. However, the remaining 38.7 per cent reported that they typically have at least some role in training follow up.

One reason for this limited post-training involvement is that client organizations cannot delegate many important post-training activities. Although outside consultants (including training providers) may assist in designing or initiating some of these activities, in the post-training stage, client organizations themselves must demonstrate their commitment to the lessons training has stated.

¹For examples in which training providers were extensively involved in pre-training organizational audits, see the case studies of Methodist Health Systems (Section 5.8), Nationwide Insurance (Section 5.10), Owens Corning (Section 5.11), and United Technologies (Section 5.15).

²In the parallel study of anti-discrimination training in the Netherlands, followup to training was described as "more exception than rule" (Abell, Havelaar, and Dankoor, 1997, p. 57).

5. Descriptive summaries of case studies

5.1. The role of these summaries

This chapter provides a capsule description of each of the 14 case studies conducted within this study. The descriptions appear in alphabetical order and are current as of the dates of the site visits, conducted between March 1997 and April 1998. Prior to inclusion in this report, a draft of each case study was provided to the organization studied for their review and correction, and the case studies appear with their permission.

These summaries provide concrete illustrations of the subject of this study. With the grounding that these illustrations provide, readers will be better able to interpret the statistical description already presented in Chapter 4, as well as the evaluation to be presented in Chapter 6. Although each summary concludes with an overall assessment by the authors, these conclusions should be treated as preliminary until they are further justified in Chapter 6.

5.2. Advantica Restaurant Group, Inc.

Neither Advantica Restaurant Group, Inc., nor the company's former name of Flagstar, is a widely-recognized corporate label, despite the company's \$2.6 billion in annual revenues and 65,000 employees. Far better known are the 2,500 fast-food and moderately-priced restaurants the company owns, operates or franchises throughout the United States under the brand names of Denny's, Quincy's, El Pollo Loco, Coco's, Carrows, and Hardee's. Started in 1961 with a single hamburger stand, the firm evolved through a complex series of mergers, bankruptcies, and reorganizations to become the fourth largest food service firm in the United States. Every day, Advantica serves meals to nearly two million customers.

On April 1, 1993, those customers did not include six African American Secret Service agents who waited for breakfast at a Denny's restaurant near Washington while their fellow white agents were served ahead of them. In multiple lawsuits surrounding this nationally-publicized incident, a systematic, nation-wide pattern of discriminatory treatment of African American customers was alleged, and a large-scale consumer boycott seemed imminent. Investigation of these complaints further revealed a corporation with all-white management, virtually no minority suppliers, and a work environment in which racial epithets were allegedly not uncommon. One of the leading business periodicals in the United States characterized Denny's during this period as "a shameful model of entrenched prejudice" and "one of America's most racist companies."¹

To settle the lawsuits it faced, Advantica accepted court supervision of Denny's operations for seven years, distributed \$54 million to compensate African American customers, expanded the number of African American restaurant managers and franchisees,² and created a toll-free telephone line for customer complaints. But further upheaval was underway within Advantica's corporate leadership. In 1992, controlling ownership of the firm was purchased by a well-known "corporate raider," Kohlberg Kravis Roberts. In 1995, the owners installed a new Chief Executive Officer, James Adamson, with a mandate to protect their highly leveraged investment by dramatically improving company performance. Adamson soon replaced 11 of the company's

¹Rice (1996), p. 1; see also Jones (1995), Faircloth (1998), and Watkins (1997).

²The number of Denny's franchises owned by African Americans rose from one in 1992 to 29 in 1997.

12 most senior executives, recruiting replacements with restaurant industry experience but no previous ties to Advantica and including women and people of colour. His goal was a clean break both from past problems of discrimination and from a legacy of provincial, lethargic management.

While attitudes among senior executives might be changed by replacing individuals, the same strategy could not practically be applied to the several thousand managers and assistant managers responsible for the daily operations of the firm's restaurants across the country. Like their counterparts throughout the moderately priced segments of the food service industry, these managers typically had risen to their positions through experience with the company and company-internal training. These processes tended to develop in them loyalty to the firm and comfort with its corporate culture. If Advantica was to break from discriminatory attitudes and practices that were formerly part of that culture, then extensive retraining would be essential.¹

Such training was mandated for all Denny's managers and employees as part of the litigation settlement. But even before the litigation, Advantica had developed an initiative called Mission 2000 with a goal of becoming the best food service company in the country by the year 2000. This initiative sought to develop commonalities among the largely-independent restaurant concepts, establish the firm as an "employer of choice," and make training in customer service as important as the company's long-standing training in technical aspects of restaurant operations such as hygienic food handling. As corporate human resources staff struggled to find a positive aspect to the litigation that had so shaken their company, they came to view it as a "teachable moment" for these longer-term improvements.

To implement training, Advantica engaged an array of consultants. The process started in 1992, with a short-lived internal Diversity Advisory Committee and employee focus groups on diversity and other issues in human resource management. A university professor of anthropology developed a self-study course on diversity to be part of new manager training in the Hardee's and Quincy's concepts. A charismatic, inspirational speaker, Dr. Samuel Betances, was brought in for awareness-focused presentations, titled "Harness the Rainbow," to senior executives, franchisees, and others.² During a three-month period in 1994, a for-profit training vendor, I.E.C., delivered one-day diversity awareness workshops to 4,000 employees, including all restaurant managers and assistant managers in Denny's and El Polo Loco chains.

While this latter training was generally received with politeness, informal feedback suggested that trainees preferred training that would move beyond awareness to guide daily behaviour. Trainees also denigrated the trainers' lack of background in the restaurant industry and classroom examples not explicitly depicting restaurant situations. In response, subsequent training was redesigned to use company internal staff. A racially-mixed group of 75 employees -- typically, persons with

¹*Non-training* initiatives that Advantica initiated to support this same culture change included: placing the firm's Chief Diversity Officer on the firm's management committee; placing 5 women or persons of colour on the corporation's 12 member board of directors; modifying personnel practices, both formal and informal; expanding the sources from which employees are recruited; establishing minority purchasing goals under "fair share" agreements with African American and Hispanic civil rights organizations; conducting focus groups to probe minority consumers' perceptions and attitudes toward the company's brands; redesigning advertising to feature non-white customers and Spanish-language versions; and, as a last resort, dismissing some employees who were not adapting to the new culture.

²Betances brings to his training a unique combination of skills, having been both a university professor of sociology and a standup comedian (Betances, 1993).

restaurant experience currently working at corporate headquarters -- was developed into training facilitators. They received two days of training in interpersonal sensitivity and training methods from a non-profit organization (the National Coalition Building Institute), three to five additional days from a for-profit diversity training firm (Pace Group), and Dr. Betance's awareness training. These 75 employees then led one-day training sessions around the company, under titles such as "We Can" and "We Care." To date, several thousand restaurant managers and other employees have been trained in groups of 25, and the process continues as company resources permit. Priority is given to training in the Denny's concept, because training is mandated there by the litigation settlement.

The focus of this training is treatment of customers, rather than employees, although the two subjects often intertwine. Sessions are keynoted by a videotape in which a senior executive -- either the Chief Executive Officer or the head of the restaurant concept -- personally endorses diversity and the training that is about to be delivered. The "business case" for diversity is given prominence, highlighted by statistics concerning the purchasing power of potential restaurant customers with different demographic characteristics. Laws covering discrimination in public services are discussed, as is material on quality customer service adapted from previous company training programmes. Specific examples of problematic incidents are presented on videotape, some of them reproducing incidents alleged in the litigation; and practical behavioural responses for handling these situations ("scripts" of what to say, "decision trees" concerning what actions to take) are practised in role-playing exercises.

Today, Advantica remains a company with many problems. Its leveraged buy out still burdens the firm with more than \$1 billion in debt, and the cash required to service that debt sometimes limits the resources available for training and other new initiatives. The process of culture change remains incomplete. But the "inexorable zero" levels of representation of minorities in position of authority has been dramatically altered; for example, African Americans, Hispanics, and other racial/ethnic minorities now represent 26 per cent of managerial employees in the Denny's concept. The same business periodical that called Denny's one of the country's most racist companies now describes it as "a model of multicultural sensitivity."¹ In terms of a very rapid change starting from a disastrous situation, it may be reasonable to consider it so, and anti-discrimination training appears to deserve an important part of the credit.

5.3. Fleet Financial Group, Inc.

Fleet Financial Group, Inc. is the 11th largest bank holding company in the United States, with 32,000 employees operating 1,200 retail bank branches throughout the Northeast region of the United States, from Maine to New Jersey. Like all firms in the financial services industry, Fleet has been buffeted throughout the past decade by profound changes in its industry, including interstate banking, internationalization of financial markets, electronic transactions, and the blurring of boundaries between banking and other financial services such as insurance and investments. Fleet has emerged as one of the winners in the resultant "winnowing out" among firms, having grown in both size and profitability through repeated mergers and acquisitions, but the process has not always been smooth. For example, today's Fleet Bank has been created over a decade from 150 predecessor banks, and conflicts sometimes arise from differences in the corporate cultures and practices of these many predecessor institutions.

¹ Rice (1996), p. 1; see also Faircloth (1998).

To increase the efficiency of the post-merger organization, Fleet has gradually centralized functions previously handled by individual predecessor banks. Diversity became a focus of this process in 1995. The bank was motivated to address diversity issues not primarily by crises (such as discrimination litigation) or even by long-term trends in the demographic characteristics of its workforce. Rather, it was motivated by a sense, documented through employee surveys and focus groups, that women and minorities generally rated the bank less favourably as a place to work than their white, male counterparts.¹ An important second motivation was to raise morale and increase the productivity of a constantly-downsizing work force. An additional, although less urgent, goal was to enhance the bank's capacity to serve increasingly diverse customers; for example, as part of continuing efforts to expand its markets, Fleet had targeted advertising to ethnic minority markets, and the company wanted to be prepared to serve the resultant customers.

Implementing the recommendations of a 1995 corporate task force, the firm began its efforts by creating a corporate-level office of diversity, placing it parallel in the organizational structure to the firm's human resources department, reporting directly to the corporation's Chief Administrative Officer. The firm also assigned the Chief Administrative Officer to chair a diversity council composed of high-level bank executives; the role of this council is to maintain attention to this issue by senior management. Next, Fleet established temporary leadership teams in each of the bank's 11 business lines to examine business rationales for diversity and develop unit-specific action plans. Symbolizing the firm's intention to address diversity in terms of efficient bank operations rather than equal opportunity laws, it selected as the first Corporate Director of Diversity a person who is neither a human resources specialist nor a member of a protected group. Instead, he is a white male whose previous 15 years of bank experience was in commercial banking operations.

Training was selected as one major operational initiative of the new diversity push. It had two principal components,² in which the primary developmental and delivery roles were played by the corporate diversity office, training specialists from the corporation's human resources staff, and an outside organization development consultant, DelTech.

The first component is a training programme lasting two and a half days for the bank's 1,000 most senior executives, from the Chief Executive Officer to managers four levels down from him. Over three years, this programme has been delivered to about 900 of these persons, in classes of 24. The training focuses on race, gender, culture, and personal style as dimensions of diversity. It begins with material to expand trainees' awareness of diversity and discrimination, including a dramatic videotape depicting racism in daily life. Training then seeks to develop trainees' skills in addressing issues of discrimination and diversity, focusing on techniques for evaluating incidents to determine if they are isolated or signal a broader problem, conducting dialogues with persons from different cultural backgrounds, and employee coaching. Themes emphasized throughout the training include: respecting individual differences, harnessing these differences for maximum productivity, and understanding individual and organizational prejudice. Classroom

¹Women constitute 70 per cent, and racial/ethnic minorities constitute 19 per cent, of the bank's overall workforce. Their rates of representation among managers and executives are substantially lower.

²A third training component, being implemented over time, is to "mainstream" diversity content into the organization's 3 principal ongoing training programmes for management development: Foundations of Management (for new managers), Managerial Leadership (for managers with some experience), and Strategic Leadership (for those rising toward the top).

exercises, role-playing, and other forms of active learning are used to increase trainees' involvement beyond the level that would be achieved through lectures.

Fleet's organizational development consultant advised the firm that training for executives should be largely completed, so that senior staff would be available to reinforce training messages, before Fleet commenced its second training initiative. This second phase consists of a one-day workshop that is gradually being delivered to all 3,000 supervisory and managerial employees below the rank of the executives attending the previous training. This programme covers the highlights of the two and a half day programme, with primary attention paid to awareness rather than skills. One hour at the end of training is devoted to development of each trainee's individual plans for follow-up actions.¹

Training is not the only initiative that Fleet is mobilizing to improve diversity management. The corporate diversity office plays a primary role in all these undertakings. However, because this office does not control the bank's business operating units, many of the desired changes must be promoted through persuasion and coaching rather than mandates. Many aspects of company policies and practices are being reviewed and modified, particularly those affecting staff recruiting, employee evaluations, employee assignments, and communication. For example, the diversity office has been urging managers to complete formal annual employee evaluations on time; to put increased emphasis on employees' career development plans within these evaluations; to broaden the pool of employees who receive assignments to special project teams that, in this firm, often confer the visibility and contacts that lead to promotions; to ensure that job openings are publicly posted; and to add explicit requirements in contracts with outside staffing consultants ("headhunters") to identify a diverse set of job candidates.²

Within Fleet, as well as throughout the banking industry, goals that are concrete and measurable tend to receive the most sustained attention. Each of the firm's top 300 managers is supposed to set annual measurable goals for specific actions that promote diversity, and the diversity office has prepared a list of 30 examples of such actions to choose from. To implement such a process in business units within the bank that use "management by objectives" systems, the head of the business unit and the corporate diversity director often meet individually with each manager in the unit to set measurable goals against which that manager wishes to have his or her performance evaluated at the end of the business year.³

¹One hoped-for followup is that the managers will carry information from training back to the employees they supervise. Fleet is currently discussing possible training for its non-managerial employees, but since they number 30,000, the firm is seeking a short, lower-cost format (such as videotapes) for that undertaking.

²Additional actions to promote the same ends include: establishing an independent ombudsperson to address individual discrimination issues expeditiously; allocating 25 per cent of the stories in the company newsletter to diversity topics; and firing a manager who made inappropriate comments on the company's e-mail.

³A typical manager's list of measurable objectives for one year might read as follows: (1) By the end of the business year, I will complete written performance evaluations for all employees reporting to me; (2) by the middle of the business year, I will meet with each employee reporting to me to discuss whether the career development plans in their previous year's performance evaluation are being carried out; (3) at least once each calendar quarter, I will attend a public event broadening my diversity awareness (e.g., a dinner for Black History Month); (4) by the end of this business year, I will appoint to special project teams at least 3 persons who have never before served on these teams; and (5) by the end of the business year, at least 80 per cent of the managerial employees under my supervision will have attended the one-day diversity workshop.

Fleet's approach to diversity is one of long-term commitment to systemic change, neither narrowly conceived nor implemented in hasty response to crisis. Political acceptability is carefully built by starting activities with the top executives, explicitly making a "business case" for diversity by linking it to objectives such as efficiency and profitability, and monitoring progress in the "management by the numbers" style standard throughout the firm.¹ Only time will tell the nature and magnitude of the changes that result. However, in multiple, thoughtful ways -- including training -- the company seems to be pushing steadily in a positive direction.

5.4. General Motors Corporation

With \$178 billion in annual revenues and 608,000 employees, General Motors Corporation (GM) is the largest industrial corporation in the world. From its headquarters in Detroit and facilities across the United States and 190 other countries, it has long been a dominant force in the design, manufacture, marketing, and financing of automobiles, trucks, and motor vehicle parts.

While huge scale and historical dominance confer many competitive advantages, they can also be handicaps. For many decades, GM has been managed in a decentralized manner, with considerable operational autonomy by 25 separate business units (e.g., the Chevrolet Division). While this structure has made it possible to manage an enterprise of this magnitude,² it also renders the company slow to change. Throughout the 1970's and 1980's, GM found itself chronically outpaced by more aggressive competitors in product styling, product quality, technological innovation, and production costs. While the motor vehicle manufacturing was becoming global at a rapid pace, GM lagged its competitors in focusing on markets outside North America. By the early 1990's, with its market share sharply eroding and its workforce experiencing large layoffs, GM launched a concerted effort at corporate resurgence.

The firm's utilization of human resources was one principal focus of these efforts. Employee surveys and focus groups reported pervasive low morale, with many employees feeling insecure, under-valued, and disengaged. Inability to attract desired job candidates signalled that the firm was no longer an employer of choice for many talented potential employees. Adversarial labour relations between the company and its principal trade union, the United Auto Workers, had hampered assembly-line productivity for decades.

These issues, which affected employees of all backgrounds, coexisted with additional problems particularly affecting racial/ethnic minorities, women, and other groups historically subject to discrimination. Despite decades of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies, racial/ethnic minorities and women continued to be under-represented in many occupations throughout the company, especially those at higher levels. The company recurrently faced, and often lost, employment discrimination litigation. And the company's difficulties relating to diverse groups encompassed not only employees but also customers, automobile dealers, and corporate suppliers. Thus, changing times were challenging the company to address both narrow problems of discrimination and broad issues of corporate culture. In practice, according to

¹The corporate diversity office currently monitors annual data on the representation of women and minorities at different levels as a primary indicator of progress. It hopes eventually to conduct semi-annual employee surveys to provide additional data on diversity issues and employee attitudes and track changes over time.

²The approach was developed during the 1930's by GM's then Chief Executive Officer, Alfred P. Sloan, who is considered one of the century's major innovators in corporate management; see Sloan (1996).

corporate staff, discrimination in its traditional sense has received about 25 per cent of the attention in the corporation's diversity efforts, with the remainder devoted to broader issues.¹

Leadership of these efforts fell to William Brooks, an African American who in 1994 was named GM's Vice President of Corporate Affairs, with responsibility for diversity as well as corporate public relations. Brooks brought in as consultants R. Roosevelt Thomas and other staff from Thomas's American Institute for Managing Diversity (AIMD), a non-profit institution related to one of the nation's leading historically African-American universities. Thomas is a nationally-recognized pioneer of the diversity movement, a widely published author, and a well-established consultant to very large corporations (Thomas, 1990; Thomas, 1991).

Brooks and Thomas fomented a two year series of diversity communications/awareness efforts, using a variety of formats and venues to reach executives throughout each of the corporation's business units. For example, a meeting of 3,600 GM executives was held in Orlando in 1997 to promote commitment to a new corporate culture; that culture was intended to encompass diversity in parallel with such other themes as globalization and total quality management. In response to such overtures, some of the business units have actively promoted the diversity theme, while others have responded only minimally.

In units where diversity has been seriously pursued, the process is estimated to require between two and four years to move through a cycle of problem identification, analysis, planning, implementation, and evaluation:

- C Because decision-making within each business unit tends to be "top down," the process begins with efforts to get the unit's senior executives to understand diversity as GM defines it and its role in the firm's resurgence. These efforts were often keynoted by presentations by Brooks and/or Thomas. Ideally, this process generates a consensus among senior managers in favour of diversity initiatives, one or more executives willing to serve as "diversity champions" within the unit, and authorization for further action.
- C The next step is an organizational audit to define the rationale (the "business case") for diversity within the business unit, identify specific diversity issues to be addressed, and analyse possible actions. This process begins with an "armchair audit" (i.e., a focused discussion) among senior managers within the unit, led by an AIMD organization development consultant. Insights from this discussion are then supplemented with data from the omnibus employee survey conducted by the company every two years. While many of the conclusions reached in these audits are similar

¹Reflecting this complex set of objectives, a corporate brochure describes GM's approach to diversity as follows:

General Motors Corporation defines managing diversity as the process of creating and maintaining an environment that naturally enables GM employees, suppliers, dealers, and communities to fully contribute to the pursuit of total consumer enthusiasm. By diversity, we mean much more than race and gender. Diversity also includes such factors as family status, military service, ethnicity, religious beliefs, education, age, and physical abilities. Working with others of different backgrounds and perspectives helps us learn that diversity is a competitive advantage enabling us to do a better job of satisfying the customer.

in different business units, GM's tradition of decentralization requires that the process be conducted separately in each unit.

- C Organizational infrastructure needs to be set in place to carry out diversity activities. When Brooks was appointed a vice president, GM created a corporate diversity office reporting to him. With a staff of two professional training and human resource specialists, this office coordinates, advises, and supports the diversity activities of the business units. However, primary responsibility resides with diversity staff within each business unit.¹ These staffs usually consist of persons with general human resource management backgrounds, and they typically work within the unit's human resources management department. Many units have also formed a diversity advisory council of employees (in some cases, by adding this activity to the responsibilities of an existing committee).
- C Diversity training is the most common operational activity undertaken by the business units to promote diversity. Classes typically last either four or eight hours and focus on awareness of diversity issues. They are usually presented by outside diversity training firms, such as K. Iwata and the Pace Group. As of 1997, about 20 per cent of the company's salaried employees -- about 17,000 persons -- have received such training.²

On the issue of diversity, GM is positioned more as a follower than an industry leader. It has addressed the issue only slowly and cautiously, blending it so extensively into broader organizational concerns that the company's commitment to this issue is not clear. Some groundwork for corporate progress has been laid, particularly in terms of raising awareness, but training and other efforts at even this preliminary level of activity have been more limited in scope than at many other firms. However, in the authors' judgment, neither what has been accomplished, nor even what has been attempted, seems to reflect a belief that improvements in discrimination and diversity can importantly contribute to the future of this venerable but challenged organization.

5.5. Hewlett Packard Corporation, Boise Facility

The Hewlett-Packard Corporation (HP) is a world-wide leader in the design, manufacture, and marketing of computer equipment, office machines, communication systems, and devices for scientific measurement. With annual revenues of \$38 billion and 112,000 employees worldwide, it is the 16th largest corporation in the United States. It regularly appears on lists of the most admired, innovative, and successful enterprises and most desirable employers (Fisher, 1997; Levering and Moscovitz, 1993).

¹For example, the diversity staff relies on the company-wide employee survey as a primary means of monitoring diversity issues and evaluating diversity initiatives such as training. However, the *corporate-level* diversity staff is never given survey data identifying business units separately, so it can not compare the performance of units.

²All hourly GM employees have received brief "this is the law" training on racial and sexual harassment. This initiative was undertaken as a pragmatic measure, largely separate from longer-term efforts to improve diversity management.

Throughout the high technology industry of which HP is a leader, the workplace climate tends to be very different from that in more traditional firms. Incidents of explicit racism or blatant sexual harassment are relatively rare. However, even in this environment, few companies are free of concerns about whether women are fully utilized and whether racial/ethnic minorities feel comfortable. Additional diversity issues also tend to arise in this environment. For example, in many firms, individuals who conform to a particular personal style thrive and advance most readily. At HP, the favoured style is assertive, gregarious, expressive, and risk-taking. But the company realizes that many talented employees do not possess that style, and the firm needs to learn how to recognize and utilize their capabilities as well. Concurrently, as a company whose market is global rather than limited to the United States, HP requires staff who can function in many different cultural environments.

Diversity initiatives have been evolving and growing at HP over a protracted period. Focus groups of women and minority employees were held as long ago as 1985. Training with diversity as the explicit subject was first delivered in the late 1980's. Diversity was added to the corporation's statement of values in the early 1990's.¹ But the subject gained particular prominence starting in 1994. Annually, HP's Chief Executive Officer, Lewis Platt, announces a small number of "hoshins" (a term from the Japanese language meaning a breakthrough business strategic concept) that will receive his priority attention in the upcoming year. The executives reporting to Platt, and in turn the managers reporting to those executives, are responsible for developing and implementing strategies to promote these hoshins. Starting in 1994 and continuing through 1996, Platt selected "people" (and within that concept, diversity) as a hoshin. As HP interprets diversity in this context, the focus is not women, minorities, or other groups *per se* but rather establishment of an inclusive work environment in which all employees can be individually productive, and the organization can capitalize on the synergies that variation allows.

Some 600 miles away from HP's corporate headquarters in California's "Silicon Valley," HP's Boise, Idaho facility is located on the outskirts of an attractive small city at the edge of the Rocky Mountains. There, in modern buildings on a 220 acre suburban office campus, 4,000 employees design, manufacture, and service equipment for personal computers and computer networks, such as printers, plotters, scanners, and data storage systems. Responsibility for implementing the diversity hoshin fell on the general managers of the 11 separate organizational components located at this facility, assisted by a two person diversity staff in the facility's central human resources office.

These 11 managers embraced the hoshin with varying levels of personal commitment.² That variation, in combination with the fact that no individual is in overall charge of the Boise facility, has meant that local leadership on diversity has been relatively limited. Nevertheless, an ongoing series of incremental changes has carried the issue forward somewhat. In terms of company-wide initiatives, sexual orientation was added to the company's policy of non-discrimination in 1992,

¹A widely-circulated document titled "The HP Way" identifies one of the firm's seven principal objectives as:

To help HP people share in the company's success which they make possible; to provide employment security based on performance; to ensure them a safe and pleasant work environment; to recognize their achievements; to value their diversity; and to help them gain a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment from their work.

²When the performance of an HP manager is evaluated annually, diversity is one of nine criteria on which the manager is rated. In principle, each criterion is accorded equal weight, but in practice, diversity is not always given equal attention.

an expanded system of job postings was implemented in 1993, the company appointed its first female vice president in 1995, and fringe benefits were extended to employees' domestic partners in 1996. In terms of actions specific to the Boise facility, over the past several years, a diversity advisory board has been created, a system for measuring progress (using turnover rates and other employment statistics) has been devised, employee networks (such as the Society of Women Engineers) have become more active, and events (such as "Take Your Daughter to Work Day") have been promoted.

As a firm with a highly educated workforce in an industry experiencing constant technological change, HP has a long tradition of extensive in-house training for employees. As diversity has received increasing attention, the Boise site has expanded its offerings to include classes ranging from "Diversity Basics" and "Interviewing Today's Workforce" to "Japanese Business Communications." These courses typically last between one and three days and are delivered by outside consultants. In most cases, attendance is voluntary, and professional and managerial employees are responsible for selecting courses to advance their careers or personal interests.

One of the most popular diversity courses offered at Boise, entitled "Men and Women Working Together," has been delivered since 1993 by its developer, Dr. Elaine Yarbrough. Yarbrough is an experienced organizational development consultant and head of the Yarbrough Group, based in Boulder, Colorado. Her three day course seeks to enhance trainees' understanding of the psychological and cultural forces that lead men and women to behave differently in the workplace. She does not emphasize specific practices that trainees should implement in the workplace. Rather, she sees the class's major role as development of a cadre of influential employees sympathetic to diversity issues and linking them in networks through which they can influence the corporate culture. She feels that major changes in that culture start when perhaps 25 per cent of the staff has received such training. Having delivered her course at Boise some 30 times to about 750 trainees, Yarbrough now sees this "critical mass" for culture change coming within reach.

Yarbrough's strategy of promoting culture change through training is compatible with HP's own approach to diversity. The company's activities are not motivated by crises but by a desire for continuous performance improvement. They emphasize voluntary actions by professional employees who are responsible for their own career development. The environment in the "high tech" industry in which HP operates is often viewed by more traditional firms in the United States as exotic and operating by rules outside their own experience. From executive leadership through "hoshins" to training that does not pursue traditional training objectives, HP's approach to diversity seems to confirm such views. But within their own environment, these approaches to diversity and diversity training may well make sense.

5.6. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Engineering Directorate

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is operated by the University of California (a unit of California state government) under a contract from the federal government's Department of Energy. Within a sprawling campus of closely-guarded buildings near San Francisco, the laboratory applies highly sophisticated concepts in physics, materials science, lasers, computing, instrumentation, and systems integration to nuclear weapons and related technologies.

The Laboratory employs about 7,000, including more than 2,000 persons with master's or doctoral degrees in engineering or science. Racial and ethnic minorities (including African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asians and Pacific Islanders) constitute 16 per cent of employees, and women constitute 28 per cent. Currently, these groups are moderately under-

represented in various categories of Laboratory employment compared to their availability in the available work force; for example, women currently stand at 25 per cent, and minorities at 50 per cent, of their expected representation among blue-collar supervisors. In the Laboratory's first all-employee survey on diversity, conducted in 1995, women and minorities rated the Laboratory significantly less favourably as a place to work than their white male counterparts; and these groups display higher turnover than white males (Lawrence Livermore, 1996, pp. 122-125).

Early in the 1990's, the Laboratory's long-standing obligations of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action as a government contractor assumed new visibility within the organization. With defense expenditures declining in the post-Cold War era, the Laboratory was forced to redefine its mission and broaden its sources of financial support. In this broader environment, the organization found that some potential clients reacted adversely to Laboratory work teams consisting of all white males and operating in a style reflecting their long association with the military. Concerns about lack of staff diversity were also prominently raised by the organization's principal funder, the federal Department of Energy, when an African American woman was appointed the United States' Secretary of Energy in 1993.

The Laboratory's management responded to these developments with a variety of initiatives, ranging from small, symbolic acts to policy changes with operational consequences. These efforts included cultivating ethnic/gender affinity groups (e.g., a Black Employee's Association), establishing a diversity speaker series, formalizing employee mentoring programmes, offering scholarships to promising minority job candidates, commissioning ombudspersons to resolve employment disputes, and modifying procedures for posting job vacancies. Diversity Action Teams were created within work groups, reporting to a Laboratory-wide Diversity Action Steering Committee.

The Laboratory also selected the Laboratory's Engineering Directorate to pilot a programme of diversity training which was subsequently made mandatory Laboratory-wide. In this period, the Engineering Directorate was headed by a dynamic, strategic leader, a white male, who adopted diversity as a major thrust of his leadership. He conceived of diversity as one of multiple efforts to strengthen the human resources of his organization, parallel to efforts to hire staff with marketing skills, enhance staff creativity, develop supervisors' interpersonal skills, and promote teamwork. Throughout the subsequent process, the head of the directorate forcefully supported diversity initiatives, even publicly threatening to fire senior-level employees who did not cooperate.

The diversity process within the Directorate began with an organizational audit. Some 80 employees from different sections and levels within the organization were each requested to discuss diversity issues with three to four peers. Then these 80 employees participated (in separate groups for managers, engineers, technicians, and administrative staff) in two days of discussions; a high level of candour in these discussions was supported by an organizational climate with low fear of retaliation and high expectations that good ideas would be acted upon. The head of the directorate and his senior staff then met for a day to review the groups' discussions and develop a strategy for training and related initiatives. This process led to efforts, considered of approximately equal importance, in diversity training, employee recruitment, and employment practices (e.g., performance appraisals, salary decisions, and career development).

Consistent with its long association with the engineering profession and the military establishment, the Laboratory and its employees generally present a conservative, "buttoned up," deliberate appearance. In marked contrast, the person selected to lead their diversity training combines a

high level of competence with a personal style featuring confidence, energy, charm, and more than a little flamboyance; the Directorate's leadership considered this contrast in styles useful in enhancing her impact as a catalyst for change. Rosalyn Taylor O'Neale is an African American woman with graduate training in organizational systems and several decades of experience in diversity, including ten years as United States Valuing Differences Manager for a leading computer manufacturer, Digital Equipment Corporation. O'Neale worked with Laboratory internal staff throughout the planning process just described. Then, between 1992 and 1996, she conducted nearly 100 training sessions to cover all 1,800 employees in the Engineering Directorate.

Training was provided at two levels:

- C A *basic* class, lasting eight hours, was mandatory for all employees. The principal goal was to raise employees' awareness of diversity issues. Through concrete examples, material was presented on topics such as the role of diversity in Laboratory productivity and marketing, differences between diversity and affirmative action, legal ramifications of discriminatory behaviour, the role of stereotypes in how individuals are judged, issues of social comfort and the inclusion or exclusion of individuals from informal interaction, the impact of upbringing on adults' behaviour, and cultural differences in how people present themselves.
- C An *advanced* class, lasting 12 hours, was mandatory for managers, from senior Directorate executives to first-level supervisors. In this class, the emphasis shifted from awareness to practical skills. Classroom discussion was organized around how to handle four case studies involving such topics as an employee who spoke with an accent, an employee undergoing gender transformation, and employees expressing "white backlash."

Among directorate staff, there is considerable consensus that this training generally raised employees' sensitivity to diversity issues, promoted workplace discussion about issues previously considered too sensitive to raise, and increased the number of conflicts that are resolved before they require senior-management attention. Employees readily cite specific ideas from their training that they have subsequently applied in work situations. For example, an Hispanic female employee stated that when a co-worker makes a comment she finds offensive, she learned to signal her concern immediately by saying, "Ouch." A manager reported that he had learned that Asians are trained by their culture not to brag, so that when he interviews Asian job applicants, he questions them to draw out accomplishments and qualifications that they might not otherwise mention.

Shirley McWilliams, the Laboratory's Manager of Recruiting and Diversity for Engineering, had played central roles in the assessment process, the design of training, and the selection of O'Neale as trainer. While training was being delivered to directorate staff, McWilliams coordinated work on the recruiting and employment practices that directorate leadership had targeted for change. She brought to this role an unwavering commitment and a view of diversity as a long-term, ongoing process rather than a one-time programme. The activities she shepherded included a review of pay equity, revisions of criteria for evaluating employee performance, expansion of the range of universities from which employees were recruited, and training of diversity coaches.

Organizational cultures are not transformed overnight, and a visitor comparing the Laboratory in 1998 to the same organization in 1988 would probably be at least as struck by continuity as by change. Nevertheless, in diffuse ways, the Engineering Directorate appears to be somewhat more diverse, probably a somewhat more welcoming place for minorities and women to work, and perhaps even a more flexible, creative, and productive work environment. Diversity training seems to have contributed modestly but usefully to that evolution.

5.7. Manpower, Inc.

Manpower, Inc. employs 12,500 workers to staff its headquarters in the Midwestern city of Milwaukee and its 2,200 operating offices around the world. But every work day, it employs another 825,000 persons to send out as temporary clerical workers, manufacturing assemblers, labourers, and professional and technical employees at some 250,000 client firms. With \$8.9 billion in annual sales, Manpower is the world's largest labour market intermediary.

The staffing industry¹ in the United States has a complex record with regard to discrimination. On the one hand, temporary jobs employ millions of persons, particularly persons with little work experience, limited personal contacts linking them to job opportunities, or commitments that prevent them from seeking permanent employment. These characteristics imply that women, recent immigrants, and racial/ethnic minorities are often disproportionately represented among workers placed by staffing agencies, and these groups importantly benefit from the earnings and potential mobility to permanent employment that such temporary jobs provide (Belous, 1989; Bendick, 1989). On the other hand, when *some* employers turn to staffing agencies for temporary or permanent workers, either explicitly or implicitly they expect the agencies to screen out "undesirable" job candidates, sometimes defining their preferences in illegally discriminatory ways (for example, an office seeking to hire a receptionist might request a "young, attractive, white woman."), and some employment agencies accommodate such requests. Both systematic research and recurrent discrimination litigation testify to the continued prevalence of this problem.²

Despite the prominence of this issue within their industry, when approached to respond to the telephone survey for the present study, virtually none of the leading for-profit staffing firms in the United States was willing to participate. In some cases, this refusal reflected firms' doing little or no anti-discrimination training; in other cases, firms were reluctant to subject any aspect of their practices with regard to discrimination to outside examination. The sole exception was Manpower. In many areas of its operations -- including information technology, employee training, qualifications certification, and internationalization -- Manpower has an established reputation as an innovative industry leader. Apparently, anti-discrimination training should be added to this list.

¹The staffing industry includes firms that supply temporary employees to other firms (a relationship often referred to as contract employment) and those that identify and place permanent employees. Many firms in the industry provide both types of services, but Manpower specializes in the former.

²In particular, "testing" studies on random samples of employment agencies in the United States have documented discrimination against young African American and Hispanic job seekers by 67 per cent -- *two out of three* -- of employment agencies examined (Bendick, Jackson, and Reinoso, 1994). See also Rogers and Barrett (forthcoming), pp. 15-17.

At the centre of Manpower's leadership within its industry and the company's growth and prosperity is its *Predictable Performance System*, an approach to placement operations that the company has been utilizing, and continuously improving, since the 1970's. Under this system, all 1,200 operating offices in the United States¹ follow standardized procedures for defining client needs, assessing employee qualifications, and matching the two. The system includes formal skills tests that have been validated as non-discriminatory by industrial psychologists, as well as specific checklists and procedures for analysing each client's work environment and tasks to be performed. The primary goal of this standardization is client satisfaction with the temporary staff sent to them. As an additional benefit, when the system bases placement decisions solely on employees' abilities to perform required tasks, it leaves little room for other considerations in these decisions, including discriminatory ones.

To ensure that all offices consistently implement the company's standardized procedures, Manpower mandates two stages of training for all service representatives and managers who operate its local offices:

- C When these employees first join the firm, they spend their first month in training at their local office under the supervision of the office's manager. Instruction is delivered via training manuals, reference manuals, videotapes, and quizzes developed at corporate headquarters, interspersed with on-the-job practice. This training includes basic information on equal opportunity law, as well as company-specified procedures for complying with the law. For example, trainees are given a one page "script" describing how to respond when a customer presents a discriminatory order.
- C About four months after being hired, each service representative or manager travels to corporate headquarters to participate in a Professional Services Seminar reinforcing and amplifying their initial training. Instruction is delivered to groups of 25 to 30 trainees and lasts 37.5 hours over one week. These seminars are led by training specialists employed at corporate headquarters. The company's legal department makes a presentation on employment discrimination law and related company policies, and trainees engage in role-playing exercises to practice applying these policies in practical situations.

Although both of these training activities include segments in which discrimination is the explicit topic, in an important sense the subject is addressed throughout the process. The ultimate goal of this training is to ensure that, although operating staff are scattered in hundreds of small offices across the nation, they all conform to the organization's corporate culture, consistently implement its standardized procedures, and present a uniform image to customers. The dominant concept in that interrelated package of corporate culture, procedures, and image is objectively-measured performance ability. The company seeks to attract and hold customers in this highly competitive industry by providing temporary employees whose performance is guaranteed to match clients' requirements. It seeks to attract able temporary employees in a highly competitive labour market by offering opportunities and earnings reflecting the skills employees possess. Thus, in effect, the principal way that Manpower addresses discrimination is by sending a consistent message to customers and employees alike that it is incompatible with the company's style of operation.

¹In Manpower's more than 1,000 offices outside the United States, these procedures are currently implemented to varying degrees.

Manpower believes that this approach is generally effective in controlling discrimination within its operations. It receives only a small number of formal discrimination complaints annually, despite employing a large, diverse workforce. Similarly, according to the company officials interviewed during this study, its ongoing audits of local office operations, which include surveys of customers and temporary employees,¹ reveal few problems related to this issue, and those that are observed are dealt with without hesitation. Where necessary, staff -- including some at high levels in the organization -- have been dismissed.

Concerning those aspects of its training that address discrimination explicitly, Manpower rates them as having modest benefits, consistent with their modest scale. In particular, they are seen as having modest positive effects on trainees' *awareness* of discrimination issues, *attitudes* toward protected groups, and trainees' *behaviour* on the job. The only subject on which they perceive that the training provides major benefits is expanding the *personnel practices* of which trainees are aware and can apply in their daily activities. However, when training is viewed in its broader role -- as one means of maintaining a corporate culture in which discrimination would be discordant and counterproductive -- then training's effects appear to be more than modest. Ultimately, Manpower addresses discrimination through what one company official referred to as a "law of accumulation," an approach to quality improvement which emphasizes the eventual aggregate benefits if each employee does just one thing just a little better. Discrimination training appears to be just one of many aspects of Manpower's operation in which such cumulate effects are central to the company's success.

5.8. Methodist Health Systems, Inc.

In the world of increasingly complex health care technology and management, Methodist Health Systems, Inc. is itself a highly complex institution. This non-profit organization operates 12 hospitals, a network of primary care clinics, 15 home health care agencies, and related health care management services throughout the city of Memphis, western Tennessee, and the state of Mississippi.

Diversity impacts these operations on multiple fronts. Methodist's 11,000 employees range from 2,000 highly-paid, highly-educated health care professionals (such as physicians) to maintenance workers, kitchen staff, and health care aides earning the minimum wage. This workforce is 80 per cent female and 50 per cent African American. Concurrently, the population to whom Methodist provides health care services is both urban and rural, young and old (50 per cent of its hospital care days are delivered to elderly patients), affluent and poor, 50 per cent African American, and 60 per cent female.

Among these dimensions of diversity, however, race historically occupies a particularly prominent position in the region in which Methodist operates. From the days of slave-holding ending in the 1860's, through the civil rights revolution of the 1960's, and continuing through the present, racial segregation, race discrimination in many aspects of daily life, and the linkages between race and poverty have remained contentious in many aspects of public policy, economic activity, and social relationships in the region.

¹Manpower's system for monitoring quality in its operations is certified under ISO 9000, indicating that it meets high international standards of sophistication and consistency.

During the 1970's and 1980's, Memphis and its surrounding area, long a region of slow economic growth and low incomes, began to enjoy rapid economic growth based in large part on attracting production facilities and headquarters of major corporations, including the world headquarters of Federal Express. Local civic leaders, economic development officials, and executives of area corporations increasingly came to view the region's contentious race relations as an impediment to these long-sought developments. In 1979, these leaders created a non-profit organization, Goals for Memphis, to expand the region's bi-racial consensus, enhance the quality of life for all racial groups, and improve the region's public image concerning race. By 1993, Goals for Memphis had identified training to improve race relations in the workplace as an important element of its programme and created a subsidiary, the Memphis Race Relations and Diversity Institute, to implement this aspect of its programme. Subsequently, the Institute has expanded its diversity work beyond race alone, separated from Goals for Memphis to become a separate non-profit organization, and adopted a more broadly-focused name, the Memphis Diversity Institute (MDI).

Methodist Health Systems is one of MDI's major clients. Early in the 1990's, Methodist had initiated a number of cautious, exploratory diversity activities, including lectures on minority entrepreneurship and women's experiences with the "glass ceiling." Motivating these actions was a mixture of moral imperatives (the organization is related to the Methodist Church) and pragmatic goals (the need, in a highly competitive medical market, to attract and serve patients from a wide range of backgrounds). By the mid-1990's, these concerns were propelling the organization beyond such initial steps. An internal Diversity Committee was formed to develop an organization-wide strategy, and MDI was hired to audit Methodist's diversity climate through a series of 16 employee focus groups, an employee survey to which 4,059 responses were obtained, interviews with senior management, and analysis of employment statistics. Based on this audit and other inputs,¹ the Committee presented detailed recommendations to management in 1996. They recommended that Methodist hire a senior-level internal director of diversity, establish a minority purchasing programme, develop a comprehensive diversity communication strategy, and implement staff diversity training. In some form, all these recommendations were promptly implemented.

MDI subsequently became the primary vehicle for carrying out Methodist's commitment to diversity training. The Institute's standard diversity workshop, lasting two days, is led by trainers with substantial business experience including staff loaned by leading local corporations. As currently delivered, the workshop emphasizes understanding diversity issues (e.g., the evolving composition of the workforce, the influence of stereotypes on how individuals are viewed, differences between affirmative action and managing diversity, and ways in which diversity contributes to workforce productivity) rather than specific practices to be followed in the workplace.

Although diversity training in the United States is most commonly delivered to employees of a single firm, MDI's most typical training is presented at the Institute's headquarters in downtown Memphis to groups of about 25 trainees from different employers. This approach facilitates trainees' learning from the experience of other companies, although it increases the burden on trainees to apply their learning in their home work environment. During its first three years, MDI delivered workshops to more than 2,600 employees from 160 companies.

¹These other inputs included an informal "benchmarking" survey by the Committee of diversity practices at 29 leading corporations across the United States

Among the attendees at these sessions over the past two years have been all senior executives of Methodist Health Systems, including the Chief Executive Officer. In the long run, Methodist intends that all its 11,000 employees will receive such training, although probably in a one day format rather than MDI's two day version and probably delivered by Methodist staff whom MDI has trained as trainers rather by the Institute itself.

Training is not Methodist's only activity directed at improving its diversity management. Other activities aimed at systemic change range from reviewing the organization's fringe benefit policies for their compatibility with employees' diverse family situations, to deepening its analysis of the reasons for high staff turnover, to exploring systems for career development such as mentoring.¹

In many important senses, both Methodist and MDI are only beginning to plumb the depths of diversity issues. Methodist knows that its training task is far from complete in terms of the numbers of employees who have been trained, and MDI knows that its training programmes are far from complete in terms of content, especially in their limited provision of practical behavioural skills. Methodist recognizes that it has not implemented all the system changes that it needs to undertake, and MDI recognizes that the same is true for many of its client companies. In this process of searching for solutions, the diversity training and other assistance that MDI has supplied to Methodist Health Systems might appropriately be judged a helpful and hopeful start.

5.9. Microsoft Corporation

The personal computer revolution that started in the 1980's catapulted Microsoft Corporation from an obscure startup company to one of the most influential businesses on earth. From its headquarters in a suburb of Seattle, its 22,000 employees constantly reshape the technology that increasingly dominates workplaces, homes, and schools worldwide.

The working environment within this unusual company contains many unique features. Hiring is extraordinarily selective, with more than 15,000 applications screened each month to yield only 200 hires. The professional staff, whose average age is only 26, includes a number of individuals whose technical skills are more fully developed than their interpersonal skills. Many employees have become wealthy at a young age through stock options. Long hours, high enthusiasm, constant change, and creative self-expression dominate the working atmosphere.

Such an environment generates diversity issues in somewhat unusual forms. Blatant racism or explicit sexual harassment tend to be relatively rare concerns. Female and minority employees rate the company highly as a place to work and reflect this satisfaction in turnover rates lower than their white, male counterparts. However, in an atmosphere of aggressiveness and youthful high spirits, insensitive humour sometimes crosses the lines of propriety. A corporate culture emphasizing the excitement of work can become intolerant of individuals who have personal or family responsibilities. Pride in the firm's many inventive contributions can spawn arrogant rejection of ideas originating elsewhere. And a staff which includes few racial and ethnic minorities may have less ability to develop products attractive to all potential consumers.²

¹MDI itself consistently seeks to promote such *systemic* approaches. It sometimes refers to its training primarily as a marketing tool for its broader range of consulting services, and it is reluctant to provide training services to firms which are not committed to longer-term, comprehensive efforts.

²In the early years of the personal computer era, the population of computer users was dominated by individuals who resembled Microsoft staff both in their technical expertise and their narrow demographic

To address such issues, Microsoft began in 1992 to assemble a small diversity staff within its Human Resources Department. This group, currently consisting of five employees, is responsible for diversity strategy, diversity training, affirmative action planning, special recruitment initiatives,¹ and diversity consulting for the entire corporation.²

The primary training initiative offered by Microsoft's diversity staff is a course entitled "The Business of Diversity," which has been delivered to some 4,500 employees attending either on a voluntary basis or, in some work groups, at the direction of their supervisor. The course provides an introduction to diversity concepts, an appreciation of the ways diversity affects Microsoft's workforce and customers, and suggestions for how to react with increased sensitivity when trainees encounter diversity-related situations in their workplace. That final objective is promoted through four videotaped scenarios, each lasting about three minutes, which were written and filmed by Microsoft's own film production department based on actual incidents reported by company employees. In sharp contrast to the multi-day format typical for diversity training at most other firms, Microsoft's diversity course lasts only three hours.

The brevity of this course, the creative use of software to address diversity concerns, and the unusual diversity issues facing the firm all differentiate Microsoft from most other employers in the United States. Eventually, the firm's approach to diversity may prove to be either a pioneering model to be widely imitated or a naive oversimplification of inherently complex issues. For the moment, it might most appropriately be regarded as yet another creative possibility emerging from Microsoft's powerful, innovative empire.

5.10. The Nationwide Insurance Enterprise

backgrounds (primarily white and Asian). However, the future which Microsoft now envisions for personal computers is as pervasive, user-friendly "computing appliances" in every home and workplace. In that future, the demographic characteristics of the users of Microsoft products will evolve to resemble that of the population as a whole, which is considerably more diverse than that of Microsoft's current staff.

¹The highly specialized skills required of software developers at Microsoft often frustrate the company's desire to broaden the demographic characteristics of its staff. To address this issue, the diversity team works with colleges and universities, especially those serving under-represented groups, to develop courses that prepare students to meet Microsoft's hiring requirements.

²Consistent with Microsoft's culture, the staff utilizes computer technology to manage this substantial workload. For example:

- C Every new employee automatically receives an e-mail message listing 13 race, gender, and other demographic affinity groups available to join (e.g., Blacks at Microsoft).
- C Employees wishing to file a discrimination complaint can do so using a on-line form.
- C Managers concerned about whether a possible action would affect employees of different demographic backgrounds equitably can perform statistical analyses using an on-line computer programme.
- C Employees seeking advice about how to handle common diversity issues can consult an on-line manual.
- C All job vacancies at Microsoft are listed on the company's website, which is accessible both throughout the firm and worldwide.

During the 1920's, a small subsidiary of a farmer's association in a Midwestern state, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, started selling life insurance and property insurance to the organization's members (Franklin, 1994). Some 70 years later, that modest effort has evolved into the Nationwide Insurance Enterprise, a financial services behemoth offering a broad range of insurance and investment products to households and businesses in all 50 states, generating annual revenues of \$12.6 billion, and employing 29,000 workers at its headquarters in Columbus, Ohio and across the United States

Until the early 1990's, Nationwide's attention to matters of discrimination and diversity consisted primarily of conventional equal employment opportunity policies and activities. However, in the late 1980's, the firm's Vice President for Human Resources began to call the attention of the Chief Executive Officer to the evolving composition of the firm's workforce. Widely-publicized race, age, and gender employment discrimination litigation against one of Nationwide's major competitors advanced this interest. Concurrently, the company was beginning to explore markets for its products that it had previously not pursued, including urban minority households. This interest gained additional currency when the federal government sued the firm for discriminatory "redlining" in these markets. The role of litigation in sparking the firm's interest in diversity should not be over-emphasized, however. The firm's primary motivation was an awareness of long term trends that made attracting and retaining a diverse workforce important for both productivity and customer relations.

To develop this awareness in more detail, Nationwide hired Simmons Associates, Inc., a diversity training/consulting firm headquartered near Philadelphia, to conduct a diversity audit. The consultants' activities were led by Terrence Simmons, an African American with several decades of experience as a human resource executive and diversity consultant at major firms. In 1994, Nationwide created a full-time position of Diversity Manager within its human resources department and filled the post with a white woman who had previously been a university professor of counselling.

After completing the diversity audit, Simmons was commissioned to design and deliver diversity training to Nationwide's senior executives. He and his staff subsequently delivered training, lasting one day and a half, to all managerial-level employees. Each business unit within Nationwide was then made responsible for training all their non-managerial employees (a process now nearly complete), and ensuring that newly-hired employees receive training as they join the company. To fulfill this mandate, the business units could draw upon a cadre of 80 Nationwide employees trained by Simmons to deliver a one day version of his training.

Except for adaptations to different lengths of presentation and different audiences within the firm, all the courses developed by Simmons for Nationwide follow the same basic structure. They begin with an explanation of the concept of diversity, a catalogue of 16 principal dimensions on which individuals differ, and a discussion of how diversity relates to more familiar concepts such as affirmative action. Then, the "business case" for diversity is presented, emphasizing ways in which a diverse workforce assists Nationwide to be more productive, customer-responsive, and profitable. That discussion is followed by an exploration of gender and racial bias and the ways in which individuals experience "vectors of force" (or "headwinds" and "tailwinds") in their work lives based on bias for or against the demographic groups to which they belong. The session closes with a discussion of accountability for improving diversity management within the company and actions that trainees might implement to follow up their classroom experience.

In addressing each of these topics, training leaders begin by presenting information and ideas through lectures and handouts. However, the majority of class time is spent on exercises in which trainees actively discuss the material presented to them. For example, after the concept of bias as “vectors of force” is presented, trainees are divided into small groups in which they apply the concept to three case studies from the workplace (one involving orientation of new employees, one concerning employee productivity, and one addressing the “glass ceiling”).

To a degree unusual among large firms in the United States, Nationwide’s approach to diversity management relies on persuasion rather than mandates. In these efforts to persuade, the company’s Chief Executive Officer acts as a highly visible spokesperson, making repeated statements and prominent public appearances signalling his support. Selected appointments of women and minorities to executive positions and seats on the corporate board, combined with retirement of senior executives not supportive of the concept, have increased the number of role models and advocates in influential positions within the firm. Business units have been provided with a detailed manual outlining possible diversity activities and other innovative techniques for personnel management. And mandatory diversity training has delivered the message directly to every Nationwide employee.

Such efforts have influenced the attitudes that prevail among Nationwide’s staff. In the most recent biennial company-wide survey, about 90 per cent of employees agreed with the proposition that a diverse work force makes their company stronger. However, a more critical question is whether such a gradual approach suffices in the rapidly-changing environment in which the firm operates. Nationwide faces increasing competition as banks and other non-traditional providers enter the insurance market. Its market share is further threatened by the shrinkage, as a proportion of the nation’s population, of the middle-class, white, suburban and rural households that have been its traditional customer base. The demographic characteristics of the company’s workforce is diversifying at a very high rate, and developments in the firm’s work processes (such as increased use of work teams) dramatically increase the importance of effective interpersonal relationships. While few observers would fault Nationwide for the direction in which it is moving, some might question whether it is moving fast enough.

5.11. Owens Corning

Owens Corning, Inc. (OC) is a manufacturer of industrial materials, especially building materials such as fibreglass insulation, with 24,000 employees and \$4.3 billion in annual revenues. Founded in 1930 and headquartered in the small Midwestern city of Toledo, Ohio, the firm enjoyed more than 50 years of slow but steady growth under a combination of innovative product development and conservative, grow-from-within management. In the aggressive business climate in the United States in the 1980’s, that conservative management style made the company a target for a hostile takeover. The recapitalization used to defeat the takeover left the company with a multi-billion dollar debt that, in turn, made the firm even more conservative (e.g., by discouraging financially-risky product innovations and eliminating nearly all hiring of new employees for seven years).

In 1992, Glen Hiner, an executive from General Electric, was hired as the first “outsider” Chief Executive Officer in the company’s history. He articulated ambitious goals for the firm: transform its product line from individual building components to comprehensive building material systems; expand annual sales to \$5 billion; increase international sales to 40 per cent of revenues; enhance productivity six per cent a year; and have profitability grow twice as fast as sales. To support these ambitions, he radically raised expectations for individuals’ performance and sought

profound changes in the firm's staid corporate culture, processes he estimated would take five years or more to institutionalize. Soon the company's historic headquarters building had been replaced by an ultra-modern facility featuring open offices; half a dozen senior executives had been replaced; and a new sense of possibility pervaded the firm (Stewart, 1997).

For Hiner, diversity was, above all else, a way to broaden the company's vision and create an organization where flexibility, openness to new ideas, and continuous learning would support his ambitious performance targets. He argued that a more diverse workforce would promote the internationalization of the firm, assist in sales to demographically-diverse domestic markets, and provide talented employees who could increase productivity.

Having made diversity central to his strategy for the firm, Hiner became indefatigable in keeping the subject in front of his employees. In his first meeting with senior executives, he is reported to have bluntly stated, "We are too white and too male, and that will change."¹ In partial fulfillment of that prediction, he appointed two women to the formerly all-male 12 member corporate board of directors² and five women, including one woman of colour, to the firm's formerly all-male, all-white corps of 50 vice presidents. He ordered that employees' business cards state the company's three core values, and this statement set *individual dignity* (the base of diversity, as OC conceptualizes it) equal to *customer satisfaction* and *shareholder value*. When he made yearly conferences with the company's top 120 executives a principal mechanism of his leadership, he devoted several days of one early conference to diversity and made the subject a recurrent theme of other conferences. In reviewing senior-level hiring decisions, he constantly questioned whether minorities, women, or citizens of other countries were considered as job candidates. In annual performance reviews for his senior managers, he paid prominent attention not only to financial goals but also nonfinancial goals, including diversity.³

For assistance in diversity, Owens Corning formed a long-term relationship with a for-profit consulting/training firm, the Kaleidoscope Group, LLC, an affiliate of Bea Young Associates. This firm is led by Bea Young, whose 30 years of experience as a diversity consultant to large companies makes her one of the most experienced practitioners in the field. She is joined by four

¹That bold statement had both a positive and a negative effect on subsequent developments within the firm. On the positive side, it captured managers' attention and helped to mobilize rapid change. On the other hand, it tended to set an adversarial tone and created intergroup tensions that then had to be defused.

²Hiner's choice of these women reflected the breadth of his definition vision of diversity. While their gender diversified the Board in one sense, he selected women who would simultaneously broaden it in other dimensions as well. One of the women is an expert in materials technology, and the other is experienced in retailing, perspectives which other directors do not possess.

³In common with many large corporations, many aspects of individuals' performance at OC are measured in quantitative terms, such as productivity increases, sales increases, or return on investment. In such firms, quantitative goals often carry greater weight than those on which performance is evaluated more subjectively. Hiner feels that establishing numerical goals for diversity would be counter-productive in his evaluation of senior executives. However, the firm is now experimenting with such measures in selected business units and production plants, using indices such as the number of hires from under-represented groups, staff turnover, and the number of discrimination complaints filed.

partners,¹ one of whom, Michael Kilgore, has lead responsibility for work with OC and has spent the majority of his time with them for nearly five years.

Although training is typically part of Kaleidoscope's work with its clients, the firm views itself not as the deliverer of isolated training events but as long-term organizational development consultants, devising and implementing strategies for cultural change. In their ideally-balanced diversity process, training absorbs only about *one-third* of the time and resources. Equal efforts precede training (in assessing issues, developing strategies, and customizing training materials) and follow it (in activities reinforcing training, cultivation of diversity councils and supporting systems such as demographic affinity networks and coaching processes, and modifying company practices and procedures).

Consistent with this ideal, Owens Corning's work on diversity, with pervasive advice and assistance from Kaleidoscope, has included establishment of the post of Director of Diversity; an initial organizational assessment, conducted by Kaleidoscope in 1994 using focus groups and interviews; presentations to senior management on the results of the assessment and on diversity more generally; a day-long group dialogue between senior managers and lower-level employees from under-represented groups; individual planning meetings among the Director of Diversity, the Vice President for Human Resources, and the head of each operating division; establishment of diversity councils at corporate headquarters and branch plants; development of systems for monitoring the demographic characteristics of the company's workforce; distribution of a first-ever diversity survey to all professional employees; and modifications in company personnel practices (e.g., establishing an electronic bulletin board to advertise job vacancies company-wide, giving managers more international assignments to broaden their experience, and promoting informal mentoring for women and minority employees).

Owens Corning is committed to providing diversity training to all its 6,000 salaried employees, and Kaleidoscope is implementing that commitment, in two day sessions for groups of 25 to 30 trainees, as OC's budget permits.² The first day of this training is devoted to conceptual understanding of diversity, with the training material made directly relevant to OC by examining eight diversity issues identified in Kaleidoscope's 1994 organizational assessment. During the second day, the trainees divide into small, demographically-mixed teams to design actions addressing problems discussed the previous day.

With regard to the diversity aspects of its corporate culture, Owens Corning in 1998 can reasonably be described as an organization in transition. Although the company's managerial ranks remain predominantly white and male, some women and minorities now occupy positions unprecedented for them half a dozen years ago. While many employees have yet to receive diversity training and others have passed through the training silently unconvinced, many employees have emerged with broadened understandings and increased openness. Although informal social networks still keep "outsiders" from feeling fully at home at the firm, and women and racial/ethnic minorities continue to rate the firm as only average as a place to work, many

¹Kaleidoscope has 18 permanent employees, as well as relationships with about 20 consultants who can be brought in for temporary high-volume assignments such as training a large work-force in a short period. The firm is a "virtual company," with its headquarters in Chicago coordinating the activities of partners and associates located all over the United States.

²In the long run, Owens Corning plans to train all of its 11,000 hourly employees as well, and some 2,500 have already been trained. To make the remaining volume less expensive, Kaleidoscope has been designing and pilot-testing a one-day version of its class that could be delivered to groups as large as 100.

formal company systems have been revamped to increase their inclusiveness. Among manufacturing plants located across the country, while the production workforce at some locations remains overwhelmingly white and male, it has become substantially more diverse at other locations (especially newer plants, where diversity processes were in place during the plant's initial hiring). And while women and racial/ethnic minorities still tend to sit apart from their white, male coworkers in the company cafeteria, crude gender humour and use of racial epithets on the shop floor have been substantially curtailed.

When they began to work on diversity together nearly five years ago, both Glen Hiner and the staff of Kaleidoscope recognized that they faced a long-term challenge. Today, they might derive satisfaction from the fact that, while the pace of change has not been fast, its direction has always seemed clear, and their efforts appear to have been the driving force. Training might reasonably be judged one important component in this overall process.

5.12. Pacific Enterprises, Gas Transmission Division

Through its operating arms -- the Southern California Gas Company, San Diego Gas and Electric, and several smaller entities -- Pacific Enterprises is the dominant energy production and distribution utility for the sprawling Southern California region and its 18 million residents. The firm is a private, for-profit company, but its rates and many aspects of its operations are supervised by government regulatory bodies. This traditionally-stable operating arrangement is now undergoing dramatic transformation as utility deregulation sharply reduces public-sector control and increases market competition. Deregulation has shaken all aspects of the company's operations, perhaps most stressfully through staff reductions from 16,000 to 8,600 employees.¹

As a company serving the general public under close regulatory scrutiny, the company had for many years argued that its workforce should be a microcosm of the ethnically-diverse community that it serves.² With increasing pressure to be cost competitive under deregulation and workforce downsizing, this argument for diversity has increasingly been joined by an emphasis on diversity's benefits in terms of staff productivity. To support the latter argument, the company cites the results of an employee survey in which minority employees estimated that they were contributing only 65 per cent of their capacity and women employees estimated that they were contributing only 75 per cent of their capacity, in contrast to white male employees who reported that they were contributing 90 per cent of their capacity. Widespread under-utilization of human resources is simply not acceptable in a competitive, downsized operation.³

Over the past 25 years, numerical goals and timetables for advancement of women and minorities, combined with outreach and mentoring efforts to expand the pool of job candidates, have

¹These figures exclude employees in the San Diego Gas and Electric Company, which recently merged with Pacific Enterprises.

²Southern California is one of the most ethnically-diverse regions in the United States. An extreme example is Los Angeles County where, among nine million residents, 39 per cent are Hispanic, 11 per cent are Asian, and 11 per cent are African American; 33 per cent were born outside the United States; and 45 per cent live in households where a language other than English is spoken (United States Bureau of the Census, 1994, pp. 46-47).

³The company has also conducted controlled experiments on the productivity of workteams with different compositions. These studies concluded that, although their work processes tend to be slower, demographically-diverse work teams are more productive than homogeneous ones.

significantly modified the demographic profile of the company, especially in entry-level positions. Today, some 50 per cent of all employees are minorities (slightly above the state population's average of 48 per cent), and 33 per cent are women (despite a work force largely employed in technical and manual jobs, for which the supply of women is historically limited). However, the firm's attempts to move beyond such initial progress have been cautious. Over the past seven years, a corporate Office of Diversity Affairs has been established, diversity language been written into the Company's official statement of "Beliefs and Behavior," and diversity has become a performance criterion by which managers are evaluated. However, it is only one of 30 such criteria. And, although a number of senior level-managers were known to be unsupportive of diversity, no training for senior managers was initiated until 1997. In that year, an outside consultant, Innovations International, delivered one-day training sessions titled "Diversity, Empowerment and Leadership." Attendance at this training was mandatory for the 110 highest-ranking executives in the firm.¹

Initiatives to promote diversity outside senior management have encountered even greater resistance. Consider, for example, the company's Gas Transmission Division, whose 475 employees are spread from downtown Los Angeles to remote pumping stations in the Mojave desert. Within this entity, traditional race, ethnic, or gender conflicts emerge periodically — for example, in issues of disrespectful treatment of women at isolated rural work sites and offensive ethnic humour. Perhaps equally common are conflicts among employees along cultural dimensions other than race or gender (for example, differences between rural and urban employees in their judgments about spending money to repair equipment). Interpersonal tensions have also risen in the Division from the company's downsizing (which shocked many employees who had previously assumed that they had lifetime employment) and a company initiative to enhance productivity by empowering front line workers (which has required first-level supervisors to manage in a new, more coaching, delegating style where workers to learn to take responsibility for more decisions). Employee discontentment about diversity in this division has centred among high-seniority, non-supervisory white male employees who have experienced all these unsettling changes concurrently.

Into this environment came an offer from Pacific Enterprise's corporate diversity office² to provide diversity training to all employees in the Gas Transmission Division if the division would pay for attendees' time to attend. The immediate trigger for this offer was complaints arising from inappropriate race/ethnic/gender humour, but the corporation's diversity staff also viewed it as an opportunity to pilot-test a programme that could later be applied company-wide. The offer appealed to the head of the division, a white male with more than three decades of experience with the company who is widely recognized as a skilled leader. His enthusiasm partially reflected what he had learned in the diversity training he had attended with his fellow senior managers. But equally it reflected his belief that this training might enhance employee productivity and reduce operating costs, his ever-pressing concerns.

Jointly with the head of the company's diversity office, the division head met with the two principals in the Los Angeles-based diversity training firm of Gardenswartz and Rowe. Lee Gardenswartz and Anita Rowe, both white females with doctoral degrees, several decades of experience in diversity training, and a strong reputation based on having trained many diversity

¹When 75 of the 110 managers failed to accept an initial invitation to attend, the firm's Chief Executive Officer personally called them to insist.

²The company's Office of Diversity Affairs, with a professional staff of three, handles employee diversity, supplier diversity, equal employment opportunity, and affirmative action corporate-wide.

trainers nationwide and having developed a widely-used “toolkit” of diversity training materials and exercises. The head of the Division emphasized to the consultants that he wanted diversity to be an on-going initiative rather than an isolated, one-time training programme. For this reason, as well as for reasons of cost minimization, they selected a “train-the-trainer” approach, in which Gardenswartz and Rowe would prepare a cadre of company employees as *trainer/advocates*. These trainer/advocates would first lead training for their peer workers. Then, after returning to their regular work assignments, they would form an infrastructure of diversity advisors available throughout the organization.

In response to a request for volunteers, about 20 potential trainer/advocates were identified, drawn from the ranks of first-line supervisors and front line workers. Some were minorities or women, but others were high-seniority white males. These volunteers were given three days of training by Gardenswartz and Rowe, during which they learned diversity concepts and worked as a group to adapt Gardenswartz and Rowe’s training materials to the Division’s environment. In retrospect, this stage represented one of the most successful parts of the activity, with management pleasantly surprised by the number and diversity of the volunteers and their enthusiasm and initiative.

The next stage produced more uncertain results. Training eventually was rolled out to some 600 employees of the Division, each attending for half a day. For the most part, work groups were trained as intact units. The sessions opened with a videotaped message from the head of the Division emphasizing the importance of teamwork. The training which followed focused on raising employees’ awareness of diversity issues and increasing their understanding of concepts such as the difference between diversity and affirmative action, the role of stereotypes in interpersonal interaction, and the importance of personal respect, communication, and teamwork in the workplace. Given the brevity of the training, relatively little time was available to develop skills for improved interpersonal interaction.

One positive outcome from this training was that controversial issues that had underlain interpersonal tensions were brought to the surface and explicitly discussed. Participants did seem to gain some enhanced awareness of diversity issues, although in many cases, this enhanced understanding was very basic (e.g., “I did not realize that you would find that joke offensive.”). Furthermore, because the training used peer trainers and was highly interactive -- both innovations in training style for this company -- it advanced the long-term corporate goal of modernizing human resource management practices. On the other hand, in some sessions, a substantial amount of time was devoted to unproductive personal denials (“I’m not prejudiced.”); many trainees did not modify their pre-training perception of diversity as a direct competition among ethnic/gender groups; some white males interpreted the training primarily as a warning that their traditional dominance was threatened; and some other trainees, such as women and minorities, complained that the company raised many issues without planning for, or committing to, resolving them. An employee survey comparing circumstances six months after training to the work environment before training showed little change.

Pacific Enterprise’s management views diversity as a long-term process and can readily articulate the importance of placing training into a broader programme for system change. However, the firm is moving very slowly to implement such a programme. In part this slowness reflects a company tradition of being more a follower than a leader on many aspects of human resources management.¹ In other part, it is due to the company’s still not having demonstrated a consistent commitment to

¹For example, Pacific Enterprises adopted flexible fringe benefits only three years ago, while early-adopting employers did so as long as 15 years ago.

diversity. For example, the Gas Transmission Division adopted diversity as one of seven operating priorities for 1997, parallel with cost reduction. However, division employees are constantly reminded of the cost goal by a graph posted at every operating unit plotting cost per unit of production over time, while no parallel visible indicators for measuring progress has been implemented for diversity. Similarly, the company has an Employee Diversity Council, with 25 members drawn from different levels and organizational components throughout the corporation. This council meets monthly, hears interesting speakers, and deliberates a range of issues, but it seems to have little proactive power. And, in the Gas Transmission Division, although the trainer/advisors remain available for assignments related to diversity, plans remain vague concerning how to utilize them.

In short, within Pacific Enterprises, diversity training may well have been undertaken on too small a scale, and too far in advance of complementary initiatives, to have substantial impact.

5.13. United Food and Commercial Workers International Union

The United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW), with 1.4 million members in the United States and Canada, is the largest trade union in the United States representing workers in the private sector. Its members include 900,000 retail sales clerks and other food store employees, 250,000 meat packing and poultry processing workers, and 300,000 other workers ranging from insurance clerks to garment assemblers.

Production-line jobs at meat packing plants have limited skill prerequisites, are low-paid, and are sometimes dangerous. Historically, most UFCW members holding those jobs at plants throughout the rural Midwest were white males who had lived in the local area for several generations. In the 1980's, employers began to hire new, non-local workers for these plants, first African Americans from the rural South, then recent immigrants from Mexico, Central America, and Southeast Asia, and eventually refugees from Eastern Europe (Prairie Fire, 1992). However, local union leadership -- elected presidents, paid staff, and shop stewards -- continued to be drawn predominantly from the ranks of experienced, local, white males, and many of them did not reach out to the new workers. Because the packing houses often employed bilingual supervisors but the union lacked bilingual shop stewards, many of the new workers felt more affinity with their employer than their union. In addition, many of the new workers had expectations about the union role, based on experience in their home countries, that conflicted with established UFCW approaches. The result was steeply declining union membership in multiple locations, as well as scattered instances of violence, unauthorized ("wildcat") strikes, and votes to decertify the union as the workers' collective bargaining representative.

By the mid-1990's, senior officials at union headquarters in Washington viewed these developments as a crisis. To address it while not violating the union's strong tradition of local autonomy, they adopted training for local officials as one primary response. In June 1995, the union's Washington-based staff organized a one-day session for 14 local union officials, with training led by national union leaders and the union's national education director (a long-time union member with graduate degrees in labour studies and human resource development). Trainees were requested to bring to the training session data on the demographic characteristics of the workforce at their plants, and discussion focused on Hispanic workers and practical actions that local officials could implement immediately (e.g., provide Spanish translations of union contracts, recruit and train bilingual shop stewards, establish programmes to educate immigrant workers on the customs and laws that prevail in the United States).

That session has been followed by three additional multi-day training sessions, with attendance expanded to 65 local officials and gradually enhanced training content. Under the title “Organizing and Representing a Diverse Workforce,” these sessions balanced continued discussion of practical activities (such as using immigration issues as an organizing tool) with more theoretical material (such as presentations by university faculty and similar outside experts on Hispanic culture, workforce diversity, and unconscious bias).

National UFCW officials themselves describe these training efforts as only a first step in addressing problems that are both complex and continually evolving. Although the union’s membership at meat packing plants has stabilized, little information is available concerning the extent to which local officials have implemented the actions suggested in training. It is not clear that programme participants developed conceptual understanding from training (for example, that might lead those who have improved relationships with Hispanic workers to adapt and repeat these same processes with recent influxes of Bosnian workers). Union officials involved in the first meeting seem to concur in a very cautious assessment of progress. When asked to rate the ability of their union to deal with the issues raised in this initiative, 50 per cent rated it as “culturally blind” and 50 per cent rated it as “culturally open,” but none rated it as “culturally competent.” The diversity training activities to date appears to represent, at best, an *initial* effort to address problems seriously hampering the union in its mission.

5.14. The United States Coast Guard

The Coast Guard is an agency of the federal government, operating within the Department of Transportation in peacetime and the Navy during wars. Its activities on the oceans and navigable inland waters include vessel inspection, maintenance of navigational aids, environmental protection, and law enforcement. It is the smallest of the uniformed military services of the United States, with 35,000 active duty members, and it has a special sense of pride based in that exclusivity and on a tradition of service covering more than 200 years.

In recent decades, the military services in the United States, especially the Army, have been considered in some respects models of equal employment opportunity, especially for racial/ethnic minorities (Moskos and Butler, 1996). However, the Coast Guard has not been a leader in these developments, and today it has the highest proportion of white males among uniformed personnel of any of the services. Currently, racial/ethnic minorities constitute 18.9 per cent of the Coast Guard’s enlisted members and 10.4 per cent of its officers; women constitute 9.6 per cent of both officers and enlisted ranks.¹ Among the service’s 33 admirals, there are no minorities, and the only woman holds her commission from a different service.

Upon taking command of the Coast Guard in 1994, the current Commandant published eight goals for the four years during which he expected to hold his post. The second of these goals is to “place diversity in the Coast Guard at centre stage,” especially through pursuit of three subgoals: change the composition of the Coast Guard workforce to better reflect the United States population; change the workforce culture to guarantee equal treatment and opportunity; and assign individuals from groups targeted in diversity goals to experience-enhancing positions so that they can subsequently be promoted to admirals.

¹In comparison, in the Army, racial/ethnic minorities constitute 42.5 per cent of enlisted ranks and 19.1 percent of officers, while women account for 13.0 per cent of officers and 14.3 per cent of enlisted.

To implement this direction, the service has undertaken a number of actions, some of them well-developed, permanent, and concrete and others more preliminary, temporary, or unspecific. In particular:

- C A detailed *workforce cultural audit* was conducted by an outside consultant in 1994, with plans to be repeated periodically. In the first audit, data were gathered through 40 focus groups and a 319-question survey responded to by 3,800 employees.
- C In 1995, a *diversity staff* was created at Coast Guard headquarters in Washington, D.C., with three full-time professional employees (an Ethnic Policy Advisor, who is currently an Hispanic male; a Gender Policy Advisor, who is currently a white female; and a Civilian Workforce Policy Advisor, who is currently a white male). Thus, staff resources are available to implement diversity initiatives in a sustained manner.

This staff is part of the service's Office of Leadership and Career Development (OLCD), which is separate from the office that deals with equal employment opportunity and affirmative action. Placement within OLCD has the benefit of associating diversity with traditional Coast Guard values (such as leadership) and neutral issues (such as performance improvement), rather than with controversial issues of discrimination. On the other hand, because diversity reports to an admiral placed at the second level in the service's hierarchy below the Commandant, the diversity office does not have direct access to the service's top management.

- C Two *diversity advisory councils* -- a Women's Advisory Council and a Minority Advisory Council -- were established to advise the service on diversity issues. Each council has 10 members drawn from both officer and enlisted ranks and meets twice yearly for a full week. A third council is being developed to encompass other dimensions of diversity (such as uniformed personnel versus civilian employees and officers with full-time commissions versus reserve officers).
- C The service has considered *modifications of operational practices* to support diversity goals, and some of these modifications have been implemented. For example, the system for advertising job vacancies for civilian employees has been expanded; management of diversity has been added to the list (currently about 20 items in length) on which officers' performance is evaluated annually; a special minority officer recruitment effort was launched using paid summer internships to attract students from historically-African American universities; and training has been developed to promote mentor relationships that encourage retention and advancement of service members from under-represented groups.

However, some more controversial operational issues have not yet been addressed. Although diversity management has become a criterion by which officers are evaluated, standards detailing expected performance on this criterion have not been defined. Minority recruitment efforts have been conducted intermittently rather as a sustained programme. Policies have not been developed to assign husband and wife service members to the same location. Incidents of racial hostility in some rural communities where service facilities are located have not been dealt with aggressively. Opportunities for women to obtain command experience on coast guard ships have

been allowed to remain limited by lack of ship-board berthing and bathing facilities. Formal employee discrimination complaints continue to be filed at a rate exceeding 700 per year.

Training is perhaps the most concrete means by which the service has sought to advance its diversity agenda. In fact, training activities had been started in 1991, before the current commandant's emphasis on the issue. Currently, training activities have three principal components:

- C First, publicity and communications are used as an *informal* means of training. Posters, pamphlets, newsletters, and media materials are recurrently prepared and widely distributed throughout the many locations where service members and civilian employees work.
- C Second, *special courses* on aspects of diversity have been developed and delivered. Two of the most common courses cover sexual harassment (which is mandatory for all employees and is delivered by an outside training firm) and mentoring and leadership (within which diversity accounts for about one day's content within a week's training). In general, the content of this training emphasizes similarities among demographic groups ("we are all on the same team") as well as differences (e.g., how communications patterns differ between men and women). The training typically focuses on trainees' awareness of diversity issues (e.g., the role of stereotyping in how individuals are judged) rather than specific behaviour.
- C Third, diversity content is being "*mainstreamed*" into ongoing training activities throughout the service. For example, members of the diversity staff make presentations in all the principal training programmes for newly-hired or newly-promoted personnel (such as new recruit's "boot camp," the Chief Petty Officer's Academy, and the Coast Guard Academy for officers), as well as at other meetings and conferences (including periodic meetings of the service's admirals). In such presentations, the diversity content typically emphasizes "mainstreaming" in a second sense -- the compatibility between diversity and long-held service values (such as communication, leadership, and teamwork) and emotionally-neutral management practices (such as Total Quality Management). Thus, for example, in the Coast Guard, diversity is defined as "the uniqueness of all individuals which encompasses different personal attributes, values, and organizational roles. Diversity management is the process of creating and maintaining a positive environment where the differences of all personnel are recognized, understood, and valued, so that they can achieve their full potential and maximize their contributions to Coast Guard missions" (United States Coast Guard, 1964, p. iii). Words such as "race" and "gender" do not appear in this definition.

By 2015, according to the Coast Guard's commandant, the demographic profile of the service should parallel that of the nation it serves. This goal is likely to persist beyond the tenure of an individual commandant because it is rooted in both operational pragmatism (the need to recruit service members in a labour market in which minorities and women are increasingly prominent) and politics (the need to maintain good relationships within a government in which women and

minorities are increasingly influential¹). How well has the Coast Guard been carrying out this mission?

The Coast Guard's response to that question would probably emphasize the *long-term* nature of its strategy. The service's approach seeks to gain *gradual* acceptance for diversity by emphasizing its compatibility with traditional service values and avoiding controversy. Equally, the approach focuses on the demographic characteristics of *new employees*² and opportunities for female and minority junior officers to develop credentials for *future* promotion to senior ranks. The implicit plan is that demographic diversity will increase "naturally" as current staff retire from the service.

The experience of most other organizations with such very gradual approaches has not been positive. Even if this strategy were to operate as hoped, a full generation of employees -- for the Coast Guard, 20 years or more -- is required before employees with new attitudes and new characteristics have replaced their predecessors. That rate of change does not match the rapidly evolving labour market and social climate in which the Coast Guard is required to operate today. But even that limited aspiration is unrealistic, because newly-recruited employees with new characteristics and attitudes tend not to stay in organizations not yet ready to welcome and develop their talents.³ If diversity management and anti-discrimination training represent anything other than symbolism, they must seek to change the *existing* organizational culture and the attitudes and behaviour of *current* staff. Although such changes can sometimes be difficult, military services, with unusually clear lines of authority and an emphasis on obeying orders, are better situated than most work organizations for such undertakings. In those circumstances, the anti-discrimination/diversity efforts of the Coast Guard to date may well be too cautious to meet the needs of this proud organization.

5.15. United Technologies, Tyler Plant

With \$24.7 billion in annual revenues, United Technologies Corporation (UTC) is the 34th largest corporation in the United States. It provides customers worldwide with high technology products and support services ranging from Pratt and Whitney aircraft engines and Sikorsky helicopters to Otis elevators and Carrier air conditioners. UTC's second largest component, Carrier Corporation, has been a leading manufacturer and marketer of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems since its founder helped to develop modern air conditioning technology in 1902. Carrier has 28,000 employees and operates 49 manufacturing plants around the world.

One of these plants is a 50 year old facility in a small Southern city, Tyler, Texas, where 950 workers assemble small and medium-sized air conditioners for residential and commercial use. The plant is considered productive and profitable. Wages are among the highest in the local area,

¹For example, the two most recent federal Secretaries of Transportation (the cabinet member to whom the Coast Guard reports) have been an Hispanic male and an African American male, respectively.

²For example, women now constitute 30 per cent of the entering class at the Coast Guard Academy for officers.

³This point is cogently argued in Thomas (1990), who describes the futility of "recruitment oriented" efforts that fail to change the culture in which these recruits subsequently work. Consistent with Thomas's prediction, the Coast Guard has yet to achieve rates of recruitment and retention sufficient to achieve its stated goals.

staff turnover is low, and the plant generally has many applicants from whom to choose when hiring. Production processes are relatively uncomplicated and repetitive. Although the hourly employees of the plant are unionized, the industrial relations climate is generally non-confrontational, with less than one dispute per year entering formal arbitration.

As a government contractor,¹ UTC and its subsidiaries have long been involved in mandatory equal employment opportunity and affirmative action programmes. Among the production workers at the Tyler plant, 33 per cent are African American, five per cent are Hispanic, and 23 per cent are female. Some diversity concerns are revealed in the company's employee satisfaction survey conducted every 18 months, and some discrimination complaints have been filed over the years. However, plant management has never received a high volume of complaints and diagnose many of the complaints they do receive as conflicts between individuals rather than groups and conflicts between groups along dimensions other than race and gender (e.g., hourly versus salaried employees, first shift versus second shift, and recent arrivals versus veteran employees).

Carrier first began to move beyond equal employment opportunity and affirmative action in the early 1990's when Carrier headquarters hired Towers Perrin, a major nationwide human resource consulting firm, to analyse diversity issues. In retrospect, officials at the Tyler plant perceive the Towers Perrin effort as primarily enhancing mistrust between workers and management and fomenting divisions among ethnic groups. The topic of diversity lay fallow for several years after the Towers Perrin study, as the plant manager changed and attention focused on more pressing issues, such as staff downsizing.

The diversity theme was revived in 1996, reflecting pressure from the Chief Executive Officer of UTC, who was arguing with increasing vehemence that, with 57 per of its sales coming from outside the United States, UTC had to be a culturally flexible and inclusive organization. This increased priority was communicated to the Tyler plant through Carrier's headquarters, and plant management had to decide how to respond. The recently-appointed plant manager (a dynamic African American man) and the plant's personnel director decided to bring in a training/consulting firm.

In its corporate brochure, Tulin Diversiteam Associates describes itself as "an inter-racial, inter-gender team specializing in leveraging excellence through diversity and sexual harassment prevention consulting and training to advance the strategic goals of corporations, law firms, government agencies, community groups, law enforcement personnel, schools, unions, and hospitals." In business since 1987, it is headquartered in suburban Philadelphia. The firm's work in Tyler was led by David Tulin, the firm's president, who is a white male with graduate training in education and is a former teacher's union president and school superintendent. The effort began with consultations between Tulin and the plant manager, other plant staff, and union officials, to develop a strategy.

Training is the most visible element of the strategy that emerged from these consultations. During 1997, diversity training absorbed about 25 per cent of the plant's annual training budget, placing it on the scale of a typical major training initiative within the plant.

¹Some 13 per cent of UTC sales are to the federal government, and additional sales go to state and local governments.

Tulin personally led the first component of this training effort, a two day workshop titled “Valuing and Leveraging Diversity to Advance Carrier-Tyler’s Team and Business Strategic Goals,” which was attended by all of the plant’s managers, salaried employees, and first-level supervisors. Then, over a three month period, Tulin coordinated a team of his firm’s associates¹ to deliver 38 four hour sessions to train all 900 of the plant’s hourly employees.

Reflecting its greater length, training for managers covered more material than its counterpart for hourly employees, especially with respect to trainees’ plans for follow-up actions. However, both managerial and hourly training were delivered in “low key” style designed to be compatible with rural, Southern sensibilities, and both used examples drawn from the Tyler plant. Moreover, the same themes, including the following, were emphasized in both training activities:

- C Diversity is a business issue, not a social initiative. Both management and hourly employees in the Tyler plant are keenly aware that, among Carrier’s 49 manufacturing facilities, only seven remain in the United States. They realize that their well-paid jobs could disappear unless the plant continues to show high productivity. Thus, training emphasized full utilization of human resources and more effective teamwork as principal benefits of diversity initiatives. Echoing what he had heard in training, the plant’s operations manager told the authors, “Diversity is not about gender and race; it is about getting air conditioning units out the door.”
- C Diversity is not limited to race and gender. Individuals differ in many other characteristics, including age, physical abilities, religious beliefs, family responsibilities, ambitions, and workplace affiliations (e.g., first shift workers versus second shift workers, or recent transfers into the plant versus long-term employees). Diversity management should not focus on the characteristics and customs of specific ethnic or gender groups. Rather, it should establish general processes of respecting and valuing all differences. Under that approach, white males are included among the beneficiaries of improved diversity management.
- C In the workplace, employee *behaviour* is what counts. Actions should be evaluated in terms of their impact rather than their intent. The company need not change employees’ attitudes and beliefs about members of other groups, so long as these attitudes are not expressed in the workplace and do not affect relationships or decisions in the workplace.
- C Workplace requirements often push individuals outside their “comfort zones.” Working with employees of other demographic backgrounds is one circumstance placing people in challenging situations, but so do other circumstances such as working in cross-functional teams. The flexibility learned in one such situation may enhance an employee’s effectiveness in another.

This training was generally well received. On evaluation forms at the end of class sessions, 94 per cent of participants rated the information presented as useful, and 94 per cent said their understanding had increased.

¹These associates, who typically hold master’s or doctoral degrees, worked on this project while on leave from full-time jobs as educators, human resource managers, or consultants.

Both management and consultants are clear, however, that training is not an end in itself. Its primary roles were to raise diversity awareness and enhance diversity skills as a prologue to an ongoing process dealing with practical issues in plant operations.¹ The principal structure designed to implement this process is the plant's newly-created diversity council, named by its members the Carrier-Tyler Unity Council. This in-house committee has an initial membership of nine salaried employees (ranging from the plant's operations manager to first-level supervisors) and 11 hourly employees (encompassing a variety of ethnic/race/gender groups, all production shifts, a range of departments, and a union representative). A professional employee in the plant's human resource department serves as staff. The council met with David Tulin for a two day planning retreat in March 1997 and began to meet regularly the following month.

The council's precise role was initially left vague, allowing the team to set its own priorities. They decided to form three subgroups, focusing on communications, relations between hourly and managerial employees, and education/professional development. The priorities they selected for their first year of operation were to gain acceptance for the council as a medium of two-way communication about diversity issues; to broaden the understanding of diversity beyond issues of race and gender; and to advertise the linkage between diversity and business objectives. Additionally, plant management has identified a number of significant potential projects that it hopes the team will eventually control.²

From its inception, participation by Tulin Diversityteam Associates was intended to be of limited duration, from late 1996 through early 1998. By that latter date, two specific goals had been accomplished: all plant staff had been trained, and the diversity council was in place. In addition, some initial changes were observable within the plant, and more were under active discussion. Perhaps the most judicious evaluation of this effort was provided by the plant's general manager, who had envisioned the initiative from the beginning as one of multiple efforts he planned to attune the plant's somewhat provincial culture to changes in the broader society. In relation to that objective, and in terms of continuous incremental improvement of plant productivity, the benefits seem to have justified the investment.

6. Evaluation of training activities

¹Such issues sometimes unfold in surprising directions. For example, early in the process of developing a Carrier-Tyler strategy for diversity, attention focused on conflict between male and female employees concerning job assignments on the plant's production line. Female employees complained that they were excluded from opportunities for which they were qualified, while male employees complained that, because some women lack the strength required for certain tasks, males were disproportionately assigned to physically more demanding roles. In response, the company performed an industrial engineering audit and installed hoists for all jobs that required repetitive heavy lifting. This change made these positions more accessible to employees, including some women who might have lacked the strength to perform the job previously. However, it also benefitted male employees by reducing fatigue and back injuries.

²These projects include: using television monitors located throughout the assembly line as "bulletin boards" to improve communications in the plant; starting community college classes on-site to provide English language training for non-native speaking employees and their families; starting on-site classes in blueprint reading (a critical skill for promotion among production workers); arranging for salaried and hourly employees to switch roles periodically to develop their understanding of each others' perspectives; incorporating diversity issues in safety meetings; and designing a leave policy for employees with child-care problems.

6.1. The evidence for moderately positive effects

What are the effects of the anti-discrimination training described in Chapters 4 and 5? Does it enhance employment opportunities for immigrants, ethnic minorities, and other protected groups? Is it effective in promoting other goals that trainers or client organizations set? Are its benefits offset by adverse side effects?

The present study does not provide definitive answers to such questions. As Section 7.2 will discuss, obtaining such answers probably requires a complex controlled experiment that is beyond the scope of the present study. However, a relatively convincing answer can be assembled with information from several sources.

Trainers' estimates of effectiveness

The most direct information on this subject is provided by the telephone survey, which included questions in which the training providers were asked to estimate the effects of their activities. Their responses are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. The effects of training estimated by training providers

What are the effects of your training, on the following scale: +2= large positive effect; +1= small positive effect; 0= no effect; -1= small negative effect; -2= large negative effect?

Training's Effect on	Mean Score	Modal Score	Per cent Negative
trainees' awareness of issues	1.6	2 (large positive)	0.0
use of stereotypes in personnel decisions	1.3	1 (small positive)	0.0
the range of personnel practices employers are aware of	1.3	1 (small positive)	0.0
corporate culture concerning discrimination	1.3	1 (small positive)	1.1
trainees' behaviour in the workplace	1.2	1 (small positive)	0.0
employees' attitudes on discrimination	1.2	1 (small positive)	0.0
hostility among groups in the workplace	1.2	1 (small positive)	1.1
productivity of client organizations	1.1	1 (small positive)	0.0
employment opportunities for protected groups	.8	1 (small positive)	1.1
morale of white males	.6	1 (small positive)	14.1
other outcomes	.5	0 (no effect)	0.0

Because these respondents are professionally involved in anti-discrimination training, it is reasonable to be concerned that their financial self interest would bias their responses in a positive direction. In addition, psychological research suggests that individuals tend to view activities more favourably when they have invested time and effort in them.¹ Consistent with this concern about over-rating are the results of one survey in which human resource professionals and non-human resource managers were asked to rate the effectiveness of workforce diversity programmes. The average rating by human resource professionals (who presumably felt a professional affinity with these efforts) was 2.6 out of a possible five points, while that by managers (who were presumably less personally involved) was 1.9 (CCH, 1997, p. 93).

¹On the psychological concept relevant here, called *cognitive dissonance*, see Myers (1990), pp. 53-54.

To minimize such biases, our telephone survey avoided asking training providers to rate their efforts' overall success and instead asked about its effects on 11 specific subjects. Their responses to these questions, summarized in Table 11, generally claimed positive but modest effects, with important variation among the different forms of effects. Specifically:

- C Respondents estimated that training's largest effect was on trainees' *awareness* of diversity issues. This subject was the only one on which respondent's average response, 1.6, rounds off to a score of 2, a large positive effect. This status as the strongest estimated impact is consistent with the findings, discussed in Section 4.4, that many training programmes make awareness their central focus.
- C Concerning more concrete outcomes -- such as changes in trainees' attitudes, trainees' behaviour, the client organizations' personnel practices, and corporate culture -- training providers estimated more modest effects. On these four subjects, responses averaged 1.3, which rounds off to a score of 1, a small positive effect.
- C Training providers made still more limited claims for outcomes that might follow in turn if the outcomes just discussed were achieved -- for example, enhanced productivity in the client organization (with a score of 1.1) and expanded employment opportunities for members of protected groups (with a score of .8).

Evaluation evidence from case studies

As was noted in Section 3.4, the case studies in this report were selected in part because we believed them to represent "best practices" in anti-discrimination training. Although the closer examination conducted in the case studies themselves sometimes persuaded us that our initial perceptions had been too favourable, the sophistication, scale, and effectiveness typical of this group is likely to be somewhat above that of the overall anti-discrimination training industry.

The organizations visited in the case studies typically could provide some, but usually only fragmentary, quantitative measures of the effects of training.¹ To form our own assessment, we drew on these data where available, on judgments expressed by the training providers, clients, and trainees we interviewed, and our own observations. These bases for our conclusions are set forth in the text of each case study, presented in Chapter 5. In drawing conclusions about the magnitude and direction of impacts, we considered the same 11 dimensions of impact listed in Table 11.²

¹ In that limitation, the case studies are consistent with the findings of our telephone survey, where respondents were asked how they measured the effectiveness of their efforts. Some 83.3 per cent replied that they distribute questionnaires to trainees at the end of training sessions. Such questionnaires are often referred to as "smile sheets" because they almost always report a high level of trainee satisfaction, which professional evaluators discount as often reflecting politeness rather than honesty. Some respondents reported that they attempted to measure effects by other means as well: 41.1 per cent examine trends in periodic all-employee surveys; 32.7 per cent interview trainees well after training; and 28.3 per cent monitor employment statistics. However, comments made during telephone interviews and case studies suggest that such efforts are typically unsystematic and usually separate the effects of training from other developments in the client firms only impressionistically.

² The methodology for gathering and analyzing case study data was specified by the ILO research design (Wrench and Taylor, 1993, Section 4) and is summarized in Section 3.4 of the present report. Essentially, the process is judgmental, relying on the skills and background of the researchers. Suggestions for a more systematic, controlled evaluation of training's impact are presented in Section 7.2.

Based on these sources, we concluded that, among the 14 cases examined, training had very strong positive effects in one case, that of Advantica (Section 5.2). In seven additional cases,¹ training had somewhat less dramatic effects but nevertheless clearly positive ones. In the remaining six cases, the effects of training, although predominantly positive, seemed of such limited scale that they were hard to differentiate from no effects. Thus, our assessment for the group as a whole was that of moderately positive effects, a conclusion consistent with that expressed in the telephone survey by trainers themselves.

6.2. When does training have negative effects?

The final column in Table 11 reports the proportion of respondents to the telephone survey who estimated that their efforts had negative effects. This proportion was zero (or virtually zero)² for ten of the 11 subjects examined. The exception involved the morale of white males, where 14.1 percent of respondents estimated that their efforts had a small negative effect.

The absence of negative responses may seem surprising in light of claims made in some of the literature reviewed in Section 3.1 and in some journalistic accounts of anti-discrimination training in the United States. These writings describe activities from which negative effects would be expected. For example:³

For several years, the United States Department of Transportation [DOT] provided the most egregious example of how not to conduct diversity training. In the name of exposing racial and sexual prejudice, DOT trainers continually subjected employees to what amounted to psychological abuse. The sessions, suspended in 1993 after outraged complaints from employees, included a gauntlet where men were ogled and fondled by women. Blacks and whites were encouraged to exchange racial epithets, people were tied up together for hours, and some were forced to strip down to their underwear in front of coworkers. Trainers also verbally abused participants, referring to one obese employee as “muffin queen.”

Another form of training likely to have negative effects is that which reinforces stereotypes. Some anti-discrimination training programmes devote considerable attention to describing and explaining the behaviour allegedly “typical” of members of different groups. For example, one respondent in the telephone survey reported that his training describes Hispanics as family-oriented rather than work-oriented and then explains to employers how they can motivate their Hispanic employees by appealing to these family interests. In a similar vein, Table 9 reports that 34.6 per cent of respondents to the telephone survey describe “making the content of stereotypes of protected groups more positive” as one of their training goals.

¹Fleet Financial Group (Section 5.3), Hewlett Packard (Section 5.5), Lawrence Livermore Laboratory (Section 5.6), Manpower (Section 5.7), Methodist Health Systems (Section 5.8), Owens Corning (Section 5.11), and United Technologies (Section 5.15).

²“Virtually zero” refers to the three questions reported in Table 11 to which there was a negative response from 1.1 per cent of respondents. That 1.1 per cent represents one respondent, and the negative response came from the same respondent in all three cases.

³Labich (1996), p. 178. For other examples, see Ferguson (1994), Lynch (1997), pp. 66-70, and Lubove (1997).

Such training is usually well-intentioned, seeking to improve communication between members of protected groups and employers and co-workers of different cultural backgrounds. However, it reinforces the tendency to assume that all individuals who belong to a group have the same traits. A more appropriate approach discourages reliance on stereotypes and emphasizes the importance of understanding and judging each employee as an individual.¹

A final type of training likely to have negative effects is that which focuses on past abuses experienced by particular groups and describes current anti-discrimination efforts as reparations for these abuses. Such an approach implies that women and minorities can advance only at the expense of the white males who have traditionally dominated the workplace and sets the stage for self-protective reactions from persons who see their future threatened (Cherners, Oskamp, and Costanzo, 1995, p. 106):

Diversity backlash occurs when minority members are perceived as attempting to obtain power by individual and collective means. Diversity backlash can be characterized as a preemptive strike against the development of power by groups lacking power in organizations. Typically it occurs before power has actually been obtained by minority groups.

Such feelings of resentment and fear, and the consequent tendency of some white males to rebel against their employers' affirmative action or diversity efforts, are not rare in the workplace.² For example, a survey in 1991 reported that 35 per cent of male managers believe that their company discriminates against men to rectify past bias against women (but only 10 per cent of women agree). (Nelson-Horcheler, 1991). Backlash is also believed to have hampered the advancement of some African American executives (Baskerville and Tucker, 1991).

Given the potential of anti-discrimination training to foment or exacerbate such backlash, is it credible that only 14.1 per cent of respondents to our telephone survey reported negative effects on the morale of white males, and all of them characterized that effect as small? We believe that it is. The overwhelming majority of training activities profiled in Chapters 4 through 6 do not focus on past grievances, current reparations, and the "we versus them" themes that are most likely to engender adverse reactions from white males. As was discussed in Section 4.2, among the 108 respondents to our telephone survey, fewer than half a dozen presented themselves as the angry advocates of special interests described in some journalistic accounts. The more typical style of anti-discrimination training, with its business-like tone and emphasis on the shared advantages of a diverse workforce and respect for the individual differences of all employees, is far less likely to foster white male backlash.

6.3. Eight benchmarks for effective training

The discussion in Sections 6.1 and 6.2 implies that whether anti-discrimination training is effective or ineffective importantly depends on the specific style and content of the training. In

¹Once an individual is known to have a particular trait, knowledge of that person's cultural background may help to explain why he or she has that trait. However, that use of cultural information is different from using it to predict that individual will have a trait because of his or her group membership. Social scientists emphasize this point by distinguishing *idiographic* information (that explains individual persons or events) from *nomothetic* information (that explains groups and other abstract entities) (Vogt, 1993, p. 109, 152).

²See Galen (1994), Lynch (1991), and Wentling and Palma-Rivas (1997b), pp. 28-30.

both the telephone survey and our case studies, we encountered many examples of training that was well designed, effectively delivered, and influential, contrasting sharply with other efforts that were poorly conceived, amateurishly presented, and had little impact.

From these experiences, we have identified eight characteristics associated with effective anti-discrimination training. These characteristics can serve as *benchmarks* or standards of “best practices” in the field.

Benchmark 1. Anti-discrimination initiatives enjoy strong, visible, consistent support from the client organization’s top management.

One respondent to our telephone survey remarked that, if he could choose between an unlimited budget for anti-discrimination training and having the top executive of a client organization *insist* that discrimination be banished, he would always select the latter. When trainees understand that the managers to whom they report are serious about the subject, they participate in training more whole-heartedly and are more likely to apply its lessons. They also are more likely to take actions to address issues of discrimination not addressed in the training.

In our case studies, we saw numerous examples of leadership on issues of discrimination and diversity from chief executive officers, heads of divisions, and similar persons in charge, expressed strongly, visibly, and consistently through both statements and actions. For example, in Advantica (Section 5.2), employees were aware of senior executives being dismissed because they were not committed to the anti-discrimination efforts championed by the corporation’s new Chief Executive Officer; at Hewlett Packard (Section 5.5), managers were required to reflect the Chief Executive Officer’s “people” hoshin in their annual work plan; at Nationwide Insurance, employees repeatedly observed their Chief Executive Officer appearing at diversity events; and at Owens Corning (Section 5.11), managers were repeatedly prodded by their Chief Executive Officer’s probing questions and challenging comments.

Benchmark 2: Training is closely tailored to the specific circumstances of the client organization.

A number of the training providers responding to our telephone survey offer “off the shelf,” standardized training packages. This approach is attractive because it is relatively inexpensive, and it appeals to some client firms that wish to delegate work on this subject and remain uninvolved. However, such training is likely to be relatively ineffective. Some trainees find it difficult to absorb information if the situations studied do not precisely match those in their own workplace. More importantly, off-the-shelf training is unlikely to match the corporate culture of the client organization and therefore may be irrelevant. Furthermore, the process in which the client firm works with the training provider to tailor training to its needs is itself an important part of the client’s organizational learning.

Tailoring can be implemented at many different levels. The examples used in training exercises can be based on situations typical in the client organization’s own operations; for example, at Advantica (Section 5.2), videotapes were prepared illustrating actual incidents that had occurred in the firm’s restaurants, with separate videotapes filmed in restaurants of each of the company’s chains. The style in which training is delivered can be selected to match normal company practices; for example, at Microsoft (Section 5.9), anti-discrimination training delivered through a very short class combined with online follow-up materials matched the way the firm normally delivers all staff training. Most elaborately, training can be preceded by an organizational audit

identifying the client firm's current circumstances and priority issues; for example, at Owens Corning (Section 5.11), an organizational audit conducted by the training provider identified eight issues that became the focus of subsequent training. Whether elaborate or simple, however, tailoring must meet the standard implied by the definition of corporate culture presented in Section 2.4: trainees must recognize the training as reflecting "the way things are done here."

Benchmark 3: Training is motivated by the client organization's important operational goals.

As was discussed in Section 2.6, if client organizations implement training to satisfy senior managers' guilty consciences, to placate disaffected groups among its employees, or to reduce the chances of being sued for discrimination, then the efforts are likely to be short-term, shallow, and not taken seriously by trainees. Conversely, if client organizations believe that training will promote important operational goals, such as increased productivity, reduced costs, improved client service, or expanded markets, then the training is likely to be undertaken on a more substantial scale, and trainees are more likely to treat the activity seriously.

Every case study in this report illustrated ways in which the senior management of client organizations perceive anti-discrimination or diversity activities to promote their organizational objectives and ways in which these perceptions are communicated in anti-discrimination courses. For example, in the United States Coast Guard (Section 5.14), anti-discrimination training was assigned to an office concerned with leadership development and performance improvement; at the United Food and Commercial Workers (Section 5.13), training was triggered by the need to serve a growing number of Hispanic union members; and at Pacific Enterprises (Section 5.12), training was motivated in part by the need to obtain increased productivity from a downsized workforce.

Benchmark 4: Trainers have qualifications in management or organizational development.

The fourth characteristic relates to the personal perspective of the individuals conducting training sessions. Throughout Chapters 4 through 6 of this report, we have emphasized the business-like style that typifies most anti-discrimination training and its emphasis on the contributions of diversity to client organizations' performance goals. Trainers with personal experience managing organizations that resemble their client organizations, formal training in business or public management, or training or experience as organizational development consultants working with such organizations, have backgrounds that automatically draw them toward this approach. As was discussed in Section 4.2, personal experience as a member of a group traditionally facing discrimination is not an effective substitute for this expertise. Thus, for example, training efforts at Nationwide Insurance (Section 5.10) were led by the President of Simmons Associates, who is both an African American and a former corporate human resources executive; and the first Corporate Director of Diversity appointed at Fleet Financial Group (Section 5.3) was a white male with 15 years' experience in commercial bank operations.

Benchmark 5. Training focuses on discrimination as a general process rather than unique issues of special groups.

As was discussed in Section 6.2, journalistic accounts of anti-discrimination training often portray it as harping on the experiences of specific groups, such as racism experienced by African Americans or sexism encountered by women. In reality, it is more typical for anti-discrimination

training to address these issues in terms of the general processes of inclusion and exclusion discussed in Section 2.4. While the experiences of specific groups are often cited as examples, trainers typically use a breadth of examples to emphasize that individuals of many backgrounds -- including white males -- often experience discrimination's adverse effects. This broader approach is more effective for several reasons. First, as was discussed in Section 6.2, it is less likely to exacerbate intergroup tensions and competitiveness in the workplace. Second, it focuses attention on the issues of discrimination most prevalent in the today's workplace.

Examples of the application of this principle are found in virtually all our case studies. For example, at Nationwide Insurance (Section 5.10), discrimination was analysed as "vectors of force" that advance or retard employees' career advancements; and at United Technology's Tyler plant (Section 5.15), workforce diversity was defined to include work shift, family responsibilities, and plant seniority in parallel with race, ethnicity, and gender.

Benchmark 6: Training is designed to change trainees' behaviour rather than attitudes alone.

As was discussed in Section 4.4, 95.4 per cent of respondents to our telephone survey identified changing trainees' behaviour in the workplace as a very important goal for their activities. However, many of the training programmes implemented by these respondents focus primarily on increasing trainees' awareness of issues and changing their attitudes and devote very limited attention to behaviour itself.

Of course, some training that focuses on behaviour does so in a narrow, mechanical way that, while useful, may offer only limited guidance to trainees when they encounter discrimination in forms or contexts other than the ones on which they were trained. For example, both Advantica (Section 5.2) and Manpower (Section 5.7) provided their employees with specific "scripts" for what to say in handling discrimination incidents in the workplace. However, when done with appropriate integration of conceptual material, training that actively engages trainees in developing and practising new ways of speaking and acting that can be applied in the workplace are more likely to achieve the changes in post-training behaviour that are the training providers highest-ranked goal. Thus, for example, managers receiving anti-discrimination training at Owens Corning (Section 5.11) spend the second day of their two-day class in small work teams designing actions to address problems identified the previous day.

Benchmark 7: Training is complemented by improvements in the client organization's human resource management practices.

Typically, some improvements in the discrimination/diversity climates within organizations can be achieved by changing the behaviour of individuals. But additional problems are often embedded in systems and procedures that are beyond individuals' control, such as the criteria and procedures used in employee recruitment, hiring, assignment, compensation, training, evaluation, promotion, and dismissal.

In some cases, the most effective way to address some discrimination problems might not be narrowly linked to discrimination itself. For example, at Nationwide Insurance (Section 5.10), the company did not routinely provide training in basic supervisory skills for inexperienced supervisors. The resultant inconsistencies in policies, failures of communication, and interpersonal conflicts disproportionately affected members of groups traditionally experiencing discrimination, but it affected other employees as well. In such a circumstance, basic supervisory training may be a more appropriate remedy than anti-discrimination training. One respondent to our telephone survey estimated that 60 per cent of the organizations hiring him to address issues

of discrimination have only generic problems associated with antiquated corporate cultures and operating systems; the remaining 40 per cent combine these problems with more specific issues of discrimination *per se*.

Effective anti-discrimination training programmes make their trainees aware of these issues and develop them as supporters and advocates of change. For example, at Hewlett Packard's Boise facility (Section 5.5), the trainer's strategy for organizational change was to create a "critical mass" of graduates of her training programme who would alter the corporate culture to engender such changes. In some cases, the trainees themselves become more directly involved. For example, at United Technology's Tyler plant (Section 5.5), training was followed by creation of a committee of non-supervisory employees and managers responsible for developing company policies, training programmes, and other initiatives related to discrimination and diversity. However, as is discussed in Section 4.5 and illustrated in a number of our case studies, the primary impetus for such system changes must come from senior management, and most of the changes take place outside of, and parallel to, training itself. This pattern is illustrated, for example, in changes in recruiting practices at Lawrence Livermore Laboratories (Section 5.6), fringe benefits at Hewlett Packard (Section .4), employee assignments at Fleet Financial Group (Section 5.3), and performance evaluations in the United States Coast Guard (Section 5.14).

Benchmark 8: Training is part of broad efforts at organizational development.

Ideally, the changes in systems and procedures for human resource management discussed in Benchmark 7 are part of an even broader process of organizational change. In such a process, training combines with organizational self-examination, symbolic acts, reforms of policies and procedures, and selective changes in personnel to achieve far-reaching changes in the organization's corporate culture (Greenberg and Baron, 1993, p. 622; Harvey and Brown, 1996, p.4). Our case studies include two examples of particularly broad-ranging efforts at organizational transformation -- Advantica (Section 5.2) and Owens Corning (Section 5.11).

Some of the indicators of the commitment to overall organizational development are found within training itself, including the length/depth of the training, the proportion of all employees who receive training, the participation of top managers in training, the sequencing of training (whether managers are trained before non-supervisory employees, so that the managers are prepared to reinforce the training), and whether it is voluntary or mandatory. Other indicators are outside of training itself, including the 10 anti-discrimination activities complementary to training examined in Table 10 of Section 4.5.

These comprehensive efforts tend to require substantial resources and effort over a period lasting two to five years and strategic support from top management. Thus, they are not to be undertaken lightly. However, such thorough processes may be the ultimate way to ensure that issues of discrimination are addressed in their full complexity.

6.4. The relationship between benchmarks and impact

Table 12 tabulates whether each of the 14 training efforts examined in our case studies met each of the eight benchmarks just presented. The bottom row of the table reveals that two benchmarks were met in 100.0 per cent of the case studies -- Benchmark 3 (training is motivated by important operational goals) and Benchmark 4 (trainers have qualifications in management or organizational development). At the other end of the spectrum, three benchmarks were met in fewer than half of the case studies -- Benchmark 6 (training is designed to change trainees' behaviour), Benchmark 7 (training is complemented by improvements in human resource management practices), and

Benchmark 8 (training is part of broad organizational development). The remaining three benchmarks were met in more than half, but not all, of the cases.

Table 12. The relationship between overall impact and conformity to benchmarks

Benchmark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	% of 8
	Management Support	Close Tailoring	Tied to Goals	Trainer Qualifications	Not Group Specific	Change Behaviour	Change Personnel Systems	Organizational Devel.	
Major Positive Impact									
Advantica	x	x	x	x		x		x	87.5
Average									87.5
Moderate Positive Impact									
Fleet									
Financial	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	100.0
Hewlett Packard	x		x	x		x	x	x	62.5
Lawrence Laboratory	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Manpower	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		100.0
Methodist Health	x		x	x					87.5
Owens Corning	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	50.0
United Technologies	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		87.5
Average									87.5
									82.1
Limited/No Impact									
General Motors			x	x	x				37.5
Microsoft		x	x	x	x				50.0
Nationwide Insurance	x		x	x	x				50.0
Pacific Enterprises		x	x	x	x				50.0
UFCW	x	x	x	x		x			62.5
Coast Guard	x	x	x	x	x				62.5
Average									52.1
% of 14 cases	78.6	71.4	100.0	100.0	78.6	42.9	50.0	35.7	

Table 12 also examines the relationship between the proportion of benchmarks met in each case study and our rating of the overall impact of the training effort presented in Section 6.1. The table reveals a consistent relationship between these two characteristics. In the one case we rated as having major positive impact, 87.5 per cent of the benchmarks were met; among the seven cases we rated as having moderate positive impact, an average of 82.5 per cent of the benchmarks were complied with; and in the six cases we rated training to have had little or no impact, an average of 52.1 per cent of the benchmarks were met.

Table 13 examines the relationship in the case studies between the overall rating of the training's impact (estimated in Section 6.1) and the type of training (set forth in Figure 1 in Section 3.2).

Table 13. The relationship between overall impact and training type

Case study	Equalities Training	Diversity Training	Cultural Awareness Training	Other Types
Major Positive Impact				
Advantica	x			
Average	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moderate Positive Impact				
Fleet Financial		x		
Hewlett Packard			x	
Lawrence Laboratory		x		
Manpower	x			
Methodist Health		x		
Owens Corning				
United Technologies	x	x		
Average	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%	0.0%
Limited/No Impact				
General Motors		x		
Microsoft		x		
Nationwide Insurance		x		
Pacific Enterprises		x		
UFCW	x			
Coast Guard		x		
Average	16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%
% of 14 cases	28.6%	64.3%	7.1%	0.0%

and defined in the final paragraphs of Section 4.1). The bottom row of the table reveals that the 14 case studies encompassed examples of all three types of training most common in the telephone survey -- equalities training (28.6 per cent of case studies), diversity training (64.3 per cent of case studies), and cultural awareness training (7.1 per cent of case studies). However, the table reveals little consistent relationship between the type of training and the estimates of effectiveness. In particular, the four examples of equalities training included one example of major positive impact, two examples of moderate positive impact, and one example of limited impact. Similarly, diversity training included four examples of moderate positive impact and five

of limited impact. Therefore, it does not appear that any of the types of training can be judged consistently more effective than other types, at least as these types are defined in Section 4.1. Instead, the degree of impact of training seems more closely related to the eight benchmarks discussed in Table 12.

7. Recommendations for improving anti-discrimination training

Diversity training appears likely to continue to be an important activity in the United States labour market throughout the upcoming years. Major trends motivating much of the current activity -- including increasing workforce diversity, accelerating internationalization, and continuing litigation -- are likely to continue. Surveys of the business community suggest that many executives are aware of discrimination problems that they have not yet attempted to correct.¹ And as federal and state legislation and court decisions increasingly limit other anti-discrimination approaches such as affirmative action,² anti-discrimination training is likely to be increasingly considered as an alternative. Consistent with all these circumstances, 73.3 per cent of the respondents to our telephone survey said that they expected demand for their training activities to increase over the next several years, while only 10.5 per cent expected it to decrease.

To maximize the benefits to employers, workers, and society as a whole of this large and expanding activity, the following three recommendations should be implemented.

Recommendation 1: Focus activities on best practices

In the empirical information on anti-discrimination training presented in Chapters 4 through 6, the most striking characteristic is the variability among training activities. In both our telephone survey and case studies, we encountered many different philosophies, goals, techniques, and levels of quality. The eight benchmarks proposed in Section 6.3 represent important best practice standards within this variation. Both training providers and client organizations should be guided by these standards toward effective practices and away from ineffective ones.

Recommendation 2: Expand the volume of anti-discrimination training

¹For example, in a confidential survey of 645 senior human resource executives across the United States in 1990, 55 per cent of respondents voiced concerns about the ability of supervisors in their firms to motivate diverse employees, 29 per cent described discrimination as a continuing problem in their firm, and 25 per cent agreed that their firm's corporate culture was not open to diversity. However, fewer than half of the respondents acknowledging each problem indicated that their firms had current plans to do anything about it (Towers Perrin, 1990).

Similarly, a 1992 survey of 1,045 private-sector firms by a major human resources consulting firm, the Hay Group, found that only 5 per cent of respondents felt that their companies were currently doing a good job of managing the diversity of their work forces (Rice, 1994, p. 79).

²See Assembly Committee on the Judiciary (1995) and Bendick (1998).

If the first recommendation is followed, the current level of benefits delivered by anti-discrimination training, which Chapter 6 characterizes as positive but modest, should become even more positive. At that level of performance, anti-discrimination training appears to be a useful activity that more than justifies its costs. Thus, if and only if the first recommendation is implemented, then the volume of anti-discrimination training activities should be expanded. As Sections 3.1, 4.1, and 4.3 discuss, this activity is currently relatively common but by no means universal across the labour market in the United States. Among the sectors where anti-discrimination training is particularly under-utilized are smaller firms, trade unions, and employment placement organizations.

Recommendation 3: Invest in more systematic research

Although this report has drawn many conclusions about anti-discrimination training, the information on which such conclusions are based is quite limited. Section 3.1 reported that the number of formal research studies of this activity is very small. Section 6.1 revealed that most training providers and client organizations do not systematically evaluate their own experiences. Further empirical studies would usefully add to society's scant stock of knowledge about this important activity.

Ultimately, however, empirical studies similar in approach to the present one provide only suggestive rather than definitive estimates of the impact of anti-discrimination training. More rigorous information on this key topic probably can be provided only by controlled experiments.

For example, cooperation might be sought from a large firm with many branches performing similar functions, such as an insurance company with hundreds of local sales offices. These offices could be assigned randomly to a control group (receiving no anti-discrimination training) and one or more experimental groups (receiving anti-discrimination training, perhaps in several different forms¹). The impacts of training could then be estimated by comparing the offices' performance over several years.² Although such research would be complicated and costly, it potentially could generate important information about both anti-discrimination training and broader issues in organizational development.

¹In devising the variations of anti-discrimination training that should be tested, the eight benchmarks discussed in Section 6. 4 should be considered important hypotheses.

²Ideally, these measures should include attempt to trace the effects of training on such ultimate measures of performance as firm's financial returns. Some studies have explored such relationships for broad measures of diversity management. One study concludes that the 5-year total return on investment for stockholders was 17 per cent higher for the 50 firms picked as best companies in the United States for Asians, African American and Hispanic employees than for a standard index of 500 comparably-sized companies (Johnson, 1998, p. 96). A second study estimated that stock valuations were lower than expected for firms losing discrimination litigation and higher than expected for firms receiving awards for exemplary affirmative action programmes (Wright, Ferris, Hiller, and Kroll, 1995). A third study found that firms identified as best-performing companies either objectively (in terms of financial performance) or subjectively (voted most admired by leading executives) were only one-tenth as likely as other firms to discriminate against older workers (Bendick, Jackson, and Romero, 1996, pp 37-39).

Bibliography

- Aaron, H.; C. Loughy. 1986. *The comparable worth controversy*, Brookings Institution, Washington.
- Abell, J.; A. Havelaar; M. Dankoor. 1997. *The documentation and evaluation of anti-discrimination training activities in the Netherlands*, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- AARP. 1989. *Business and older workers, Current perceptions and new directions for the 1990's*, American Association of Retired Persons, Washington.
- Abelda, R. 1986. "Occupational segregation by race and gender, 1958-81", in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 39 (April), pp. 404-11.
- Adler, N.; D. Izraeli. 1994. *Competitive frontiers, Women managers in a global economy*, Blackwell, London.
- Aigner, D.; G. Cain. 1977. "Statistical theories of discrimination in labor markets", in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 30 (2), pp. 175-87.
- Allport, G. 1954. *The nature of prejudice*, Addison Wesley, Cambridge, MA.
- AMA. 1995. *1995 AMA survey on managing cultural diversity*, American Management Association, New York.
- Arredondo, P. 1996. *Successful diversity management initiatives, A blueprint for planning and implementation*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Assembly Committee on the Judiciary. 1995. *Discrimination and affirmative action: Are there any facts out there?* California State Legislature, Sacramento, CA.
- ASTD. 1991. *Cultural diversity survey report*, American Society for Training and Development, Alexandria, VA.
- Baskerville, D.; S. Tucker. 1991. "A blueprint for success", in *Black Enterprise*, 22 (4), pp. 85-93.
- Baytos, L. 1995. *Designing and implementing successful diversity programs*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Becker, G. 1965. "A theory of the allocation of time", in *Economic Journal*, 75 (September), pp. 493-517.
- Belous, R. 1989. *The contingent economy: The growth of the temporary, part-time, and subcontracted workforce*, National Planning Association, Washington.
- Bendick, M., Jr. 1997. *Access, diversity and civil rights issues in the development of skills standards*, United States National Skills Standards Board, Washington.
- . 1998. "Adding testing to the nation's portfolio of information on employment discrimination", in M. Fix and M. Turner (eds.) *Testing for racial and economic discrimination in American economic life*, Urban Institute Press, Washington, in press.
- . 1996a. *Discrimination against racial/ethnic minorities in access to employment in the United States: Empirical findings from situation testing*, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- . 1996b. *Employment practices and employment discrimination: A bibliography combining economic, managerial, and behavioral science research*, Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington, Washington.
- . 1989. "Matching workers and job opportunities, What role for the federal-state Employment Service?", in D. Bawden and F. Skidmore (eds.) *Rethinking employment policy*, Urban Institute Press, pp. 81-104.
- ; L. Brown; K. Wall. 1997. *No foot in the door: An experimental study of employment discrimination against older workers*, Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington, Washington.
- ; C. Jackson; V. Reinoso. 1994. "Measuring employment discrimination through controlled experiments", in *Review of Black Political Economy*, 23 (Summer), pp. 25-48.
- ; -; L. Hodges. 1991. "Discrimination against Latino job applicants: A controlled experiment", in *Human Resource Management*, 30 (Winter), pp. 469-84.
- ; -; J. Romero. 1996. "Employment discrimination against older workers: An experimental study of hiring practices", in *Journal of Aging and Social Policy*, 8 (4): 25-46.
- Bergmann, B. 1996. *In defense of affirmative action*. Basic Books, New York.
- Betances, S. 1993. "Using humor to promote multicultural understanding", in J. Adams and J. Welsch (eds.) *Multicultural education, Strategies for implementation in colleges and universities*, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL, pp. 3-9.
- Blackmon, D. 1997. "Consultants' advice on diversity was anything but diverse", in *Wall Street Journal*, (March 11), p.1.

- Blau, F. 1998. "Trends in the well-being of American women, 1970-1995", in *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36 (1), pp. 112-65.
- Blumrosen, A. 1995. *How the courts are handling reverse discrimination claims*, Office of Contract Compliance, United States Department of Labor, Washington.
- Brach, S. 1998. "What Blacks think of corporate America", in *Fortune*, (July 6), pp. 140-6.
- Braddock, J.; J. McPartland. 1987. "How minorities continue to be excluded from equal employment opportunities, Research on labor market and institutional barriers", in *Journal of Social Issues*, 43 (1), pp. 5-39.
- Brown, C.; J. Hamilton; J. Medoff. 1990. *Employers large and small*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Business Week*. 1996. "Diversity, Making the business case", in *Business Week*, (December 9) (unpaginated insert).
- Carnevale, A; S. Kogod. 1995. *Tools and activities for a diverse workforce*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- ; S. Stone. 1995. *The American mosaic: An in-depth report on the future of diversity at work*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Catalyst. 1997. *1997 Catalyst census of women board directors of the Fortune 500*, Catalyst, New York.
- . 1989. *Flexible work arrangements, Establishing options for managers and professionals*, Catalyst, New York.
- Cattan, P. 1993. "The diversity of Hispanics in the United States workforce", in *Monthly Labor Review*, (August), pp. 3-15.
- Caudron, S.; C. Hayes. 1997. "Are diversity programs benefitting Black Americans?", in *Black Enterprise*, (February 1997), pp. 21-32.
- CCH. 1995. *Human resource management ideas and trends*, Commerce Clearing House, Inc. Washington.
- CCH. 1995. *1995 SHRM/CCH Survey*, Commerce Clearing House, Inc., Washington.
- Cherners, M.; S. Oskamp; M. Costanzo (eds.). *Diversity in organizations*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Clark, L. 1989. "Insuring equal opportunity in employment through law", in D. Bawden and F. Skidmore (eds.) *Rethinking employment policy*, Urban Institute Press, Washington, pp. 173-204.
- Committee for Economic Development. 1996. *American workers and economic change*, Committee for Economic Development, New York.
- Cose, E. 1993. *The rage of a privileged class*, Harper Collins, New York.
- Czinkota, M.; I. Ronkainen. 1995. *International marketing*, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Fort Worth, TX.
- Darity, W.; P. Mason. 1998. "Evidence of discrimination in employment, Codes of color, codes of gender", in *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12 (2), pp. 63-90.
- Darley, J.; P. Gross. 1983. "A hypothesis-conforming bias in labeling effects", in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, pp. 20-33.
- Delaney, J.; D. Lewin; C. Ichniowski. 1989. *Human resource policies and practices in American firms*, United States Department of Labor, Washington.
- DuPont, K. 1997. *Handling diversity in the workplace, Communication is the key*, Motivational Technologies, Cleveland, OH.
- Egan, M; M. Bendick, Jr. 1994. "International business careers in the United States: Salaries, advancement, and male-female differences", in *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5 (February), pp. 33-50.
- ; -. 1991. *Managing Greater Washington's changing work force*, Greater Washington Research Center, Washington.
- Ehrenberg, R.; R. Smith. 1997. *Modern labor economics, Theory and public policy*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Ellis, C; J. Sonnenfeld. 1994. "Diverse approaches to managing diversity", in *Human Resource Management*, 33 (Spring), pp. 79-109.
- Ettore, B. 1993 "Managing diversity for competitive advantage", in *Management Review*, 82 (April), p. 6.
- Faircloth, A. 1998. "Guess who's coming to Denny's", in *Fortune*, (August 3), pp. 108-110.
- Feagin, J.; M. Sikes. 1994. *Living with racism, The Black middle class experience*, Beacon Press, Boston.
- Ferguson, A. 1994. "Chasing rainbows", in *Washingtonian*, (April), pp. 35-42.
- Ferguson, T. 1994. *Blue collar women: Trailblazing women take on men-only jobs*, New Horizon Press, Liberty Corner, NJ.
- Fisher, A. 1997. "The world's most admired companies" in *Fortune*, (October 27), pp. 220-40.
- Fitzpatrick, B. 1997. "Make the business case for diversity", in *HR*, (May), pp. 119-23.
- Fix, M.; R. Struyk (eds.) 1993. *Testing for discrimination in America*, Urban Institute Press, Washington.
- Fortune*. 1998. "The Fortune 1998 500", in *Fortune*, (April 27), pp. 211-68.

- Francke, L. 1997. *Ground zero, The gender wars in the military*, Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Franklin, P. 1994. *On your side, The story of the Nationwide Insurance Enterprise*, Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company, Columbus, OH.
- Fullerton, H. 1997. "Labor force 2006, Slowing down and changing composition," in *Monthly Labor Review*, (November), pp. 23-38.
- Galen, M. 1994. "White, male, and worried", in *Business Week*, (January 31), pp. 1-5.
- Gardenswartz, L.; A. Rowe. 1993. *Managing diversity, A complete desk reference and planning guide*, Business One Irwin, Chicago.
- Gentile, M.; R. Thomas. 1994. *Differences that work, Organizational excellence through diversity*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Gill, A. 1989. "The role of discrimination in determining occupational structure", in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 42 (4), pp. 610-23.
- Glass Ceiling Commission (1995). *Good for business: Making full use of the nation's human capital, The environmental scan*, Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, Washington
- Gordon, J. 1992. "Rethinking diversity", in *Training*, 29 (January), pp. 23-30.
- Graham, L. 1997. *Proversity*, John Wiley, New York.
- Greenberg, J.; R. Baron. 1993. *Behavior in organizations*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- Griggs, L.; L. Louw (eds.) 1995. *Valuing diversity, New tools for a new reality*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Harris, L. 1989. *The unfinished agenda on race in America*, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, New York.
- Harvey, D; D. Brown. 1996. *An experiential approach to organization development*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Hemphill, H.; R. Haines. 1997. *Discrimination, harassment, and the failure of diversity training*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.
- Herriot, P.; C. Pemberton. 1995. *Competitive advantage through diversity*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Holzer, H. 1996. *What employers want: Job prospects for less-educated workers*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Hubbard, E. 1997. *Measuring diversity results*, Global Insights Publishing, Petaluma, CA..
- Institute for Corporate Diversity. 1996. *Diversity in corporate America*, Institute for Corporate Diversity, Minneapolis.
- Jackson, S. 1992. *Diversity in the workplace, Human resource initiatives*, Guilford Press, New York.
- .; K. May; K. Whitney. 1997. "Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision making teams", in R. Guzzo, and E. Salas (eds.) *Team decision making effectiveness in organizations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco (in press).
- Jacobsen, J. 1994. *The economics of gender*, Basil Blackwell, Cambridge, MA..
- Jamieson, D.; J. O'Mara. 1991. *Managing workforce 2000*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Jaynes, G.; R. Williams (eds.) 1989. *A common destiny, Blacks and American society*, National Academy Press, Washington..
- Johnson, R. 1998. "The 50 best companies for Asians, Blacks, And Hispanics", in *Fortune* (August 3), pp. 94-122.
- .; J. O'Mara. 1992. "Shedding new light on diversity training", in *Training and Development*, (May), p. 45.
- Johnston, W.; A. Packer. 1987. *Workforce 2000*, United States Department of Labor, Washington.
- Jones, D. 1995. "Denny's strives to eliminate racist elements", in *USA Today*, (November 2), p. 1.
- Jones, J. 1997. *Prejudice and racism*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Kessler, L. 1990. *Managing diversity in an equal opportunity workplace, A primer for today's managers*, Employment Policy Foundation, Washington.
- Kluegel, J.; E. Smith. 1986. *Beliefs about equality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be*, Aldine de Gruyter, Hawthorne, NY.
- Kotler, P. 1994. *Marketing management*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Krueger, J.; M. Rothbart. 1988. "Use of categorical and individuating information in making inferences about personality", in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55 (1), pp. 187-95.
- Kohl, J. 1990. "Wanted: Recruitment advertising that doesn't discriminate", in *Personnel*, 68, pp. 18-26.
- Labich, K. 1996. "Making diversity pay", in *Fortune*, (September 9), pp. 177-180.
- Lawrence Livermore. 1996. *Institutional plan, FY 1997-2002*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA.
- Leach, J. 1996. *A practical guide to working with diversity*, MACON Publishing, New York.
- Lester, J. 1994. *The future of white men and other diversity dilemmas*, Conari, New York.

- Levering, R.; M. Moscovitz. 1993. *The 100 best companies to work for in America*, Doubleday, New York.
- Loden, M. 1996. *Implementing diversity*, Irwin Professional Publishing, Chicago.
- Lubove, S. 1997. "Damned if you do, damned if you don't", in *Forbes*, (December 15), pp. 122-3.
- Lynch, F. 1997. *The diversity machine, The drive to change the "white male" workplace*, The Free Press, New York.
- Lyons, F. 1991. *Invisible victims, White males and the crisis of affirmative action*, Praeger, New York.
- Morrison, A. 1992. *The new leaders, Guidelines on leadership diversity in America*, Josey Bass, New York.
- Moskos, C.; J. Butler. 1996. *All that we can be, Black leadership and racial integration the army way*, Basic Books, New York.
- Murnane, R.; F. Levy. 1996. *Teaching the new basic skills*, The Free Press, New York.
- Myers, D. 1990. *Social psychology*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Myers, J. 1995. *Enhancing the effectiveness of diversity awareness training, A review of the research literature*, United States Federal Aviation Administration, Washington.
- Myers, S.; J. Lambert. 1993. *Managing cultural diversity, A trainer's guide*, Intercultural Development, Inc. and Lambert and Associates.
- Neckerman, J.; K. Kirschenman. 1991. "We'd love to hire them, but...", The meaning of race for employers", in C. Jencks and P. Peterson (eds.) *The urban underclass*, Brookings Institution, pp. 203-34.
- Olsten. 1994. *Workplace social issues 1994*, Olsten Corporation, New York.
- Osterman, P. 1994. "How common is workplace transformation and who adopts it?", in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47 (January).
- Paulin, G. 1998. "A growing market, expenditures by Hispanic consumers", in *Monthly Labor Review*, (March), pp. 3-21.
- Pollar, O.; R. Gonzalez. 1995. *Dynamics of diversity*, TMS, Oakland, CA.
- Portes, A.; R. Bach. 1985. *Latin journey: Cuban and Mexican immigrants in the United States*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Potts, J. 1995. "The diversity assessment survey", in *The Diversity Factor*, (winter), pp. 2-11.
- Powell, G. 1994. *Gender and diversity in the workplace: Learning activities and exercises*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.
- . 1993. *Men and women in management*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Powell, W.; L. Smith-Doerr. 1994. "Networks and economic life", in N. Smelser and R. Swedberg (eds.) *Handbook of economic sociology*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, pp. 368-402.
- Prairie Fire. 1992. *Shattered promises, The plight of non-English speaking workers in Iowa's meat packing industry*, Prairie Fire Rural Action, Des Moines, IA..
- Rabin, M. 1998. "Psychology and economics", in *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36 (March), pp. 11-46.
- Reskin, B.(ed.) 1984. *Sex segregation in the workplace: Trends, explanations, remedies*, National Academy Press, Washington.
- Rice, F.1994. "How to Make Diversity Pay", in *Fortune*, (August 8), pp. 78-86.
- . 1996. "Denny's changes its spots", in *Fortune*, (May 13), pp.133-142.
- Roberts, B.; J. White. 1998. *Roberts v. Texaco, A true story of race in corporate America*, Avon Books, New York.
- Rogers, J.; M. Barrett 1998. "Barriers and building blocks: Organizing temporary workers in a contingent economy", in *Review of Industrial Relations*, (in press).
- Rosen, B. 1978. "Management perception of older workers", in *Monthly Labor Review*, (101), pp. 33-5.
- Rosenfeld, J.; A. Culberston(eds.) 1995. *Hispanics in the workplace*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Rutherglen, G. 1994. *Protecting aliens, immigrants, and ethnic minorities from discrimination in employment: The experience of the United States*, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Rynes, S.; B. Rosen. 1994. "What makes diversity programs work?", in *HR Magazine*, (October), pp. 67-73.
- SCANS [Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills]. 1992. *Learning a living: A blueprint for high performance*, United States Department of Labor, Washington.
- Schultz, V.; S. Peterson. 1992. "Race, gender, work, and choice: An empirical study of the lack of interest defense in Title VII cases challenging job segregation", in *University of Chicago Law Review*, (59), pp. 1073-81.
- Seelye, H. 1995. *Cultural clash, Managing in a multi-cultural world*, NTC Publishing.
- Segal, L.; D. Sullivan. 1997. "The growth of temporary services work", in *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11 (2), pp. 117-36.
- Sloan, A. 1996. *My years with General Motors*, Doubleday, New York.
- Smith, M.; S. Johnson. 1992. *Valuing differences in the workplace*, American Society for Training and Development, Alexandria, VA.

- Stewart, T. 1997. "Owens Corning, Back from the dead", in *Fortune*, (May 26), pp. 118-26.
- Strebel, P. 1996. "Why do employees resist change?", in *Harvard Business Review*, (May-June), pp. 86-92.
- Tannen, D. 1994. *Talking 9 to 5: How men's and women's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done at work*, William Morrow, New York.
- Taylor, P.; D. Powell; J. Wrench. 1997. *The evaluation of anti-discrimination training activities in the United Kingdom*, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Thernstrom, S.; A. Thernstrom. 1997. *America in black and white, One nation indivisible*, Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Thomas, D.; S. Wetlaufer. 1997. "A question of color, A debate on race in the United States workplace", in *Harvard Business Review*, (September - October).
- Thomas, R. 1991. *Beyond race and gender: Unleashing the power of your total workforce by managing diversity*, American Management Association, New York.
- . 1990. "From affirmative action to affirming diversity", in *Harvard Business Review*, (March-April), pp. 107-17.
- Towers Perrin. 1990. *Workforce 2000: Competing in a seller's market*, Towers Perrin, Valhalla, NY.
- Useem, J. 1998. "Harvard Business School's 'woman problems'", in *Inc.*, (July), pp. 33-7.
- United States Bureau of the Census. 1994. *County and city data book, 1994*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington.
- . 1995. *Statistical abstract of the United States, 115th edition*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington.
- United States Coast Guard. 1994. *Managing diversity as a process study*, United States Coast Guard, Washington.
- Vogt, P. 1993. *Dictionary of statistics and methodology*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Wall Street Journal*. 1994. "The price of diversity varies by consultant", in *Wall Street Journal*, (July 20), p. B1.
- Walton, S. 1994. *Cultural diversity in the workplace*, Irwin Professional Publishing, Chicago.
- Wanner, R.; L. McDonald. 1983. "Ageism in the labor market, Estimating earnings discrimination against older workers", in *Journal of Gerontology*, 38, pp. 738-44.
- Watkins, S. 1997. *The black o: Racism and redemption in an American corporate empire*, University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA.
- Wentling, R.; N. Palma-Rivas. 1997a. *Current status of diversity initiatives in selected multinational corporations*, National Center for Research on Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- . 1997b. *Diversity in the workforce, A literature review*, National Center for Research on Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Wheeler, M. 1996. *Corporate practices in diversity measurement*, Conference Board, New York.
- Wilson, W. 1996. *When work disappears, The world of the new urban poor*, William A. Knopf, Inc., New York.
- Word, C.; M. Zanna; J. Cooper. 1974. "The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction", in *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10 (1), pp. 109-20.
- Wrench, J.; P. Taylor. 1993. *A research manual on the evaluation of anti-discrimination training activities*, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Wright, P.; S. Ferris; J. Hiller; M. Kroll. 1995. "Competitiveness through management of diversity: Effect on stock price valuation", in *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (1), pp. 272-87.

Annex: Profile Sheets

Profile Sheet 1: The Trainers

Training Organisation		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(1)	a publicly funded service	<u>19</u>	<u>17.6</u>
	educational institution	<u>36.8</u> %	
	government body	<u>63.2</u> %	
	"equalities" organization	<u>0.0</u> %	
	other	<u>0.0</u> %	
	TOTAL publicly funded	<u>100.0</u> %	
(2)	an independent training consultant	<u>56</u>	<u>51.9</u>
	commercial	<u>94.6</u> %	
	non-profit organization	<u>5.4</u> %	
	TOTAL independent	<u>100.0</u> %	
(3)	an anti-racist voluntary organization	<u>4</u>	<u>3.7</u>
(4)	a professional or employer's association	<u>1</u>	<u>0.9</u>
(5)	a labour movement organisation	<u>11</u>	<u>10.2</u>
	individual trade union	<u>90.9</u> %	
	union federation	<u>0.0</u> %	
	union confederation	<u>9.1</u> %	
	other	<u>0.0</u> %	
	TOTAL labour movement	<u>100.0</u> %	
(6)	the internal training section or department of an organisation, providing in-house training	<u>17</u>	<u>15.7</u>
(7)	other	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (1)+(2)+(3)+(4)+(5)+(6)+(7)		<u>108</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Profile Sheet 2: Target Group Of The Training

		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Personnel/Management:			
(a)	Personnel, line managers, private sector	<u>81</u>	<u>75.1</u>
	Size of employer:		
	Up to 99 employees	<u>3.7</u>	%
	100-499 employees	<u>3.7</u>	%
	500-999 employees	<u>3.7</u>	%
	1000-4999 employees	<u>3.7</u>	%
	5000+ employees	<u>59.3</u>	%
	Not Known	<u>25.9</u>	%
	TOTAL private sector	<u>100.0</u>	%
	Type of private sector employer		
	Agriculture	<u>3.7</u>	%
	Construction	<u>1.8</u>	%
	Energy	<u>3.7</u>	%
	Engineering	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Finance	<u>1.8</u>	%
	Hotel/Catering	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Manufacturing	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Minerals	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Transport/Communication	<u>3.7</u>	%
	Wholesale/Retail	<u>1.8</u>	%
	Other	<u>83.5</u>	%
	TOTAL private sector	<u>100.0</u>	%
(b)	Personnel, line managers, public sector	<u>13</u>	<u>12.0</u>
	Type of public sector organization:		
	Education	<u>30.8</u>	%
	Housing	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Social Welfare	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Health	<u>15.4</u>	%
	Engineering/Construction	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Environmental Services	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Leisure	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Transport	<u>7.7</u>	%
	Administration	<u>0.0</u>	%
	Other	<u>46.1</u>	%
	TOTAL public sector	<u>100.0</u>	%

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Trade Union:		
(c) Trade union officials and/or shop stewards	<u>11</u>	<u>10.2</u>
Type of union:		
General	<u>9.1</u> %	
Craft	<u>27.3</u> %	
White Collar	<u>18.2</u> %	
Industry Specific	<u>45.4</u> %	
Other	<u>0.0</u> %	
TOTAL	<u>100.0</u> %	
Union is:		
an individual union	<u>90.9</u> %	
a federation	<u>0.0</u> %	
a confederation	<u>9.1</u> %	
other	<u>0.0</u> %	
TOTAL	<u>100.0</u> %	
Job Centre:		
(d) Public servants in labor exchange	<u>1</u>	<u>0.9</u>
(e) Staff in private sector employment agencies	<u>1</u>	<u>0.9</u>
(f) Staff in vocational advisory services	<u>1</u>	<u>.9</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)+(d)+(e)+(f)	<u>108</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Status of trainees

(a) Senior Managers/Officials	<u>10</u>	<u>9.3</u>
(b) Middle Managers/Officials	<u>14</u>	<u>13.0</u>
(c) Ordinary Workers/Junior Staff	<u>8</u>	<u>7.4</u>
(d) Mixed groups	<u>76</u>	<u>70.3</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)+(d)	<u>108</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Profile Sheet 3a: The Training Courses
Target Group: Personnel/management

PART 1

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(1) Number of client organisations the training courses have been delivered to		
	1 <u>23</u>	<u>24.5</u>
	2 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	3 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	4 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	5 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6-10 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	11+ <u>71</u>	<u>75.5</u>
Not Known	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(2) Number of times the courses have been delivered		
	1 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	2 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	3 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	4 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	5 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6-10 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	11+ <u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Not Known	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(3) Number of years the courses have been provided		
	1 <u>7</u>	<u>7.4</u>
	2 <u>7</u>	<u>7.4</u>
	3 <u>5</u>	<u>5.3</u>
	4 <u>7</u>	<u>7.4</u>
	5 <u>5</u>	<u>5.3</u>
	6-10 <u>29</u>	<u>30.9</u>
	11+ <u>34</u>	<u>36.3</u>
Not Known	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(4) The training courses are:		
(a) restricted to single organization	<u>65</u>	<u>69.1</u>
(b) open to others	<u>9</u>	<u>9.6</u>
(c) varies, other, or don't know	<u>20</u>	<u>21.3</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(5) Participation for the trainees		
(a) voluntary	<u>27</u>	<u>28.7</u>
(b) compulsory	<u>32</u>	<u>34.0</u>
(c) varies, other, or don't know	<u>35</u>	<u>37.3</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(6) Number of trainers normally involved in teaching		
	<u>1 12</u>	<u>12.8</u>
	<u>2 8</u>	<u>8.5</u>
	<u>3 2</u>	<u>2.1</u>
	<u>4 6</u>	<u>6.4</u>
	<u>5 4</u>	<u>4.3</u>
	<u>6+ 62</u>	<u>65.9</u>
TOTAL	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(7) Use of trainers from ethnic minority/migrant backgrounds		
(a) always	<u>11</u>	<u>11.7</u>
(b) sometimes	<u>83</u>	<u>88.3</u>
(c) never	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(8) Average number of trainees participating in each course		
	<u>1-5 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6-10 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>11-15 7</u>	<u>7.4</u>
	<u>16-20 30</u>	<u>31.9</u>
	<u>21-29 40</u>	<u>42.6</u>
	<u>30+ 12</u>	<u>12.8</u>
Not Known	<u>5</u>	<u>5.3</u>
TOTAL	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(9) The training programmes are:		
(a) self-contained anti-discrimination/equal opportunities courses on migrants/ethnic minorities	<u>6</u>	<u>6.4</u>
(b) part of a broader equal opportunities training programme including gender issues, disabilities, etc.	<u>12</u>	<u>12.8</u>
(c) part of a broader "Diversity Management" programme	<u>72</u>	<u>76.7</u>
(d) part of a programme of broader general training within the organization	<u>4</u>	<u>4.1</u>
Total (a)+(b)+(c)+(d)	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(10) Length of the courses (in days)		
	<u>1 57</u>	<u>60.6</u>
	<u>2 26</u>	<u>27.7</u>
	<u>3 5</u>	<u>5.3</u>
	<u>4 1</u>	<u>1.1</u>
	<u>5 2</u>	<u>2.1</u>
	<u>6-10 1</u>	<u>1.1</u>
	<u>11+ 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	Not Known <u>2</u>	<u>2.1</u>
	TOTAL <u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(11) Number of times the courses are repeated in one year for each client organization		
	<u>1 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>2 5</u>	<u>5.3</u>
	<u>3 8</u>	<u>8.5</u>
	<u>4 2</u>	<u>2.1</u>
	<u>5 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6-10 6</u>	<u>6.4</u>
	<u>11+ 16</u>	<u>17.0</u>
	Not Known <u>57</u>	<u>60.7</u>
	TOTAL <u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(12) If the courses are repeated regularly they are:		
(a) part of primary competence training for different individuals	<u>53</u>	<u>56.4</u>
(b) updating "refresher" courses for people who have attended before	<u>7</u>	<u>7.4</u>
(c) no repeats, varies, other, or don't know	<u>34</u>	<u>36.2</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(13) Location of training courses		
(a) In the workplace	<u>47</u>	<u>50.0</u>
(b) In a separate training centre	<u>14</u>	<u>14.9</u>
(c) In a local educational institution	<u>1</u>	<u>1.1</u>
(d) By distance learning	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(e) Other	<u>6</u>	<u>6.4</u>
(f) Varies or don't know	<u>26</u>	<u>27.6</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)+(d)+(e)+(f)	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(14) Whether the courses lead to a formal qualification certificate or diploma		
Yes	<u>2</u>	<u>2.1</u>
No	<u>86</u>	<u>91.5</u>
Don't know	<u>6</u>	<u>6.4</u>
TOTAL	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>

PART 2

Course Content:	<u>No.</u>
(a) Cultural information on migrants and ethnic minorities, themselves, the history of the migration process, etc.	<u>57</u>
(b) Language training in the tongue of an ethnic minority/migrant community	<u>14</u>
(c) Information on the legal context of migration, citizenship, laws against discrimination, etc.	<u>63</u>
(d) Information on problems of racism and discrimination and how these affect ethnic minority and migrant communities	<u>92</u>
(e) Procedures of fair recruitment and selection related practices (e.g. ethnic monitoring principles and procedures)	<u>67</u>
(f) Broader equal opportunities strategies, such as how to write and implement a positive action/affirmative action policy	<u>94</u>
(g) Broader strategies, such as "Diversity Management"	<u>79</u>
(h) Other	<u>92</u>

Training Strategy:	<u>No.</u>
(a) To provide information to people who would not otherwise be aware of these issues	<u>82</u>
(b) To engage actively in specific exercises to produce attitude change in individual trainees	<u>55</u>
(c) To train specifically in certain actions so as to produce behavioural change in individual trainees	<u>90</u>
(d) To train in procedures to produce organisational change over and above the individual trainees who have attended the course	<u>85</u>
(e) Other	<u>86</u>

"Classroom" Methods:

(a) Traditional lecturing methods with trainees taking notes and learning from reference material	<u>82</u>
(b) Group exercises and discussions	<u>87</u>
(c) Role play and self-discovery exercises	<u>87</u>
(d) Case studies	<u>91</u>
(e) Learning from inter-ethnic contact.	<u>45</u>
(f) Other.	<u>35</u>

Training Materials:

(a) Written information packs, handouts, etc.	<u>91</u>
(b) Training videos	<u>65</u>
(c) Computer-based learning packages	<u>10</u>
(d) Other	<u>11</u>

Categorization of the Training Approach according to the Anti-Discrimination Training Typology

Training Type:	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(1) Information Training	<u>1</u>	<u>1.1</u>
(2) Cultural Awareness Training	<u>16</u>	<u>17.0</u>
(3) Racism Awareness Training	<u>3</u>	<u>3.2</u>
(4) Equalities Training	<u>36</u>	<u>38.3</u>
(5) Anti-Racism Training	<u>1</u>	<u>1.1</u>
(6) Diversity Training	<u>37</u>	<u>39.3</u>
(7) Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(8) Not classifiable	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (1)+(2)+(3)+(4)+(5)+(6)+(7)+(8)	<u>94</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Profile Sheet 3b: the Training Courses
Target Group: Trade Unions

PART 1

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(1) Number of client organisations the training courses have been delivered to		
	1 <u>7</u>	<u>63.6</u>
	2 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	3 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	4 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	5 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6-10 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	11+ <u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>
	Not Known <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	TOTAL <u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(2) Number of times the courses have been delivered		
	1 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	2 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	3 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	4 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	5 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6-10 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	11+ <u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	Not Known <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	TOTAL <u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(3) Number of years the courses have been provided		
	1 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	2 <u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
	3 <u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>
	4 <u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
	5 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6-10 <u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
	11+ <u>5</u>	<u>45.4</u>
	Not Known <u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
	TOTAL <u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(4) The training courses are:		
(a) restricted to single organization	<u>8</u>	<u>72.7</u>
(b) open to others	<u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>
(c) varies, other, or don't know	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(5) Participation for the trainees		
(a) voluntary	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>
(b) compulsory	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>
(c) varies, other, or don't know	<u>5</u>	<u>45.4</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(6) Number of trainers normally involved in teaching		
	<u>1</u> <u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>
	<u>2</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>3</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>4</u> <u>4</u>	<u>36.3</u>
	<u>5</u> <u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
	<u>6+</u> <u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>
TOTAL	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(7) Use of trainers from ethnic minority/migrant backgrounds		
(a) always	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(b) sometimes	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(c) never	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(8) Average number of trainees participating in each course		
	<u>1-5</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6-10</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>11-15</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>16-20</u> <u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>
	<u>21-29</u> <u>4</u>	<u>36.3</u>
	<u>30+</u> <u>3</u>	<u>27.3</u>
	Not Known <u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
TOTAL	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(9) The training programmes are:		
(a) self-contained anti-discrimination/equal opportunities courses on migrants/ethnic minorities	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(b) part of a broader equal opportunities training programme including gender issues, disabilities etc.	<u>4</u>	<u>36.4</u>
(c) part of a broader "Diversity Management" programme	<u>7</u>	<u>63.6</u>
(d) part of a programme of broader general training within the organization	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total (a)+(b)+(c)+(d)	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(10) Length of the courses (in days)		
	<u>1</u> <u>7</u>	<u>63.6</u>
	<u>2</u> <u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>
	<u>3</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>4</u> <u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
	<u>5</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6-10</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>11+</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Not Known	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
TOTAL	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(11) Number of times the courses are repeated in one year for each client organization		
	<u>1</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>2</u> <u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
	<u>3</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>4</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>5</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6-10</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>11+</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Not Known	<u>10</u>	<u>90.0</u>
TOTAL	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(12) If the courses are repeated regularly they are:		
(a) part of primary competence training for different individuals	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(b) updating "refresher" courses for people who have attended before	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
(c) no repeats, varies, other, or don't know	<u>10</u>	<u>90.9</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(13) Location of training courses		
(a) In the workplace	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
(b) In a separate training centre	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
(c) In a local educational institution	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(d) By distance learning	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(e) Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(f) Varies or don't know	<u>9</u>	<u>81.8</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)+(d)+(e)+(f)	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(14) Whether the courses lead to a formal qualification certificate or diploma		
Yes	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
No	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Don't Know	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>

PART 2

	<u>No.</u>
Course Content:	
(a) Cultural information on migrants and ethnic minorities, themselves, the history of the migration process, etc.	<u>7</u>
(b) Language training in the tongue of an ethnic minority/migrant community	<u>3</u>
(c) Information on the legal context of migration, citizenship, laws against discrimination, etc.	<u>10</u>
(d) Information on problems of racism and discrimination and how these affect ethnic minority and migrant communities	<u>11</u>
(e) Procedures of fair recruitment and selection related practices (e.g. ethnic monitoring principles and procedures)	<u>6</u>
(f) Broader equal opportunities strategies, such as how to write and implement a positive action/affirmative action policy	<u>11</u>
(g) Broader strategies, such as "Diversity Management"	<u>7</u>
(h) Other	<u>11</u>

Training Strategy:	<u>No.</u>
(a) To provide information to people who would not otherwise be aware of these issues	<u>10</u>
(b) To engage actively in specific exercises to produce attitude change in individual trainees	<u>10</u>
(c) To train specifically in certain actions so as to produce behavioural change in individual trainees	<u>10</u>
(d) To train in procedures to produce organisational change over and above the individual trainees who have attended the course	<u>11</u>
(e) Other	<u>11</u>

"Classroom" Methods:

(a) Traditional lecturing methods with trainees taking notes and learning from reference material.	<u>9</u>
(b) Group exercises and discussions	<u>11</u>
(c) Role play and self-discovery exercises	<u>10</u>
(d) Case studies	<u>11</u>
(e) Learning from inter-ethnic contact	<u>7</u>
(f) Other	<u>4</u>

Training Materials:

(a) Written information packs, handouts, etc.	<u>11</u>
(b) Training videos	<u>9</u>
(c) Computer-based learning packages	<u>0</u>
(d) Other	<u>3</u>

Categorization of the Training Approach according to the Anti-Discrimination Training Typology

Training Type	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(1) Information Training	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(2) Cultural Awareness Training	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
(3) Racism Awareness Training	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>
(4) Equalities Training	<u>4</u>	<u>36.3</u>
(5) Anti-Racism Training	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
(6) Diversity Training	<u>2</u>	<u>18.2</u>
(7) Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(8) Not classifiable	<u>1</u>	<u>9.1</u>
TOTAL (1)+(2)+(3)+(4)+(5)+(6)+(7)+(8)	<u>11</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Profile Sheet 3c: The Training Courses
Target Group: Job Centres

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
PART 1		
(1) Number of client organisations the training courses have been delivered to		
	1 <u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	2 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	3 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	4 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	5 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6-10 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	11+ <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	Not Known <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	TOTAL <u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(2) Number of times the courses have been delivered		
	1 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	2 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	3 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	4 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	5 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6-10 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	11+ <u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	Not Known 0	<u>0.0</u>
	TOTAL <u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(3) Number of years the courses have been provided		
	1 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	2 <u>1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
	3 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	4 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	5 <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6-10 <u>2</u>	<u>66.7</u>
	11+ <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	Not Known <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	TOTAL <u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(4) The training courses are:		
(a) restricted to single organization	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(b) open to others	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(c) varies, other, or don't know	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(5) Participation for the trainees		
(a) voluntary	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(b) compulsory	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(c) varies, other, or don't know	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(6) Number of trainers normally involved in teaching		
	<u>1 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>2 1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
	<u>3 1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
	<u>4 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>5 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6+ 1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
TOTAL	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(7) Use of trainers from ethnic minority/migrant backgrounds		
(a) always	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(b) sometimes	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(c) never	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(8) Average number of trainees participating in each course		
	<u>1-5 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6-10 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>11-15 1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
	<u>16-20 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>21-29 1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
	<u>30+ 0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Not Known	<u>1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
TOTAL	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(9) The training programmes are:		
(a) self-contained anti-discrimination/equal opportunities courses on migrants/ethnic minorities	<u>1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
(b) part of a broader equal opportunities training programme including gender issues, disabilities etc.		<u>2</u>
<u>66.7</u>		
(c) part of a broader "Diversity Management" programme	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(d) part of a programme of broader general training within the organization	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total (a)+(b)+(c)+(d)	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(10) Length of the courses (in days)		
	<u>1</u> <u>2</u>	<u>66.7</u>
	<u>2</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>3</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>4</u> <u>1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
	<u>5</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6-10</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>11+</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	Not Known <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	TOTAL <u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(11) Number of times the courses are repeated in one year for each client organization		
	<u>1</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>2</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>3</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>4</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>5</u> <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	<u>6-10</u> <u>1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
	<u>11+</u> <u>2</u>	<u>66.7</u>
	Not Known <u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	TOTAL <u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(12) If the courses are repeated regularly they are:		
(a) part of primary competence training for different individuals	<u>2</u>	<u>66.7</u>
(b) updating "refresher" courses for people who have attended before	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(c) no repeats, varies, other, or don't know	<u>1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
(13) Location of training courses		
(a) In the workplace	<u>2</u>	<u>66.7</u>
(b) In a separate training centre	<u>1</u>	<u>33.3</u>
(c) In a local educational institution	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(d) By distance learning	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(e) Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(f) Varies or don't know	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (a)+(b)+(c)+(d)+(e)+(f)	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(14) Whether the courses lead to a formal qualification certificate or diploma		
Yes	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
No	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Don't Know	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>

PART 2

Course Content	<u>No.</u>
(a) Cultural information on migrants and ethnic minorities, themselves, the history of the migration process, etc.	<u>2</u>
(b) Language training in the tongue of an ethnic minority/migrant community	<u>0</u>
(c) Information on the legal context of migration, citizenship, laws against discrimination, etc.	<u>2</u>
(d) Information on problems of racism and discrimination and how these affect ethnic minority and migrant communities	<u>3</u>
(e) Procedures of fair recruitment and selection related practices (e.g. ethnic monitoring principles and procedures)	<u>2</u>
(f) Broader equal opportunities strategies, such as how to write and implement a positive action/affirmative action policy	<u>3</u>
(g) Broader strategies, such as "Diversity Management"	<u>3</u>
(h) Other	<u>3</u>

		<u>No.</u>	
Training Strategy			
(a)	To provide information to people who would not otherwise be aware of these issues	<u>3</u>	
(b)	To engage actively in specific exercises to produce attitude change in individual trainees	<u>1</u>	
(c)	To train specifically in certain actions so as to produce behavioural change in individual trainees	<u>3</u>	
(d)	To train in procedures to produce organisational change over and above the individual trainees who have attended the course	<u>2</u>	
(e)	Other	<u>2</u>	
"Classroom" Methods:			
(a)	Traditional lecturing methods with trainees taking notes and learning from reference material	<u>2</u>	
(b)	Group exercises and discussions	<u>3</u>	
(c)	Role play and self-discovery exercises	<u>2</u>	
(d)	Case studies	<u>3</u>	
(e)	Learning from inter-ethnic contact	<u>0</u>	
(f)	Other	<u>1</u>	
Training Materials:			
(a)	Written information packs, handouts, etc.	<u>3</u>	
(b)	Training videos	<u>2</u>	
(c)	Computer-based learning packages	<u>0</u>	
(d)	Other	<u>0</u>	
Categorization of the Training Approach according to the Anti-Discrimination Training Typology			
		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Training Type			
(1)	Information Training	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(2)	Cultural Awareness Training	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(3)	Racism Awareness Training	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(4)	Equalities Training	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
(5)	Anti-Racism Training	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(6)	Diversity Training	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(7)	Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
(8)	Not classifiable	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL (1)+(2)+(3)+(4)+(5)+(6)+(7)+(8)		<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>