

BI Norwegian Business School
Thesis

How do Organizations Implement diversity?

Master in Business with a major in HRM
GRA 19003 Master Thesis

Supervisor:
Associate Professor, Dr. Laura E. Mercer Traavik

Date of submission:
01.09.2014

Campus:
BI OSLO

This thesis is a part of the MSc programme at BI Norwegian Business School. The school takes no responsibility for the methods used, results found and conclusions drawn.

Content

CONTENT	I
ABSTRACT	III
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1 DIVERSITY	3
2.2 APPROACH TO AND PERSPECTIVES OF DIVERSITY	5
2.3 MANAGING DIVERSITY	6
2.4 THE LEVELS OF DIVERSITY PARADIGMS	8
2.4.1 DIVERSITY PARADIGMS	9
2.4.2 DIVERSITY POLICIES	9
2.4.3 DIVERSITY PROGRAMS	10
2.4.4 DIVERSITY PRACTICES	10
2.4.5 DIVERSITY CLIMATE	10
2.5 NORWEGIAN SETTING	11
2.6 THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF DIVERSITY POLICIES	12
3.0 METHOD	14
3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN AND ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING	14
3.2 PARTICIPANTS	15
3.3 PROCEDURE	16
3.3 MEASURES	16
3.3.1 Study 1	16
3.3.2 Study 2	17
4.0 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	18
4.1 RESULTS STUDY 1	18
4.2 ANALYSIS STUDY 2	22
4.2.1 New Focus	23
4.2.2 Diversity Policies	23
4.2.3 Diversity outside the organization	24
4.2.4 Barriers	24
5.0 DISCUSSION	25
5.1 NEW FOCUS	25
5.2 DIVERSITY POLICIES	26
5.3 DIVERSITY OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION	28
5.4 BARRIERS	29
5.5 LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH	30

6.0 CONCLUSION	31
REFERENCES	33
APPENDICES	38
APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE	38
APPENDIX 2: LETTER TO PARTICIPATION.....	42
APPENDIX 3: SURVEY QUESTIONS.....	43
APPENDIX 4: PRELIMINARY THESIS REPORT	44

List of Tables

Table 1. Items on questionnaire.....	17
Table 2. Results Study 1.....	19

Abstract

As the world increasingly becomes globalized, the society becomes diversified. This change leads to the organizational challenge as to how manage a divers workforce? To face the challenge of managing diversity organizations implement diversity policies and programs. This case study examines how organizations implement diversity policies. A diversity initiative was made from the organization when it chose to sign the Diversity Charter, thus committing to work with diversity and implement diversity policies. 2 months later, in study 1, a survey was utilized to assess the diversity climate. 254 employees from this Norwegian multinational corporation completed the electronic survey. Results from the survey shows that the diversity climate overall is good, although women report almost significantly to be less included than men. Moreover, 49.2% claims that the organization has no focus on diversity.

7 months after the Diversity Charter was signed, in study 2, interviews with 3 key informants were conducted. According to the informants, there were still no new diversity focus and no diversity policies had been communicated or implemented. These results are analyzed and discussed, as is the limitations and practical implications from this case study.

1.0 Introduction

Managing diversity has received increased attention since globalization has become imperative the last decades (T. H. Cox & Blake, 1991; Sippola & Smale, 2007). Reasons like a growing number of multinational organizations, deregulation of trade, flow of capital and individuals, and developing economies, has fueled the change from protectionism to globalization (Mor-Barak, 2011). The diversity management literature has provided a wide range of theoretical frameworks and empirical examples on how to manage a diverse work force (i.e. Gilbert, Stead, & Ivancevich, 1999; Mor-Barak, 2011; Sippola & Smale, 2007; Thomas, 1990). However, there is a gap between research and practice when it comes to diversity management (Kulik, 2014). The gap is caused by researches emphasis on employees' perceptions of organizations diversity work instead of targeting the managers (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Kulik, 2014; M.E. Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998). Diversity policies consists of initiatives that put organizations goals and intentions regarding diversity into writing and are communicated to stakeholders, often through missions statements, annual reports and web sites (Ferner, Almond, Colling, & 2005; Mor-Barak, 2011; Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 2000). In the start of the twenty-first century approximately 75% of fortune 500 had a diversity program mentioned on their web site (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). These policies are created by management and since not all employees are affected by diversity policies, as most of them arguably belong to the majority, they have little or no perception on whether the policies work or even exists, the managers do (Kulik, 2014). This study addresses this issue by investigating how organizations implements diversity policies from the management's perspective.

Historically, globalization comes in waves and it is not a new phenomenon. We are in such a wave now and while there is no one definition of globalization, it can be defined as the international integration in commodity, capital and labor markets (Bordo, Taylor, & Williamson, 2007). The change in economic policies is one of the key drivers of globalization, with removal or relaxing of restrictions on international trade and financial transactions (World Trade Organization, 2008). There is also a trend in that organizations are growing larger and are more

international or multinational (Sippola & Smale, 2007). These multinational companies employ people and produce goods all around the world increasing the need for understanding diversity and manage diversity (Mor-Barak, 2011; Sippola & Smale, 2007).

In addition to globalization, where the movement of labor is expected, there is an increase in immigration from family reunification and refugees, both economic refugees that dream of a better economic future and refugees due to war, starvation or prosecution. In the United Kingdom 8.3% of the population was born overseas, while in United States the number is 12% (Crisp & Turner, 2011). In Norway the number of immigrants, defined as people that are born elsewhere and have moved to Norway and have legal residence, are 11% in 2012. Forecast of immigration estimates that this number will rise to 20% in 2050 (Brunborg, 2013). These numbers do not include second or third generation immigrants. Most of the immigrants would traditionally work in low skilled positions in for example industry or construction, where language and education is not required to the same extent as in other jobs (Midtbøen & Rogstad, 2012). The trend of industrialized countries turning away from manual labor towards knowledge work, however, exclude many immigrants from the work force (Ashkanasy, Härtel, & Daus, 2002). Furthermore, Norway (as well as other industrialized countries) we are facing a surge of people ready for retirement from a 10 years time (Bellone & Bibbee, 2006). The share of elderly is increasing both due to the fact that fewer babies are being born and that people live longer (Ellingsen, 2006). These push and pull factors leads to great challenges, among others, how to pay for the healthcare and retirement benefits, how to keep ageing people as long as possible in the work force, how to fill the gap they leave behind when they stop working in the sense of knowledge loss, and how to fill their positions with qualified replacements. It is necessity to incorporate immigrants in organizations to fill the gap baby boomers leave behind, and we still require more worker immigration to keep the welfare state relatively at the same level as to day (Brochmann, 2007). Needless to say, diversity is something we will have to focus on, accommodate, and assimilate in all levels of society.

The purpose of this case study is to explore how organizations implement diversity policies. While diversity management arguably has been theoretically overemphasized through the views of employees (Kulik, 2014), this study follows

the founding of diversity management through managers' perception. The aim is to contribute to the theoretical and practical knowledge regarding implementation of diversity policies.

2.0 Literature Review

This literature review will establish the theoretical background to the research question: How do organizations implement diversity policies? It will start with the background of diversity, following into theories of the possible reasons behind why organizations choose to work with diversity and then diversity management. Next, the levels of an organization along with a closer look on different paradigms of diversity management will be included. Further, a closer look into the Norwegian setting, before diversity policies and how to implement them concludes this chapter.

2.1 Diversity

The organizational study of diversity appears to have developed from the time of the anti-discrimination movement of the 1960s in USA (Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000). Affirmative action came to exist and from 1972 secured the right for equal employment opportunities for women and minorities (Gilbert et al., 1999). The shifts in the US labor force of 1980s powered the change from affirmative action towards diversity, with a search on how to manage this diversity, a search that is not over (Colella, DeNisi, & Varma, 1998; Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000). Kelly and Dobbin (1998) however, view diversity as a “new dressing for affirmative action” claiming that affirmative action has been renamed and repositioned in order to escape from the former negative associations (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). On the other hand, according to Gilbert and Stead (1999), diversity is a more proactive approach compared to affirmative action and a needed development in order to affect the organizational culture (Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000). Moreover, Thomas (1990) stated that affirmative action was too narrow and reactive compared to diversity and that this new approach was needed. Mor-Barak (2011) argues that diversity is different from affirmative action in that instead of

correcting and righting passed wrongs, diversity wishes to engage and manage a heterogeneous workforce in such a way that it will become a competitive advantage for that organization.

Diversity has no set definition, instead it varies from a broad definition: we are all different in that we are all individuals (The Diversity Task Force, 2001 in Mor-Barak, 2011) to a narrow definition where specific demographic differences as age, sex, race and job tenure or status are named (Lau & Murnighan, 1998). Those who have a too broad definition of diversity, as for example that diversity is all differences between individuals, thus concluding that we are all different and diverse, have according to Mor-Barak (2011) missed the mark. The definition is of course true to some extent, as we are all individuals, however it misses the importance behind diversity and workforce diversity as a term. Diversity and workforce diversity aim to identify and support those groups who are or could be discriminated against in society or the workplace (Mor-Barak, 2011). In this study diversity is defined as belonging to a group that visibly or invisibly differs from the majority in the society (Mor-Barak, 2011). This could include, but not limited to demographics like ethnicity, culture, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation and health/disabilities.

Recently, diversity has been replaced more and more by the term inclusion (Roberson, 2006). While diversity has been researched extensively, scholars have only just turned their attention towards inclusion. Consequently, the construct is without agreement regarding its nature and the theoretical framework (Shore et al., 2011). According to Shore et al. (2011) most of the definitions of inclusion contain the meaning they put in the term belongingness and uniqueness. To be included the individual needs to feel both belongingness to a group and uniqueness within that group (Pickett, Bonner, & Coleman, 2002; Shore et al., 2011). M.E Mor Barak and Levin (2002) argues that women and minorities are more likely to feel excluded, as well as that job-satisfaction and well-being are linked to the feeling of inclusion (M.E. Mor Barak et al., 1998). Moreover, Mor-Barak (2011) defined exclusionary workplace as an organization where the newcomer has to adapt and conform to the already established values and norms, whereas on the other hand, an inclusive workplace has a “pluralistic value frame that respects all cultural perspectives represented among its employees” (Mor-Barak 2011, p. 9). In other words, an exclusive organization expects people to

conform to their existing culture, while an inclusive organizations culture would conform to that person (T. Cox, 2001). Furthermore, Mor-Barak (2011) states that an exclusionary organization would only concern themselves with their financial stakeholders, where inclusive organizations take on a wider responsibility, and work to benefit both extrinsic and intrinsic stakeholders.

2.2 Approach To and Perspectives Of Diversity

Influential research (i.e. Ely & Thomas, 2001; Thomas, 1990) emphasizes the judgmental effect the organizations approaches and perspectives have in regard to the success of diversity work within the organization and consequently, a closer investigation is required.

Ely and Thomas (2001) suggested three perspectives behind as to why organizations focus on diversity: the integration-and-learning perspective, the access-and-legitimacy perspective, and the discrimination-and-fairness perspective. The perspectives can be placed in a continuum along with a fourth called resistance, and as such ranges from resistance, to wanting to avoid lawsuits and conflicts, to a wish of reflecting the society they operate in, and last the integration-and-learning perspective which according to Ely and Thomas (2001) can lead to lasting organizational benefits from diversity (Kulik, 2014) .

Thomas (1990) has ten concrete points that may help organizations manage diversity. However his main point is “Managing diversity does not mean controlling or containing diversity, it means enabling every member of your work force to perform to his or her potential (Thomas, 1990. p. 112).” Furthermore, Thomas (1990) argues that it is the managers’ perception and organizational culture that has to change in order to succeed in incorporating diversity in all organizational levels. Accordingly, organizations fall in the “Affirmative Action Cycle” thinking hiring minorities is the problem, hires minorities, have great expectations, feels frustrated when nothing happens, silence and ignoring the failure until last, a crisis forces them to deal with diversity again, and the organization is back on the first step hiring minorities (Thomas, 1990).

Olsen and Martins (2012) have developed a theoretical framework where they suggest that there are two different types of values (and a combination of those two) that can be used to describe the attitudes an organization has towards

diversity: Terminal value and instrumental value. Moreover, Olsen and Martins theorizes that the success of an organizations' efforts related to diversity depending what kind of values that organization has. Olsen and Martins (2012) argues that a combination of the terminal and instrumental values are the best, followed by instrumental value and last terminal value. Value has been defined by Rokeach (1973), p. 5): as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence". Further, instrumental value can be described as something to "guide behavior in such a manner as to attain some desirable end state"(Rokeach, 1973). While terminal value is the "desirable end states themselves, which individuals strive to achieve" (Olsen & Martins, 2012; Rokeach, 1973). Olsen and Martins (2012) call the combination of the two values as a dual value, meaning that the organizational approach is that diversity is both important because it is "the right thing to do", but also it is "good for business". Furthermore, Gilbert and Stead (1999) argues that whether the organization hires based on either terminal value or instrumental value affects how the newly hired person and the existing employees both assesses the situation. Whereas terminal values may be perceived as unfair and bring a taste of "hired for diversity instead of qualification," instrumental value has a justification that leaves no questions whether the right person was hired or not. Thus, linking instrumental value to the integration and learning perspective and terminal value to discrimination and fairness.

2.3 Managing Diversity

Diversity management is the work of including all employees regardless of differences in both formal programs and informal networks (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Gilbert et al., 1999; Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000). It is voluntary and deliberate organizational actions designed to create inclusion of disadvantaged minorities (Gilbert & Stead, 1999; Mor-Barak, 2011). This is the organizational response to the growing diversity around the world, designed to recruit, include, promote and retain minorities (Mor-Barak, 2011). T. Cox (2001) claims that diversity management can generate a competitive advantage in areas of resource acquisition, marketing and problem solving (in Mor-Barak, 2011), thus is diversity management a strategic concern for the organization as a whole, not only the human resources (HR) department. Consequently, diversity management is

essential for organizations to survive and thrive. Moreover, the aim of diversity management is increasing profit through organizational transformation (T. Cox, 2001). Thomas Jr (1995) reminds us that diversity management is not only reserved for the minorities hired, instead it is the management of the mix of employees in the workforce. However, managing diversity has one prerequisite, there has to be a diverse workforce. Mor-Barak (2011) argues that recruiting minorities might be a goal of diversity management if there is little existing diversity within the organization. However, she recommends focusing on recruitment strategies, such as positive action policies, instead of diversity management if this is the goal (Mor-Barak, 2011).

According to Mor-Barak (2011) diversity management has two paradigms: One is the HR paradigm and the second is the multicultural organization paradigm. The HR paradigm is based on or inspired by the A-S-A (attraction-selection-attrition) (Schneider, GOLDSTIEIN, & Smith, 1995). Where candidates are attracted to organizations with members they perceive to have similar values to them selves, the organization selects candidates similar to existing organizational members, so that everybody feel comfortable (Schneider et al., 1995). This will lead to a dominant, majority organizational culture where minorities leave, creating a homogeneous workforce that are unhealthy for the organization. Unhealthy, in that it limits their talent pool, hinder their growth and renewal as well as their ability to change and move into new markets (Schneider et al., 1995). Mor-Barak's (2011) multicultural organization paradigm consists the three types of organizations by T. Cox (2001): The monolithic, the plural and the multicultural. A monolithic organization will have a homogeneous workforce or if there are minorities, they tend to have low-status jobs as receptionist, canteen worker or cleaning personnel (T. Cox, 2001). The monolithic organization expects diverse others to assimilate into the majority culture and are biased in favor of the majority (Mor-Barak, 2011). Furthermore, Mor-Barak (2011) argues that in the globalizing world of today such an organization will be in a competitive disadvantage. The plural organization has a small number of minorities in management positions and expects employees to assimilate to the majority culture (Mor-Barak, 2011). The organization follows laws and regulations. Still, they make no extra effort to incorporate and include minorities into informal networks and decision-making processes thus limiting their possibilities for i.e. promotion

and influencing the organization (T. Cox, 2001; M.E Mor Barak & Levin, 2002). The multicultural organization is the ideal type of organization, that fully include and values differences (T. Cox, 2001). If these three types of organizations were a continuum, then most organizations would be somewhere towards the middle (T. Cox, 2001).

The outcomes of diversity management has been researched and discussed, and as results vary with context, they are difficult to generalize (see Milliken & Martins, 1996; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998 for reviews). For example, Tajfel and Turner (1979) draw on social categorization and Byrne (1971) the similarity-attraction paradigm to suggest that a homogeneous workforce could communicate more effectively and have less conflict compared to a heterogeneous workforce, thus arguing that diversity can lead to negative organizational outcomes. While Williams and O'Reilly (1998), claims that diversity can improve performance by contributing with perspectives, ideas and knowledge into decision-making and creative processes (Olsen & Martins, 2012). According to Olsen and Martins (2012) the most important contextual research centers around what approach managers or organizations have to diversity management. The reason is that the approach is within the organizations' control deciding whether they are helped or harmed by diversity (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Thomas, 1990).

2.4 The Levels Of Diversity Paradigms

Kulik (2014) utilizes some of the typology from the research of Arthur and Boyles (2007) and presents five components of diversity paradigms: Paradigms, policies and programs above the line, practices and climate below the line. Furthermore, she argues that there is a gap between practice and research, a gap that has been created by an overemphasis on research below the line (Kulik, 2014). This line represents whom a researcher should ask in an organization according to Kulik. Above the line research should be done by targeting managers and HR personnel and below the line should address employees, to capture their perceptions (Kulik, 2014). This is in line with Syed and Özbilgin (2009) relational framework, where they argue that diversity management would greatly benefit from research in different levels: The macro-national level (to capture the differences between nations), the meso-organizational level (organizational processes, norms and activities) and the micro-individual level (the power, motivation and influence).

2.4.1 Diversity Paradigms

The first and topmost component of Kuliks (2014) diversity management framework is diversity paradigms, which she identifies as the organizations values, norms and beliefs regarding how to manage diversity. Several researches argue that the values behind organizations diversity initiatives affect the level of success that organization will see from their diversity work (T. Cox, 2001; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Olsen & Martins, 2012; Thomas, 1990). Olsen and Martins (2012) does not use the term paradigms, but instead call it diversity management approaches defining it as the norms and values behind that organization diversity work.

Mor-Barak presented three motivations behind why organizations implement diversity strategies: “Diversity is a reality here to stay,” “Diversity management is the right thing to do,” and “Diversity makes good business sense (2011, p. 246).” These three are similar to Ely and Thomas’ (2001) three perspectives introduced earlier, the integration-and-learning perspective, the access-and-legitimacy perspective, and the discrimination-and-fairness perspective. The aim of working with a voluntary issue like diversity management is increasing profitability (T. Cox, 2001). Thus, should an organization really consider their diversity paradigms before starting their work, as having the “right” values could predict their success. Kulik advises that mapping the organizations values and diversity paradigms should be done at management levels (2014).

2.4.2 Diversity Policies

The next component is diversity policies, which Kulik describes as the goal or objectives set by the organization concerning their HR recourses (2014). The diversity paradigm drives diversity policies. If the value of an organization is based on moral and ethics as reflected in Mor-Baraks “Diversity management is the right thing to do,” then equal opportunities might be in the goal of your diversity policies (Kulik, 2014; Mor-Barak, 2011).

2.4.3. Diversity Programs

The diversity paradigms and diversity policies both affect which diversity programs the organization chooses (Kulik, 2014). Diversity programs are the formal activities introduced to the organization. As an organization with the diversity policy of equal opportunities, a program could be diversity training for managers to overcome and be conscious of bias (Kulik, 2014). Programs are

typically either identity blind, activities aimed at removing obstacles for promotion and retention, or identity conscious, identifying minority talent and provide them with leadership training (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995; Kulik, 2014).

These three components are all above the line and Kulik (2014) argues that if research is to be done above the line, managers and HR personnel should be targeted. The meso-organizational level in the relational framework of Syed and Özbilgin (2009) could be seen as a above the line focus.

2.4.4 Diversity Practices

According to Kulik (2014) is diversity practices the employees' experience of how the organizations diversity programs works. These experiences may differ from the intentions of the programs as i.e. line managers could discourage employees to participate in diversity training as it takes time away from work or they perceive it as unnecessary (Kulik, 2014).

2.4.5 Diversity Climate

Last component is diversity climate, described by Kulik (2014, p. 132) as the "shared unit-level impression" on how important the diversity work is for the organization, based on their perception on diversity paradigms, policies and programs. Kossek and Zonia (1993) claims that minorities and women are more sensitive and appreciative to diversity efforts done, and as such work groups with higher representation of minorities will have a more positive attitude to diversity work and as such provide a better diversity climate. M.E. Mor Barak et al. (1998) argues that the perceived fairness and inclusiveness with regard to diversity is a central point in assessing the diversity climate. I.e. how fair are the programs and do you feel included in the organization.

These two "below the line" constructs could be related to the micro-individual level in the relational framework of Syed and Özbilgin (2009). They argue that individual power and ability to affect is important to how employees experience being a minority (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009).

2.5. Norwegian Setting

According to Syed and Özbilgin (2009) will diversity management research benefit from a macro-national consideration, as a specific national background affects the meso-organizational and micro-individual levels. Further, they argue

that is not only the nations legislation that has to be accounted for, but also other factors as political ideology, labor market, economy, demography, history, and national culture needs to be included. As they propose: “Macro context of the organisation shapes and is shaped by diversity management policies and practices” (Syed & Özbilgin, 2009, p. 2442). Some national contextual factors were discussed in the introduction others will be addressed here.

The focus on equality is strong in Norway. For instance, Norway pride it self in having gender equality in both the workforce and in education. By 2004 almost as many women as men were employed (75% women compared to 82% men) and in 2003 24% women had higher degree qualifications compared to 23% men (Grosvold, Brammer, & Rayton, 2007). The Norwegian government continues to work for even more equality. For example a law requiring a minimum of 40% representation and participation of each gender in publicly listed boardrooms was initiated in 2003 and effected from 2006 (Grosvold et al., 2007), and paternity leave increased to from 13 to 14 weeks as of 2013. Legislation has been changed to include gay and lesbians marriage in the marriage legislation, with the same benefits as heterosexuals (Hollekim, Slaatten, & Anderssen, 2012). Norway has among the worlds smallest gap between poor and rich (Landes, 1998).

The 11% immigrants that enter Norway each year traditionally work within service, industry or in low-status positions in organizations (Midtbøen & Rogstad, 2012). As the salaries in low-status professions increase in a slower pace compared to higher paid positions the difference between poor and rich in Norway is growing (Landes, 1998). This is not only a Norwegian challenge, globalization through migration from both refugees and work immigrants have changed the societies and challenged many countries, resulting in a growing gap between rich and poor in the worlds wealthiest countries (Landes, 1998). In addition, the industry in Norway employs fewer and fewer as plants are flagged out to save costs (J. Rogstad, 2000). Norway has experienced a shift from labor intense “blue collar” work to knowledge work, making it difficult for immigrants to find work (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; J. Rogstad, 2000). The lack of low-skilled work presents challenges to the Norwegian welfare system, as it will endure increased stress under the upcoming retirement of baby boomers in addition to unemployed immigrants (Bellone & Bibbee, 2006; Brochmann, 2007). However, most of immigrants in Norway do work and Norway still needs more immigrants in order

to fill the need for employees in the future (Bellone & Bibbee, 2006; Brochmann, 2007). This pressured situation due to the growth in a diverse Norwegian society and limited qualified employees for organizations to choose from, leads to increase in diversity within Norwegian organization and a question on how to manage diversity?

2.6. The Theoretical Background of Diversity Policies

Definition on diversity policies alone is hard to find. Mor-Barak defines policies and programs as actions “designed to increase the number of qualified applicants from designated groups (2011, p. 71). She talks about policies and programs as a joint venture, whereas Kulik (2014) argues that policies are the goals behind diversity work, and Olsen and Martins (2012) suggests diversity management approaches as a driver to diversity programs. However, their definition of diversity management approaches is more coherent with Kulik’s (2014) diversity paradigms than diversity policies. A definition used earlier in the context of diversity management in general, may be the closest to a definition for diversity policies there is: It is voluntary and deliberate organizational actions designed to create inclusion of disadvantaged minorities (Gilbert & Stead, 1999; Mor-Barak, 2011). Consequently, the goal (policy) behind diversity management is to include those minorities that need support and the voluntary and deliberate actions is the programs made in order to reach that goal. Since policies and programs are two concepts so tightly linked, they are used somewhat interchangeably in the diversity theories. Furthermore, if diversity policies are searched online, diversity programs appear. Consequently, although Kulik (2014) made the difference clear, policies in this research may point to both policies and programs.

Initially, there are two main types of choices an organization can do when establishing a diversity policy: Identity blind programs or identity conscious programs (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995). Identity blind programs focuses on removing obstacles minorities may face and facilitate their success. For instance remove names and gender from resumes, train managers to be bias free, and see the individuals merit instead of demographics (Olsen & Martins, 2012). Identity conscious programs take the persons demographical background into consideration. For example selecting certain minorities for leadership courses, providing minority talent with mentors or state that at least one with a minority

background will be called in for an interview (Kulik, 2014). Olsen and Martins (2012) draws parallels from identity conscious programs to what they call an integration strategy, while assimilation strategy draws on both identity blind and identity conscious programs. Olsen and Martins (2012) utilized the acculturation framework of Berry (1997, see also Berry, 1984), where there are four modes of acculturation: Assimilation, separation, marginalization, and integration. These four ranges between having little or no cultural change due to lasting contact to another cultural group, to integration where there is cultural change in the direction of the culture of the majority group while substantial parts of their original culture is kept (Sam & Berry, 2010). Similarities can also be drawn to Mor-Baraks (2011) inclusive or exclusive organizational culture, whether the organization includes the individual cultures or the organization expects the individual to culturally conform to them. Olsen and Martins (2012) expects that a diversity policy that focus on integration will be more attractive to women and minorities than one that an assimilating organization.

There has been some research regarding what types of diversity policies and programs that works or not, with advice as to what to implement (Bezrukova, Jehn, & Spell, 2012; Kalev et al., 2006; Thomas, 1990). Typically, organizations will implement one or more of these diversity policies: Diversity training of employees and management, inclusion through reducing the exclusion of women and different others, and establishing an organizational collective responsibility for diversity (Kalev et al., 2006).

Diversity training focuses on challenging stereotypes that are tied to intergroup bias (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). There is a difference between explicit bias and implicit bias. Where explicit bias are conscious and out in the open, while implicit bias are hidden and perhaps undetected and unconscious even for the person who is biased (Amodio & Devine, 2006). However, some argue that diversity training can backfire, in that it can create bias through employees getting aware of differences between them (Nelson, Acker, & Manis, 1996). Kalev, Dobbin and Kelly (2006) argues that diversity training does not work, that focus on inclusion show modest changes, and that a general organizational focus on increasing diversity does not work when it comes to actually increasing the level of diversity in an organization.

Weber (1978) claims that managers have to appoint specialists and give them

authority to achieve the goals that are set. This indicates that someone within the organization has to be responsible for the new focus or goal. Organizational sociologists and psychologists have found that employees continue on the same path as before ignoring new organizational goals and routines, due to many reasons, among them information overload (Kalev et al., 2006). If no one is responsible for the actual execution of diversity policies and the achieving of the goals that are set, these initiatives will disappear in the everyday work of managers as work tasks with shorter timelines will be perceived as more pressing compared to tasks with longer timelines and more strategic nature. This supports Kalev et al. (2006)s findings, in that diversity management, where one person or group got the responsibility and with support from management, is effective when it came to increasing the level of diversity (Kalev et al., 2006; Weber, 1978). Buttner, Lowe, and Billings-Harris (2009) found that increasing levels of minorities in the workplace were facilitated by managers recognition of different others in the organization and diversity policies as performance related feedback, in addition to hiring minorities.

This literature review shows a lack of theoretical and practical knowledge when it comes to diversity policies and their implementation. The aim is that this research could help contribute to existing knowledge. Consequently, the question stands: How do organizations implement diversity policies?

3.0 Method

3.1 Research Design and Organizational Setting

To answer the research question I conducted a descriptive case study. The discovery of the theoretical and practical gap in regard to diversity policies and how organizations implement them inspired me to learn more about this topic. A Norwegian multinational employment service organization is the data source. There is a female majority among the 500 employees in Norway, however only 8.9% in management reported diversity. To map the preexisting diversity climate I first conducted a questionnaire (study 1). To answer the “how” of my question

and with the call for research by Kulik (2014) in mind, the next step was interviewing management and HR personnel (study 2).

Study 1

A quantitative, 10 item, self-report questionnaire was used to map the preexisting diversity climate. The questionnaire was created using Qualtrics.

Study 2

A semi-structured interview was completed with key informants (interview guide in appendix).

3.2 Participants

Study 1

The 10 items questionnaire was linked to an e-mail sent to 412 employees along with a letter inviting them to participate (appendix). The e-mail was opened by 78% (325) of the recipients, the survey was started by 81% (266) of these, and it was completed by 95% (254) of the started. The total response rate was 61,7% (254/412). The gender distribution in the response reflects the organizational gender distribution with a majority of women. This survey was answer by 62% women and 38% men.

Study 2

3 key informants participated in interviews. These were identified as key informants and invited by HR. 1 male and 2 females were interviewed in line with the majority representation of female in this organization. Age ranged from 45 to 53, everyone with over 5 years higher education, everyone ethnic Norwegians, everyone managers. The informants were all very interested in diversity as a topic and had obviously reflected over diversity before I met them. This made the conversation flow effortlessly and resulted in stories from their work life that provided a deeper understanding to the diversity challenges the organization faces today.

3.3 Procedure

This research started when I was invited to attend a meeting where the organization signed and became a member of Diversity Charter Norway. By signing Diversity Charter the organization committed to have a strategic focus on diversity and incorporate diversity policies. In January a half-day seminar with diversity topic was conducted. The questionnaire was distributed to 412 employees 2 months after the organization signed the Diversity Charter, with a reminder sent 10 days after the initial distribution. In February an internal meeting with employee representatives and managers were conducted with results from the questionnaire presented and an unstructured interview with HR manager and personnel was performed. In May a breakfast meeting with diversity as topic was held. More than 7 months after the organization signed the Diversity Charter I interviewed key informants to investigate their progress and implementation of policies.

The informants were invited to participate by the HR department. Participation was thus voluntary. They were all managers and I came to their place of work, where they arranged for a meeting space. The interviews opened with asking permission to record the conversation, which they all agreed to. The reason behind wanting to use a recorder was that it allowed for a more flowing conversation, whereas without a recorder, I would have to analyze and note things during the interview, leaving a larger room for error. The conversation was kept in line with some key questions that I asked all informants, but the follow-up questions and the direction of the conversations came from a natural discussion. The interview guide evolved from the first interview to the last, due to interesting facts, follow-up question and curiosity about the subject from the informants. The duration of the interviews had an average of one hour.

3.3 Measures

3.3.1 Study 1

The questionnaire consisted of 10 items.

Table 1. Items on questionnaire

Gender	Female	Male				
Age	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	65<
Which characteristics would you include in the term diversity?	Age	Gender	Sexual orientation	Ethnic/cultural background	Religion	Disabilities
To what degree do you feel like a minority in the workplace?	very little				Very much so	
If you feel like a minority, why?						
To what degree do you perceive your organization to have focus on diversity?	very little				Very much so	
Diversity is a value to the organization	Strongly agree				Strongly disagree	
I feel included in the workplace.	Strongly agree				Strongly disagree	
Have you heard about Diversity Charter?	Yes/No					
To what degree do you think signing Diversity Charter will be positive for your organization?	very little				Very much so	

Questions ranged from demographics, to whether that person defines her/his self as a minority, to organizational information, attitudes toward diversity and inclusion, and last questions concerned Diversity Charter. 2 months had passed from the time of signing the Diversity Charter to this survey was done, and during that time the organization communicated this new diversity effort internally. These last two questions a dual purpose; one was investigating if this new effort had been noticed and two, inspire those who never heard of Diversity Charter to search for information. The questions were distributed in Norwegian and translated to English for the purpose of including them in this chapter (the original questions are in appendix). The scaled questions were answered on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from very little to very much so and strongly agree to strongly disagree. One descriptive question was included, if the respondent felt like a minority she/he could disclose why. At the end of the survey a question or comment opportunity was made.

3.3.2 Study 2

To be able to answer the research question I chose to use thematic analysis as analytic method (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This captures the important patterns in the data in relation to the research questions. The approached used is semantic, where only the explicit meaning of the data are considered, not interpretation of emotions or meanings that lay beyond what the key informant actually said. Accordingly, the semi-structured interviews were all carried out in Norwegian, recorded with the informants consent, transcribed word for word, collected in one

document to compare answers and look for themes emerging, identifying themes and interpret them searching for patterns that could shed light on the research question (see interview guide in appendix).

4.0 Results and Analysis

Results from study 1 will be presented along with an analysis of study 2.

4.1 Results Study 1

Because of the limited use of study 1 in the discussion of study 2, a short discussion follows the results as they are here presented. The theoretical thematic analysis done later for study 2 in this chapter stresses the importance of only including data that is part of the themes emerged. Study 1 is still of importance for the research done, as it maps out the organizations level of minorities, attitude towards diversity, the level of self-reported inclusion and familiarity to the organizations diversity initiative Diversity Charter.

Table 2. Results Study 1

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Means and standard deviations</i>			
	<i>%</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Demographics				
Female	62%			159
Male	38%			97
Age		3.33	1.4	
18-25	2%			4
26-35	22%			56
36-45	35%			89
46-55	26%			66
56-65	15%			39
65<	0%			1
Definition				
Age	66%			168
Gender	68%			174
Sexual orientation	46%			117
Ethnic/ cultural background	98%			249
Religion	63%			160
Disabilities	61%			156
Minority				
Degree (1= very small)		1.33	0.76	255
Why*				
Organization				
Focus (1= very little)		3.39	0.90	254
Value (1= very small)		4.14	0.75	255
Included				
Degree (1= very small)		4.50	0.70	248
Diversity Charter				
Known	24%			61
Unknown	76%			194
Outcome		2.38	0.83	
* 15 answers. 20% because of difference in Norwegian origin, 40% ethnicity and 40% other (age, gender, obesity, tenure, single parent, solitude)				

The gender distribution in this result is consistent with the gender distribution management reported before the survey, 62% female and 38% male. The age ranges from 18-25 year to over 65 years. Norwegian employees has the possibility to take early retirement from the age of 62, the organization however, can let you go without justification the year you turn 70 (Bellone & Bibbee, 2006). The mean is 38,7 years old.

Almost all define diversity as ethnicity or cultural background, and more women than men included more demographics in the expression. Next followed gender, then age and appearances. Religion is close behind, together with physical and psychological circumstances. Few included sexual orientation, which could have

several explanations. Norway is viewed internationally as a very liberal country, and it could be that the employees just don't see sexual orientation as diverse demographics because it is relatively "normal" or accepted. Or perhaps they do not include sexual orientation because it could be hard to identify who is different from just looking at people? A third option could be that there is no one within the organization that is openly gay, lesbian or otherwise sexual minority, which could result in employees overlooking the importance of including the characteristic. Grønningsæter and Nuland (2008) argue that when a difference in sexual orientation is apparent or distinct, then Norwegians are not quite so liberal. Moreover, they claim that this lead to sexual minorities "hiding" their "true self" when at work.

Over 90% do not feel like a minority in the organization. Only 3.2% identified themselves as a minority (the gap between these two is caused by the middle value), more female than males report as feeling like a minority. This 3.2% of self-reported minority is not consistent with the manager reported 8.9%. This could indicate that minorities did not answer this survey or that those who managers see as minorities do not feel like a minority. Another possibility is that the diversity among the 412 employees that the survey was distributed to is different from the average in the whole organization. Some subsidiaries were excluded from this survey by the organization. However, those who did report that they feel like a minority named several reasons why. From 15 answers as to why they feel like a minority, 20% answered because of difference in Norwegian origin, 40% ethnicity or cultural background and 40% gave other and several reasons (age, gender, obesity, tenure, single parent, solitude). Most surprising for me was reports on feeling like a minority because of a background from other parts of Norway. Researcher Gillian Warner-Söderholm confirms that there are both differences in cultural aspects and dialects that could explain why they feel like a minority (Warner-Söderholm, 2012). This regardless of place of employment, meaning that the minority feeling is there whether someone from Northern Norway works in Oslo or if someone from Oslo works in Bergen. Perhaps Norway is such an elongated country with small cities spread with noticeable distances apart, that considerable difference in dialects and behavior makes it so that we have to consider diversity difficulties also with ethnic Norwegians? Mor Barak (2011) however, argue that regional differences, while

they may make you feel different, they are not the cause of you being treated differently in the workplace. Furthermore, she claims, “diversity is about belonging to groups that are visible or invisible different from what is considered mainstream in that society” (Mor-Barak, 2011, p 131). In Norway however, there has been a historical discrimination against people from Northern Norway. When they moved in quantities to the South of Norway looking for employment in the 1960s, they were considered not trustworthy, stealing work from locals, unfit for renting homes and less intelligent (Hellstad, 2010). This could indicate that while this discrimination is from some years ago, some bias against people from Northern Norway may still exist, thus supporting employees in the organization when they feel like a minority even though they are from the same country. The Sami people still report discrimination as the indigenous people of Norway (Hansen, Melhus, & Lund, 2010).

Moving on through the results from the short survey, 50.8% say their organization has a focus on diversity while 32% are indecisive whether or not they have a focus. This means that 49.2% thinks the organization has no focus on diversity, as average score arguably is not a focus. This could indicate that there is a need to communicate clearer and more about diversity. A massive 87% agree or strongly agree that diversity is a value for the organization. However, it is uncertain how respondents have interpreted this question. Do they think about diversity as an ethical and communicated value? On the organizations international web page they state that they consider “diversity in the workplace to be essential, and encourages and embraces its diverse workforce.” The Norwegian web page however, is not that vocal about their commitment. There is says that they wish to be an inclusive employer, and works for employment for all that can and want to contribute (my translation). The difference between the two statements are that the international web page talks about their own organization, while the Norwegian talks about wishing to be inclusive and then how they provide a service to employ different others outside their own organization. Further, the respondents may have interpreted the question as monetary value, that employing for diversity could lead to better financial results. Or perhaps that employing for diversity could lead to other outcomes that are of value. Nevertheless, the majority is very positive. Most of the employees report that they feel included at the workplace (93%). However, further analysis show that there is almost a significant tendency that

women report feeling less included compared to men in this organization, which is unexpected as women is the majority. One reason could be that more women than men are a minority, and as a minority you feel less included.

Next question were whether or not they have heard about Diversity Charter. The idea behind this question was that an article was posted on their internal communication network about this organizations' commitment to work with diversity through signing Diversity Charter. Consequently, this question could to some degree reveal the efficiency of this internal communication network. This could additionally be a way to make more employees aware of Diversity Charter, as they would note the name and perhaps search for information. 76% said they have not heard about Diversity Charter, which could indicate that the communication about this work could be better. The majority of the respondents (42%) reported that signing Diversity Charter affect their organization positively, while 57% doubted the effect or answered no effect because that had never heard of the initiative. If this organization is to succeed with their diversity work, communication has to be better.

At last there was room for feedback and comments. Some expressed their agreement on the importance of the subject, one noted the importance on making inclusion a collective exercise and not yet another thing managers have implement, and one mentioned that this organization focuses on expertise and character when hiring, not how people look like or what demographics that person has. All in all only 6% had any comments to this survey.

4.2 Analysis Study 2

This analysis is a theoretical thematic one that focuses on the results emerged that has an interesting theoretical or practical implication to answer the research question (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This means that instead of relaying all the themes that emerged during the analysis, I only include those that are interesting in regard to the research question. There were several themes that emerged from the transcribed interviews, those who are directly relevant to the research question are titled: new focus, diversity policies, diversity outside the organization, and barriers.

To answer the question how do organizations implement diversity policies, several issues have to be addressed. The aim of this study was to contribute both practically and theoretically. Next, as the organization can be called an expert in

the field of employment, the key informants answers are both regarding their organization internally named diversity policies, and how other organizations should and are addressing diversity externally. The divide is interesting and is as such included under the theme diversity outside the organization. Last theme included is barriers to increasing diversity internally and implement policies. This chapter includes the analysis and the next chapter discusses the results found.

4.2.1 New Focus

When the organization signed Diversity Charter and communicated this to their employees, they at the same time launched their new focus on diversity. Through the signed charter they committed to work with diversity and implement diversity policies. Their spoken goal with this diversity initiative was to increase the level of minorities employed in the organization. However, after the first mention on their intranet, have this focus been communicated? The survey results gathered 2 months after showed that 49.2% did not think the organization had a diversity focus. Furthermore, 76% had never heard of the signing of Diversity Charter. 7 months later are the interviews with the key informants held. They are in agreement that the focus should be stronger and better communicated. It should be mentioned in different settings, through multiple channels and often. Moreover, the informants with longer tenure noted that nothing had changed from earlier diversity initiatives and called for more seriousness behind the communication. As one informant puts it:

Hello people, we have to wake up. We are only ethnic Norwegians in the entire organization. We have to change. It has to come from the top. We have to feel that it is important for the organization in order to survive. We have to believe it when they say it and that it is not just window dressing.

4.2.2 Diversity Policies

Despite the signing of Diversity Charter more than 7 months earlier, no diversity policies had been implemented according to the key informants. The theme that emerged from the transcripts was instead which diversity policies the organization could implement. Although all the key informants was unenthusiastic to the idea of rules and regulations they all recognized problems with the voluntary aspect of

diversity policies. They all thought that voluntary policies would go unnoticed and if you really wanted change in the organization, stronger tools was needed. Suggestions mentioned were resumes without names and at least one with minority background called in for interviews as possible policies. In addition were policy ideas like including diversity in their new employee training, permission and encouragement to use their own resume base to find candidates with minority background and ask talented minorities when they contact the organization for other purposes.

4.2.3 Diversity outside the organization

This organization can be considered experts within recruitment and while going through the interviews a theme of their view on other organizations diversity attitudes and work emerged. They mentioned their task in “selling in” minorities to other organizations. This is where they through talks discuss the demands the customer has when looking for a new employee. Then their job is to widen the circle, focus on qualifications instead of demography so that the customer has more candidates to choose from. Since the labor market is currently in favor of the candidates, this task of getting the employer to consider different others is key to winning the assignment as there is not enough ethnic Norwegians between 35 and 45 with this specific education to chose from. While all report an improvement in the general attitudes toward diversity in other organizations they stress the importance that diversity should be addressed in the media to further this improvement. The key informants also expressed despair over customers that refuse good candidates with minority background for no other reason than their background. They all say they find it senseless to discard people on behalf of their divers background. The informants also advised against working for a company that discriminates candidates based on characteristics or gender:

You have to choose an inclusive employer, you don't want to work for someone who discriminates.

4.2.4 Barriers

While discussing the lack of existing diversity in this organization several reasons as to why were mentioned by the key informants and consequently a theme emerged.

All informants mentioned the qualifications, or the lack thereof by minorities applying for positions in the organization as a challenge. Under the statement of lack of qualification is the problem of reaching qualified minorities and getting them to apply. The informants all stressed the importance of Norwegian as an absolute qualification to be able to work in their organization. As one informant put it:

The first job you have in Norway is learning Norwegian.

All informants also agreed that it is easier to hire someone with similar culture as yourself or the organization, compared to someone that requires change.

I think intentions are good, but habit could affect the choice, you do as you've always done, chose what is safe.

While they recognized that change could be positive, they still meant that this is a barrier. An informant also mentioned bias, that when they recruit for their own organization, conscious or unconscious bias could affect the result.

5.0 Discussion

5.1 New Focus

The organizations commitment to working with diversity became a reality as they signed the Diversity Charter. According to researchers like Ely and Thomas (2001) and Thomas (1990) the values and intention behind the diversity work within an organization is predictive of the success the effort will have.

Ely and Thomas' (2001) three perspectives can be placed in a continuum along with a fourth called resistance, which then ranges from resistance, to avoiding lawsuits and conflicts, to wanting to reflect the society they operate in, and at last

the integration-and-learning perspective which could lead to lasting organizational benefits from diversity (Kulik, 2014). The values expressed by the key informants centered around wanting to reflect society, with some statements in the direction of Ely and Thomas' (2001) perspective of integration and learning. Furthermore, this organizations goal is to increase its diversity levels. With the "right" values potential conflict could be avoided. Gilbert and Stead (1999) argues that whether the organization hires based on either terminal value or instrumental value affects how the newly hired person and the existing employees both assess the situation. Terminal value may be perceived as unfair and bring a taste of "hired for diversity instead of qualification" however, instrumental value has a justification that leaves no questions whether the right person was hired or not. Instrumental value could accordingly be linked to integration and learning perspective. If the organization adopts and communicates the perspective of integration and learning instead of reflecting society, then they could achieve a competitive advantage (Kulik, 2014).

In addition to internalize the "right" perspective or values it has to be communicated. A single mention of a new diversity focus on the intranet is not enough. The diversity effort has to be lifted up to a strategic level (Olsen & Martins, 2012) and communicated in several situations and using multiple channels. Although the informants are all managers they did not contemplate their own possibility to communicate these values, only the CEO.

5.2 Diversity policies

Diversity policies are typically either identity blind or identity conscious. The first is activities aimed at removing obstacles for promotion and retention, while the second identifies talent with minority background and provide them with for example leadership training (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995; Kulik, 2014). The organization should decide in which direction they want to go with diversity. Identity blind diversity policies are easier to implement and are less offensive to those who are against affirmative action (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995). These could be policies as suggested by the key informants nameless resumes and inviting at least one with minority background to interviews. For those who think that names on resumes does not affect who gets invited to interviews, the research of Midtbøen and Rogstad (2012) will be enlightening. Their research shows that the likelihood of being invited in for an interview reduces by 25 % if you have a

foreign sounding name compared to a majority sounding name with the exact same qualifications (Midtbøen & Rogstad, 2012). One informant expressed that diversity will even out automatically as time goes by. However, as Mor-Barak (2011) states, the forces behind historical discrimination is the same that will continue to discriminate, unless something are done. These forces could be social identity theory where one recruit and like people that are similar to your self. In the literature review this was identified as the A-S-A (attraction-selection-attrition) by Schneider et al. (1995). Here the candidates are attracted to an organization with members they perceive to have similar values to them selves, the organization selects candidates similar to existing organizational members, so that everybody feel comfortable. This will in turn lead to a dominant, majority organizational culture where minorities leave, creating a homogeneous workforce that are unhealthy for the organization. Unhealthy, in that it limits their talent pool, hinder their growth and renewal as well as their ability to change and move into new markets (Schneider et al., 1995). However, by creating an inclusive organization, one should also attract and retain more minority talent according to the A-S-A theory.

If the organization really wants to increase the diversity levels, then they should incorporate identity conscious diversity policies, where they search for minority talent and hire, promote, and retain them. This policy is in line with the suggestion from the informants to make use of their own resume base or approach talent they know but have not applied to a specific position within the organization. If they choose the latter, identity conscious approach, it would indicate a value or paradigm towards inclusive workplace (Mor-Barak, 2011), instrumental value (Olsen & Martins, 2012) and integration and learning perspective (Ely & Thomas, 2001). Furthermore, Mor-Barak (2011) argues that recruiting minorities might be a goal of diversity management if there is little existing diversity within the organization. However, she recommends focusing on recruitment strategies, such as positive action policies, instead of diversity management if this is the goal (Mor-Barak, 2011).

Typically, organizations will implement one or more of these diversity policies: Diversity training of employees and management, inclusion through reducing the exclusion of women and different others, and establishing an organizational collective responsibility for diversity (Kalev et al., 2006). However, they argue

that diversity training does not work, that focus on inclusion show modest changes, and that a general organizational focus on increasing diversity does not work when it comes to actually increasing the level of diversity in an organization. What works is hiring a diversity manager, not under HR to underline the strategic nature, and give her/him legitimacy to interfere in all levels and everything concerning diversity (Weber, 1978). That person could then remove names from resumes, get a copy of applications and call qualified different others and invite them to an interview, and discuss selection of candidates with the line managers when they are recruiting. Further, the organization is very decentralized and has offices throughout Norway. Each office and department has a leader with recruitment responsibilities. Alternatively to sending one diversity manager to be involved in every recruitment process, they can create a “buddy system” where a neighboring line manager is involved when hiring new employees. This could help right unconscious bias.

5.3 Diversity outside the organization

The informants tell about their work in “selling in” diversity to other organizations. However, they have to balance between sending out too many candidates with diverse background and ethnic Norwegians. This is because the employment service company is in a fiercely competitive market where there is no shortage in service providers, but on candidates. This means that the people that work with recruiting for others need to read in-between the clients’ list of demands in order to find candidates that fit the profile and win the assignment. If you as a customer feel like that the employment service provider does not understand you and constantly sends the wrong candidates, regardless of whether the formal qualifications are met, you have no obligation to stay on as customer and can freely move on to the next service provider.

The industries the organization provide services to are in a tough job market, they cannot afford to discriminate. It could also be that industries in a tough labor market uses employment service providers to a larger extent to find candidates. Midtbøen and Rogstad (2012) argue that when the job market is tough employers have to consider candidates they normally would discard. Further, Midtbøen and Rogstad (2012) claim that the more people that applied a position the higher the probability that employers chose based on discretionary

assessment and thus open up for discrimination, conscious or unconscious. So when the supply of employees is greater than the demand, employers discriminate more freely.

5.4 Barriers

The lack of qualifications among minorities was a recurring barrier mentioned that hinder diversity. The term qualifications can be divided into two. One is formal qualification as educations and work experience and two is informal qualification or suitability. Both need to be fulfilled in order for you to get the job. Not only to you have to have formal and informal competencies, you also have to manage to convey that you have them. If the recruiter are unsustain about your qualification, chances are that the uncertainty leads to you not getting hired. One key informants named ethnic minority background as an advantage, but would not count it as an informal qualification that could outweigh the lack of other informal qualifications. When the informal qualifications or suitability for a position are vague and shifting, almost like gut feeling or instinct of the person hiring (Midtbøen & Rogstad, 2012) it can be difficult to fulfill such qualifications or map them. If the organization specified informal qualifications, both candidates and recruiters would know what the demands are. This could also help getting away from the gut feeling and personal opinion about a person.

Research has found that informal qualifications outrank formal qualification in privately held companies, while formal qualification outrank informal qualification in governmental or municipality vacancies (Tronstad, 2010). This supports Midtbøen and Rogstads (2012) that ethnic minorities are less likely to be discriminated against in the public recruitment process. When informal qualifications are the judgmental reason behind whether you get the job or not, the leap over to social categorization is short. If recruiters rely on gut feeling or instinct when hiring, then the lack of knowledge of the body language to minorities, conscious or unconscious bias and prejudice may decide who gets the job. Stereotyping when meeting new people is a necessary and automatic process, where you automatically place individuals in categories and conscious or unconscious make decisions based on what you think you know (Fiske, 1992). Stereotyping and social categorization are well-known reasons why people discriminate and falls under the informal qualification. I.e. People from Somalia

are lazy or second generation immigrants are too ambitious to want to work for this organization. Midtbøen and Rogstad (2012) found that minorities had to have better qualifications in order to be assessed as equals to the majority, and that the uncertainty when assessing someone with unfamiliar characteristics made the employers avoid what they perceived a risk.

Language is often listed as a formal qualification in job ads, however, how perfect do you have to speak? In some ads the phrase “have to speak Norwegian fluently” can be found. This is by some read as “have to be Norwegian”.

Furthermore one could ask what kind of jobs requires what kind of knowledge level. Certainly, language is not necessary in all types of jobs.

J. Rogstad (2000) argues that when employers mean language it entails both being able to speak grammatically and write correct, however that you also are able to understand and interpret the cultural and social situations that may arise. As discussed earlier in this thesis, shortage of possible candidates to choose from has increased diversity in the work place and forced employers to find ways to make some jobs work with out language. Moreover, the research by Rogstad (2000) shows that while companies welcome people with relevant language knowledge, they experience that ethnic minorities in Norway does not know the sought after languages.

Mor-Barak (2011) defined exclusionary workplace as an organization where the newcomer has to adapt and conform to the already established values and norms, and an inclusive workplace would conform to that person (T. Cox, 2001). This organization wishes to be an inclusive workplace according to their web site, and should as such work harder to become one.

5.5 Limitations and Further Research

Even though qualitative research is superior to quantitative when it comes to capturing the complexity of attitudes, contexts and argumentations to individuals making decisions, it is also dependent of truthfulness from the informants and the researchers' ability to capture and convey the data satisfactory. When the topic of interviews is sensitive as diversity then social desirability bias is an issue.

Informants may have other attitudes towards diversity than what they expressed during our sessions. Furthermore, wanting to appear more open-minded and

inclusive are the more socially accepted virtue compared to discrimination of different others in the work place, especially when you work in the recruitment business.

The informants all participated voluntarily in this research and this could mean that only those who have special interest in the topic or have in their own view a strong moral towards diversity might have volunteered. The HR department approached those who they saw as key informants, thus indicating that the people interviewed had some kind of special interest. It could be that these informants as such do not reflect the views of the organization

As diversity in a Norwegian setting often refers to ethnicity it is easy during an interview to forget the breadth of the concept diversity both for the interviewee and interviewer. This could potentially affect the conclusions that are drawn here. It could be that this researcher was overconfident in including so many aspects of diversity, and that the analysis thus suffers under lack of investigation of certain topics.

Midtbøen and Rogstad (2012) have done extensive research on the range and causes of discrimination. They chose to exclude employment service companies and suggested instead further research within that industry. One of their questions was how the companies perceive their own role? This question could be interpreted in two parts. How do they perceive their role in the society as a whole, and what part do they play in the diversity work of others? The employment service industry already does a great job recruiting different others to organizations, consequently investigating their role more so than I was able to do here, would contribute to a lack in knowledge.

Furthermore, in order to investigate the black box called diversity policies, more longitudinal research is required.

6.0 Conclusion

The globalization of business, the increase in multicultural societies, and multicultural organizations demands understanding and valuing of different others. This case study sought after the answer to how organizations implement

diversity policies. The answer seems to be: slowly. In order for a diversity initiative to have affect, it needs to be communicated, planed, implemented, measured, and evaluated. Research shows that to have a chance of succeeding with increasing the diversity, the organization should have someone specialized in diversity with the legitimacy to affect decisions of recruitment and promotion. Diversity work, like other strategic work, can risk drowning in everyday tasks and deadlines. However, if you as an organization are serious about diversity it takes recourses and dedicated focus. The success of a diversity policy can lead to lasting competitive advantage and the society benefits from organizations voluntary work with diversity. It's a win-win situation.

References

- Amodio, D. M., & Devine, P. G. (2006). Stereotyping and Evaluation in Implicit Race Bias: Evidence for Independent Constructs and Unique Effects on Behavior. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 91*(4), 652-661.
- Arthur, J. B., & Boyles, T. (2007). Validating the human resource system structure: A levels-based strategic HRM approach. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(1), 77-92. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.02.001
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Diversity and Emotion: The New Frontiers in Organizational Behavior Research. *Journal of Management, 28*(3), 307-338.
- Bellone, B., & Bibbee, A. (2006). The ageing challenge in Norway: Ensuring a sustainable pension and welfare system. (480).
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied psychology, 46*(1), 5-34.
- Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing Diversity Training: Where We Have Been and Where We Should Go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(2), 207-227.
- Bordo, M. D., Taylor, A. M., & Williamson, J. G. E. (2007). Globalization in historical perspective. *University of Chicago Press*.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.
- Brochmann, G. (2007). Internasjonal migrasjon, velferdsstat og arbeidsinnvandring. Retrieved 23.08, 2014, from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ud/kampanjer/refleks/innspill/identitet/brochmann.html?id=492994>
- Brunborg, H. (2013). Hvor mange innvandrere er det - og blir det - i Norge? *Samfunnsspeilet, 27*(3), 2-10.
- Buttner, E. H., Lowe, K. B., & Billings-Harris, L. (2009). The challenge of increasing minority-group professional representation in the United States: Intriguing findings. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 20*(4), 771-789.
- Byrne, D. E. (1971). *The attraction paradigm Academic Pr., 11*.
- Colella, A., DeNisi, A. S., & Varma, A. (1998). The impact of ratee's disability on performance judgments and choice as partner: The role of disability–job fit stereotypes and interdependence of rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(1).
- Cox, T. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: a strategy for capturing the power of diversity.:* Jossey-Bass.

-
- Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *The Executive*, 45-56.
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2011). Cognitive Adaptation to the Experience of Social and Cultural Diversity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(2), 242-266. doi: 10.1037/a0021840
- Ellingsen, D. (2006). Mens vi venter på eldrebølgen. *Samfunnsspeilet/Statistisk sentralbyrå*. 20(5-6).
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Ferner, A., Almond, P., Colling, T., & (2005). Institutional theory and the cross-national transfer of employment policy: the case of 'workforce diversity' in US multinationals. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(3), 304-321.
- Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review*, 99(4), 689-723. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.99.4.689
- Gilbert, J. A., Stead, B., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1999). Diversity Management: A New Organizational Paradigm. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21(1), 61-76.
- Gilbert, J. A., & Stead, B. A. (1999). Stigmatization Revisited; Does Diversity Management Make a Difference in Applicant Success?. *Group & Organization Management*, 24(2), 239-256.
- Grosvold, J., Brammer, S., & Rayton, B. (2007). Board diversity in the United Kingdom and Norway: an exploratory analysis. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 16(4), 344-357. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8608.2007.00508.x
- Grønningsæter, & Nuland. (2008). Diskriminering av lesbiske, homofile og bifile av hivpositive - en litteraturgjennomgang (Vol. 24). Oslo: Fafo.
- Hansen, K. L., Melhus, M., & Lund, E. (2010). Ethnicity, self-reported health, discrimination and socio-economic status: a study of Sami and non-Sami Norwegian populations. *International journal of circumpolar health*, 69(2).
- Hellstad, V. (2010). Nordlendinger uønsket, en studie av nordnorsk identitet i møte med Oslo.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). INTERGROUP BIAS. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 575.
- Hollekim, R., Slaatten, H., & Anderssen, N. (2012). A nationwide study of Norwegian beliefs about same-sex marriage and lesbian and gay parenthood. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 9(1), 15-30.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Gilbert, J. A. (2000). Diversity Management. Time for a New Approach. *Public personnel management*, 29(1), 75-92.
-

-
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 589-617. doi: 10.1177/000312240607100404
- Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How Affirmative Action Became Diversity Management Employer Response to Antidiscrimination Law, 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(7), 960-984.
- Konrad, A. M., & Linnehan, F. (1995). Formalized HRM structures: coordinating equal employment opportunity or concealing organizational practices? *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 787-820.
- Kossek, E., & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field study of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(1), 61-81.
- Kulik, C. T. (2014). Working below and above the line: the research-practice gap in diversity management. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(2), 129-144.
- Landes, D. S. (1998). The wealth and poverty of nations. *WORLD AND I*, 13, 258-263.
- Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. (1998). DEMOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY AND FAULTLINES: THE COMPOSITIONAL DYNAMICS OF ORGANIZATIONAL GROUPS. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 325-340. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1998.533229
- Midtbøen, A. H., & Rogstad, J. (2012). Diskrimineringens omfang og årsaker. Etniske minoriteters tilgang til norsk arbeidsliv. Oslo: Institutt for samfunnsforskning.
- Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and Personal Dimensions in Diversity Climate: Ethnic and Gender Differences in Employee Perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(1), 82-104. doi: 10.1177/0021886398341006
- Mor Barak, M. E., & Levin, A. (2002). Outside of the corporate mainstream and excluded from the work community: a study of diversity, job satisfaction and well-being. *Community, Work & Family*, 5(2), 133-157. doi: 10.1080/13668800220146346
- Mor-Barak, M. E. (2011). *Managing diversity: toward a globally inclusive workplace*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Nelson, T. E., Acker, M., & Manis, M., 13-38. (1996). Irrepressible stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 32(1), 13-38.
- Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. (2012). Understanding organizational diversity management programs: A theoretical framework and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(8), 1168-1187. doi: 10.1002/job.1792
-

-
- Pickett, C. L., Bonner, B. L., & Coleman, J. M. (2002). Motivated self-stereotyping: heightened assimilation and differentiation needs result in increased levels of positive and negative self-stereotyping. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 82(4).
- Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion in Organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(2), 212-236. doi: 10.1177/1059601104273064
- Rogstad, J. (2000). Mellom faktiske og forestilte forskjeller, Synlige minoriteter på arbeidsmarkedet. *Institutt for samfunnsforskning 2000*.
- Rogstad, J. (2000). *Når sant skal sies – hvor viktig er norsk for innvandrere på arbeidsmarkedet*. (Vol. 17): Institutt for samfunnsforskning
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*.: Free press.
- Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2010). Acculturation: When Individuals and Groups of Different Cultural Backgrounds Meet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 472-481.
- Schneider, B., GOLDSTIEIN, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel psychology*, 48(4), 747-773.
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1262-1289. doi: 10.1177/0149206310385943
- Sippola, A., & Smale, A. (2007). The global integration of diversity management: a longitudinal case study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(11), 1895-1916.
- Syed, J., & Özbilgin, M. (2009). A relational framework for international transfer of diversity management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(12), 2435-2453.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, 33(47).
- Thomas Jr, R. R. (1995). A diversity framework. *Diversity in organizations. New perspectives of a changing workplace*. (pp. 245-263). London: Thousand Oaks.
- Thomas, R. R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard business review*, 68(2), 107-117.
- Tronstad, K. R. (2010). Mangfold og likestilling i arbeidslivet. *Holdninger og erfaringer blant arbeidsgivere og tillitsvalgte* (Vol. 39): Fafo-report.
- Warner-Søderholm, G. (2012). But we're not all Vikings! Nordic societal cultural practices. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*(29), 18.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretative sociology* (Vol. Vol. 1): Univ of California Press.

Wentling, R. M., & Palma-Rivas, N. (2000). Current status of diversity initiatives in selected multinational corporations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(1), 35-60.

Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR*, 20, 77-140.

World Trade Organization, W. (2008). Trade in a Globalizing World.
http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/anrep_e/wtr08-2b_e.pdf

Appendices

Appendix 1: Interview guide

Intervjuguide

1. Introduksjon

- Hvem er jeg
- Tema/problemstilling: Mangfold i organisasjonen
- Samtalen brukes som data
- Intervjuer ledere i ulike deler av organisasjonen
- Dere er nøkkelinformanter anbefalt av HR
- Hva skal undersøkelsen brukes til
- Lydopptak OK? Slettes etter oppgaven er vurdert
- Konfidensialitet, ingen lytter til samtalen, ingen leser referatet, hvem som sier hva fremkommer ikke
- Anledning til å trekke deg når som helst uten å oppgi grunn

2. Kan du fortelle meg litt om din stilling og stillingsbeskrivelse (hva gjør du til hverdags) (Oppvarming)

- I hvilken grad har dere mangfold her på kontoret/avdelingen?

2. Hva med rekruttering?

- rekrutterer selv?
- ber om hjelp eller støtte sentralt?
- Hva vil kunder ha?
- Hvordan selger dere inn mangfold?
- Har du rekruttert for mangfold?

3. Kommunikasjon:

- Hva er forholdet mellom dere og konsernledelsen?
- Leser intranett?
- Føler at de kan påvirke?

4. Mangfold definert

- Hvordan definerer du mangfold?

Alder
Kjønn
Seksuell orientering
Etnisitet
Kulturell bakgrunn
Religion

Fysisk utgangspunkt

5. Personlig

- Er mangfold viktig for deg?

6. For jobben:

- Hvorfor synes du at MPG bør jobbe med mangfold?
- Hvorfor synes du det er viktig at MPG jobber med mangfold?
- Tror du også det kan lønne seg?

7. Ny satsing:

- Når merket du et fokus på mangfold, er det noe som har økt i det siste?
- Hva er grunnen til dette økte fokuset?
- Hva er grunnen til at dere jobber mer med mangfold nå?

8. Output:

- Hva er målet med å jobbe med mangfold?
- Har dere en plan på å konkret få tak i flere med ulik bakgrunn? Søker mennesker med mangfoldsbakgrunn på stillingene deres? Er de kvalifiserte søkere?

9. Hindring:

- Hva er de største hinderet når det gjelder å gjennomføre de gode intensjonene deres?
- Lokalt
- Konsern
- Har dere lagt til rette for mangfold, eks bønnerom?
- Språk, kulturforståelse/tilnærming (passer inn), kvalifikasjoner

10. Hva ligger allerede nå til rette for gjennomføring?

11. Hva slags regler/retningslinjer (diversity policies) kan man innføre for å få opp andelen?

12. Hvordan er kjønnslikestillingen hos dere i dag?

- Hva mener du om kjønnslikestilling (fortalte at jeg ble spurt om familieplanlegging av en jeg søkte jobb hos)?

13. Har du opplevd konflikter pga mangfold?

- Hørt om?
- Lokalt?
- Konsern?
- Andre steder?

Validert spørreskjema som måler holdninger til mangfold: (Veldig strukturert for å kunne sammenlikne og se om de har like holdninger.)

Jeg synes at et fokus på mangfold er rettferdig.
Mangfold gjør at jeg føler meg stresset.
Jeg er entusiastisk når det kommer til mangfold.
Mangfold er dyrt for organisasjoner.
Mangfold fører til harmoni i organisasjoner.
Jeg blir frustrert av mangfold.
Mangfold gjør meg håpefull.
Jeg synes mangfold er verdiløst.
Jeg støtter arbeid med mangfold i organisasjoner.
Jeg trekker meg bort fra organisasjonens arbeid med mangfold.
Mangfold er givende for meg.
Jeg føler meg bitter med tanke på mangfold.
Mangfold er en verdi for organisasjoner.
Jeg har gjort personlige offer på bakgrunn av mangfold.
Jeg deltar i organisasjonens arbeid med mangfold.
Jeg motarbeider organisasjonens arbeid med mangfold.
Jeg mener at mangfold er bra.
Mangfold er ulønnsomt for organisasjoner.
Mangfold er berikende for meg.

Jeg mener at mangfold er urettferdig.
Mann/Kvinne
Alder
Hvor mange års arbeidserfaring har du?
Hvor mange års universitets-, college-, eller yrkesfaglige studier har du fullført etter videregående skole?
I hvilken grad føler du deg som en minoritet på arbeidsplassen?
Har din organisasjon et mangfoldsfokus?
Har din organisasjon et likestillingsfokus?
I hvilken grad er arbeid med mangfold kommunisert i organisasjonen?
I hvilken grad er arbeid med likestilling kommunisert i organisasjonen?

Appendix 2: Letter to participation

Hei,

XXX har signert Diversity Charter og i den forbindelse ønsker vi å gjøre en kartlegging av holdninger til og tanker om mangfold i XXX.

Formålet er å undersøke hvorvidt det oppnås en effekt av å jobbe med mangfold. Resultatene av spørreundersøkelsen skal brukes som et verktøy i å tilrettelegge tiltak for XXX, samt som datagrunnlag i en masteroppgave ved Handelshøyskolen BI. I tillegg vil Diversity Charter få et mål på effekten av sitt arbeid og vil dermed kunne videreutvikle og effektivisere sitt arbeid med mangfold.

Undersøkelsen er på 10 spørsmål og du vil bruke 2-3 minutter på besvarelsen. Ved å gjennomføre undersøkelsen samtykker du i bruken av de opplysninger du gir.

Opplysningene er anonyme og behandles konfidensielt. Den tekniske gjennomføringen av spørreskjemaundersøkelsen foretas av Qualtrics. Opplysningene slettes når prosjektet er ferdigstilt.

Appendix 3: Survey Questions

Kjønn						
Alder	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	65<
Hva vil du inkludere i uttrykket mangfold? Forskjell i...	Alder	Kjønn	Seksuell orientering	Etnisk/kulturell bakgrunn	Religion	Fysisk/psykisk utgangspunkt
I hvilken grad føler du deg som en minoritet på arbeidsplassen?	svært liten				Svært stor	
Hvis du føler deg som en minoritet, hvorfor gjør du det?						
I hvilken grad oppfatter du at din organisasjon har et mangfolds fokus?	svært liten				Svært stor	
Mangfold er en verdi for organisasjonen.	svært enig				svært uenig	
Jeg føler meg inkludert på arbeidsplassen	Svært enig				svært uenig	
Har du hørt om Diversity Charter?	Ja/nei					
I hvilken grad tror du signering av Diversity Charter vil være positivt for deres organisasjon?	Svært liten				Svært stor	

Appendix 4: Preliminary thesis report

Linn-Kristin Eriksen 0874164

Preliminary Thesis Report
BI Oslo

Exploring how diversity policies affect
perceived inclusion and attitudes towards
diversity

Hand-in date January 15. 2014 at 12:00

GRA 19003

Introduction

The increase in multicultural societies and globalization has fueled the interest in diversity and how to manage diversity. Diversity refers to all different others in a society, where demographics like ethnicity, culture, religion, age and appearances, gender, sexual orientation and health/disabilities are included. Organizations recognize, to different degrees, that the multicultural organization is upon us, and to thrive, they need to manage, include and assimilated these individuals into all levels of the workplace. I will investigate: How perceived inclusion and attitudes toward diversity changes through implementing diversity policies in an organization. Will this perceived inclusion and attitudes towards diversity differ in various levels within the organization, will the leaders intention behind the diversity policy affect the outcome, and are there a difference between the intended and the implemented diversity policy?

Background

Historically globalization comes in waves and it is not a new phenomenon. We are in such a wave now and while there is no one definition of globalization, it can be defined as the international integration in commodity, capital and labor markets (Bordo, Taylor, & Williamson, 2007). The change in economic policies is one of the key drivers of globalization, with removal or relaxing of restrictions on international trade and financial transactions (World Trade Organization, 2008). There is also a trend in that organizations are growing larger and are more international or multinational. These multinational companies employ people and produce goods all around the world increasing the need for understanding diversity and manage diversity (Mor-Barak, 2011).

In addition to globalization, where the movement of labor is expected, there is an increase in immigration from refugees, both economic refugees that dream of a better economic future and refugees due to war, starvation or prosecution. In the United Kingdom 8.3% of the population was born overseas, while in United States the number is 12% (Crisp & Turner, 2011). In Norway the number of immigrants, defined as people that are born elsewhere and have moved to Norway

and have legal residence, are 11% in 2012. Forecast of immigration estimates that this number will rise to 20% in 2050 (Brunborg, 2013). These numbers do not include second or third generation immigrants.

Most of the immigrants would traditionally work in low skilled positions in for example industry or construction, where language and education is not required to the same extent as in other jobs. The trend of industrialized countries turning away from manual labor towards knowledge work, however, exclude many immigrants from the work force (Ashkanasy, Härtel, & Daus, 2002).

Furthermore, in Norway (as well as other industrialized countries) we are facing a surge of people ready for retirement in 10 years time. The share of elderly is increasing both due to the fact that fewer babies are being born and people live longer (Ellingsen, 2006). This leads to great challenges, among others, how to pay for the healthcare and retirement benefits, how to keep ageing people as long as possible in the work force, how to fill the gap they leave behind when they stop working in the sense of knowledge loss, and how to fill the positions with qualified replacements. Needless to say, diversity is something we will have to focus on, accommodate, and assimilate in all levels of society.

Diversity emerges

The organizational study of diversity appears to have developed from the time of the anti-discrimination movement of the 1960s in USA (Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000). Affirmative action came to exist and from 1972 secured the right for equal employment opportunities for women and minorities (Gilbert, Stead, & Ivancevich, 1999). The shifts in the US labor force of 1980s powered the change from affirmative action towards diversity, with a search on how to manage this diversity, a search that is not over (Colella, DeNisi, & Varma, 1998). Kelly and Dobbin (1998) however, view diversity as a “new dressing for affirmative action” claiming that affirmative action has been renamed and repositioned in order to escape from the former negative associations (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). On the other hand, Ivancevich and Gilbert (2000) argues that diversity management is a needed development and that affirmative action was not enough to transform organizational culture. Moreover, Thomas (1990) stated that affirmative action was too narrow and reactive compared to diversity and that this new approach was

needed. This new approach is diversity management (DM), where one works to include all employees both in the informal networks and formal organizational program (Gilbert et al., 1999; Mor-Barak, 2011). One could claim that there are two reasons to why organizations should work with diversity: As a means for increasing their competitiveness by attracting a vast pool of talented candidates for hire and retain valuable employees (Gilbert & Stead, 1999) and the ethical argument as “it’s the right thing to do”, fairness, justice, and legal aspects (Gilbert et al., 1999).

Ethics and diversity

While organizations in general all seems to have some sort of diversity included in their values or on paper, the executions are vastly different and in some cases non-existent. Researches have through time found positive, negative and inconclusive results when they have studied diversity initiatives’ affect on organizational outcomes (Milliken & Martins, 1996; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). Some have found that when you have a diverse workforce the chances are that you have access to broader pool of possible employees and thus unique information sets, which could improve the knowledge, perspectives and ideas increasing creativity and strategic decision making (D. P. Forbes & Milliken, 1999; Mateos de Cabo, Gimeno, & Nieto, 2012; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). However, others believe that social categorization and similarity-attraction paradigm can be reasons to why workplace diversity can be ineffective and can increase the level of conflict between employees (Byrne, 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998).

Olsen and Martins (2012) suggests that there are two different types of values (and a combination of those two) that can be used to describe the attitudes an organization has towards diversity: Terminal value and instrumental value. Moreover, they were able to tie the success of an organizations’ efforts related to diversity depending what kind of values that organization has. Meaning that the approach the organization has to diversity and how they manage diversity affects whether the organization is helped or harmed by its diversity (Ely & Thomas, 2001). Olsen and Martins (2012) found that a combination of the terminal and

instrumental values was the best, followed by instrumental value and last terminal value. Value has been defined by Rokeach (1973), p. 5): as “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence”. And instrumental values “guide behavior in such a manner as to attain some desirable end state”. While terminal value is the “desirable end states themselves, which individuals strive to achieve” (Olsen & Martins, 2012; Rokeach, 1973). Easier put, organizations that work to increase diversity, without any further goals or perhaps thoughts as to why, have a terminal value approach to diversity. Affirmative action from the 1970s could arguably be described as a terminal value approach to diversity. On the other hand, organizations that recruit for diversity with the goal that higher presence of diversity will lead to specific and positive organizational outcomes have an instrumental value approach. Olsen and Martins (2012) call the combination of the two values as a dual value, meaning that the organizational approach is that diversity is both important because it is “the right thing to do”, but also it is “good for business”. Furthermore, Gilbert and Stead (1999) found that whether the organization hires based on either terminal value or instrumental value affects how the newly hired person and the existing employees both assesses the situation. Whereas terminal values may be perceived as unfair and bring a taste of “hired for diversity instead of qualification,” instrumental value has a justification that leaves no questions whether the right person was hired or not.

Strategies for increasing diversity

Stereotyping and social categorization is an automatic cognitive mechanism which makes associations between categories and concepts (S. T. Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007; Gorman, 2005) and social identity theory argues that we identify with and like those who are similar to us (A. P. Fiske, 1992). Organizations typically apply one or more of these three diversity strategies: Diversity training of employees and management, inclusion through reducing the exclusion of women and different others, and establishing an organizational collective responsibility for diversity (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006).

Diversity training focuses on challenging stereotypes that are tied to intergroup bias (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). There is a difference between explicit

bias and implicit bias. Where explicit bias are out in the open, while implicit bias are hidden and perhaps undetected even for the person who is biased (Amodio & Devine, 2006). However, some argue that diversity training can backfire, in that it can create bias through employees getting aware of differences between them (Nelson, Acker, & Manis, 1996). According to Kalev, Dobbin and Kelly's research (2006) they have found that diversity training does not work, that focus on inclusion show modest changes, and that a general organizational focus on increasing diversity does not work when it comes to actually increasing the level of diversity in an organization.

Weber (1978) argues that managers have to appoint specialists and give them authority to achieve the goals that are set. This indicates that someone within the organization has to be responsible for the new focus or goal. Organizational sociologists and psychologists have found that employees continue on the same path as before ignoring new organizational goals and routines, due to many reasons, among them information overload (Kalev et al., 2006). If no one is responsible for the actual execution of diversity policies and the achieving of the goals that are set, these initiatives will disappear in the everyday work of managers, setting sales budgets and financial reporting etc. This supports Kalev et al. (2006)s findings, in that diversity management, where one person or group got the responsibility and with support from management, is effective when it came to increasing the level of diversity (Kalev et al., 2006; Weber, 1978).

Acculturation and inclusion

Understanding how individuals psychologically adapt to new social norms and culture can help us when it comes to working with diversity (Crisp & Turner, 2011). When an immigrant first moves to your country, regardless of reason, how do you welcome them, and can this lay the foundation and affect the future success of diversity and inclusion?

Sam and Berry (2010)p. 472) have defined acculturation as: "the process of cultural and psychological change that results following meeting between cultures." J. W. Berry (1997) proposed 4 different strategies, assimilation, separation, marginalization, and integration. These 4 reflect the extent to which a

person affiliates themselves with the new culture and country or not, from totally, to not at all, to identify with neither, or both. Even though the individual decides to what degree of cultural affiliation she/he wants, J. W. Berry (2006) found that immigrants who experience discrimination are more likely to choose separation. The less discrimination experienced by the immigrant, the more likely would that person choose integration or assimilation (J. W. Berry, 2006).

Recently, diversity has been replaced more and more by the term inclusion (Roberson, 2006). While diversity has been researched extensively, scholars have only just turned their attention towards inclusion. Consequently, the construct is without agreement regarding its nature and the theoretical framework (Shore et al., 2011). According to Shore et al. (2011) most of the definitions of inclusion contain the meaning they put in the term belongingness and uniqueness. To be included the individual needs to feel both belongingness to a group and uniqueness within that group (Pickett, Bonner, & Coleman, 2002; Shore et al., 2011). M.E Mor Barak and Levin (2002) found that women and minorities are more likely to feel excluded, as well as that job-satisfaction and well-being are linked to the feeling of inclusion (M.E. Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998).

Diversity Management

Mor-Barak (2011) defines diversity management as the

“voluntary organizational actions that are designed to create greater inclusion of employees from various backgrounds into the formal and informal organizational structures through deliberate policies and programs”

Ivancevich and Gilbert (2000) p. 75) have a more direct approach when defining diversity management: “...refers to the systematic and planned commitment by organizations to recruit, retain, reward, and promote a heterogeneous mix of employees.”

Some researchers have found similarities between transformational leadership and diversity management (Kearney & Gebert, 2009). The connection is not as odd as

one might think, they both focuses on seeing the individual and adapt leadership style and work tasks to that person.

Research question and hypothesis

Research question: How will employees' perceived inclusion and attitudes toward diversity change through the implementation of diversity policies in an organization?

There is a call for research that examines how one can create an inclusive workplace (Shore et al., 2011), as well as a call for including other forms of diversity in research (M.E Mor Barak & Levin, 2002). I will try to answer them both. Through investigating whether implementing diversity policy throughout the organization can indeed increase the perceived level of inclusion, I hope to answer the first call for research. This could also indicate which diversity policies actually work in this specific organizational context. Second, by including all different others (individuals that are different from the majority in the workplace), and not only focus on women and ethnic minorities, my research will differ from other research done, especially in a Norwegian setting. Traditional diversity research in Norway has focused on the governmental policies to increase participation of females in the workforce and more recently the law of at least 40% females on boards. Accordingly, it seems that Norway has the world's most divers workforce (Forbes, 2012), however, research across the breadth of diversity seems uncommon. Therefore I include ethnicity, culture, religion, age and appearances, gender, sexual orientation and health/disabilities in my research.

Hypothesis 1: Implementation of diversity policies will increase the level of perceived inclusion.

Hypothesis 1a: Implementation of diversity policies will make the attitudes toward diversity more positive.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a difference in change of perceived inclusion and attitudes toward diversity in various levels within an organization.

Hypothesis 2b: If there is a difference between the levels in an organization, communication is a possible mediator.

Researchers have found that success in diversity and inclusions differ in regard to what type of industry and what level in the organization is investigated (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Joshi & Roh, 2009; Nielsen & Nielsen, 2013; Olsen & Martins, 2012). By researching an organization that has subsidiaries and investigate whether there are differences between the levels, I hope to find empirical evidence on how working with diversity can affect the organization positively (as inspired by Arthur and Boyles (2007)).

Hypothesis 3: The intention that leaders have with regard to the work with inclusion and diversity will influence the outcome.

What is the intention behind the focus on diversity: Is it good for business (instrumental value), the right thing to do (terminal value), or a combination of the two (Olsen & Martins, 2012)?

Hypothesis 4: There is a difference between intended and implemented diversity policies.

Based on Olsen and Martins (2012) work I will investigate whether there are a difference between the intended values and implemented values as inspired by Khilji and Wang (2006), incongruence between what is stated to be the value and what employees, HR personnel and managers perceive the values to be. This could affect the result of my research. If the value perceived is different through the organization, it could indicate communication difficulties or perhaps the different units have different approaches and focus on diversity similar to that units could entail their own organizational culture (Olsen & Martins, 2012).

Methodology

Organizational setting

This research will be done in a multinational human resource consulting firm with several offices and over 500 employees in Norway. In an attempt to increase diversity in a practically non-divers organization, the central management signed and became a member of Diversity Charter Norway. They have thus committed themselves to have a strategic focus on diversity and incorporate diversity policies to increase job-satisfaction, become a more attractive workplace for diverse talent and create value. As a result they have welcomed me to research their current attitudes toward diversity and the perceived level of inclusion. They will then implement some diversity policies recommended from Diversity Chambers consultants, and after some time, I will measure their attitudes towards diversity and perceived level of inclusion.

Implementation

Two sets of simple self-report questionnaires will be distributed to around 400 employees from the organization at two different times. Time one will be as a benchmark, a simple measure on how the attitudes and perception of inclusion are today. The next step is that the consultants from Diversity Charter that will advise and help the organization in suggesting what type of policies and how to implement them. A time will pass where the organization works with the implementation and then a second questionnaire that will hopefully indicate whether the diversity focus has managed to affect attitudes towards and perception about diversity. According to Kalev et al. (2006) have several studies been made where the researcher collects data in one point of time, introduce a diversity program and collects data again in time two. This as an attempt to examine the affect employer programs has in the organization. The criticism consists of that only newly introduced program are tested without considering other programs, as well as that the findings are inconsistent. I disagree. When a new program is introduced this is the change in the organization and while all things are alike, it is this change that is interesting. I will however, consider the organizational context when it comes to intentions behind diversity and investigate whether diversity policies are failing because of poor organizational communication. Furthermore, there are differences in all organizations. One might say that they are as diverse and

individual as people are. Consequently, the affect diversity programs have will differ both in difference in starting points and difference in execution.

Challenges and limitations

In order to investigate whether the attitudes towards diversity change through a new focus on and implementation of diversity policies, I have to investigate the organization at two different times. First, before the change is introduced and then when the organization has worked with implementing the change. There are several limitations and difficulties with executing this research. 1: When has enough time passed for a change in perception and attitudes to be measurable? This will probably differ from organization to organization. However, since this is a Master Thesis, time is limited and I fear that not enough time will pass between those two measures. 2: The organization decided early on in the process that sending out validated measures would lead to a too extensive questionnaire witch would require too much effort and time from the employees. They put the limit at 10 items (Appendix 1) including demography, consequently, I used a couple questions from Mor Baraks validated 15 items for inclusion and a couple of questions from a validated 20 items questionnaire on attitudes towards diversity. 3: The organization consists of different subsidiaries. The different organizations may be very distinctive in important organizational factors that could affect the success of a diversity initiative (as organizational culture, structure, management, leadership and learning) (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Kalev et al., 2006). I will not be able to assess these factors to any extent, making the validity of my research vulnerable. However, with these unknown factors affecting the outcome, one could argue that this research is more generalizable than a research conducted where all is alike.

The organization has approved me collecting qualitative data in addition to the two small questionnaires. I hope to be able to observe and interview employees and managers in different subsidiaries and at different levels in the organization.

Conclusion

The globalization of business, the increase in multicultural societies, and multicultural organizations demands understanding and valuing of different others. It will be interesting to see how serious the organization is about diversity,

or if this new focus only are window dressing. Research shows that to have a chance of succeeding with increasing the diversity, the organization should have someone specialized in diversity with the legitimacy to affect decisions of recruitment and promotion. Then the increase of different others is almost guaranteed.

- Amodio, D. M., & Devine, P. G. (2006). Stereotyping and Evaluation in Implicit Race Bias: Evidence for Independent Constructs and Unique Effects on Behavior. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *91*(4), 652-661.
- Arthur, J. B., & Boyles, T. (2007). Validating the human resource system structure: A levels-based strategic HRM approach. *Human Resource Management Review*, *17*(1), 77-92. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.02.001
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Diversity and Emotion: The New Frontiers in Organizational Behavior Research. *Journal of Management*, *28*(3), 307-338.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied psychology*, *46*(1), 5-34.
- Berry, J. W. (2006). Mutual attitudes among immigrants and ethnocultural groups in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*(6), 719-734.
- Bordo, M. D., Taylor, A. M., & Williamson, J. G. E. (2007). Globalization in historical perspective. *University of Chicago Press*.
- Brunborg, H. (2013). Hvor mange innvandrere er det - og blir det - i Norge? *Samfunnsspeilet*, *27*(3), 2-10.
- Byrne, D. E. (1971). *The attraction paradigm Academic Pr.*, *11*.
- Colella, A., DeNisi, A. S., & Varma, A. (1998). The impact of ratee's disability on performance judgments and choice as partner: The role of disability–job fit stereotypes and interdependence of rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(1).
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2011). Cognitive Adaptation to the Experience of Social and Cultural Diversity. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*(2), 242-266. doi: 10.1037/a0021840

- Ellingsen, D. (2006). Mens vi venter på eldrebølgen. *Samfunnsspeilet/Statistisk sentralbyrå*, 20(5-6).
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review*, 99(4), 689-723. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.99.4.689
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11(2), 77-83. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005>
- Forbes. (2012). Diversity and Inclusion: Unlocking Global Potential. Global Diversity Rankings by Country, Sector and Occupation: Forbes Insights.
- Forbes, D. P., & Milliken, F. J. (1999). COGNITION AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE: UNDERSTANDING BOARDS OF DIRECTORS AS STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING GROUPS. . *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 489-505.
- Gilbert, J. A., Stead, B., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1999). Diversity Management: A New Organizational Paradigm. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21(1), 61-76.
- Gilbert, J. A., & Stead, B. A. (1999). Stigmatization Revisited; Does Diversity Management Make a Difference in Applicant Success?. *Group & Organization Management*, 24(2), 239-256.
- Gorman, E. H. (2005). Gender stereotypes, same-gender preferences, and organizational variation in the hiring of women: Evidence from law firms. *American Sociological Review*, 70(4), 702-728.

- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). INTERGROUP BIAS. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 575.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Gilbert, J. A. (2000). Diversity Management. Time for a New Approach. *Public personnel management*, 29(1), 75-92.
- Joshi, A., & Roh, H. (2009). THE ROLE OF CONTEXT IN WORK TEAM DIVERSITY RESEARCH: A META-ANALYTIC REVIEW. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3), 599-627. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2009.41331491
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 589-617. doi: 10.1177/000312240607100404
- Kearney, E., & Gebert, D. (2009). Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 77-89. doi: 10.1037/a0013077
- Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How Affirmative Action Became Diversity Management Employer Response to Antidiscrimination Law, 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(7), 960-984.
- Khilji, S. E., & Wang, X. (2006). 'Intended' and 'implemented' HRM: the missing linchpin in strategic human resource management research. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(7), 1171-1189.
- Mateos de Cabo, R., Gimeno, R., & Nieto, M. (2012). Gender Diversity on European Banks' Boards of Directors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(2), 145-162. doi: 10.1007/s10551-011-1112-6
- Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). SEARCHING FOR COMMON THREADS: UNDERSTANDING THE MULTIPLE EFFECTS OF DIVERSITY IN

ORGANIZATIONAL GROUPS. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(2), 402-433.

Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and Personal Dimensions in Diversity Climate: Ethnic and Gender Differences in Employee Perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(1), 82-104. doi: 10.1177/0021886398341006

Mor Barak, M. E., & Levin, A. (2002). Outside of the corporate mainstream and excluded from the work community: a study of diversity, job satisfaction and well-being. *Community, Work & Family*, 5(2), 133-157. doi: 10.1080/13668800220146346

Mor-Barak, M. E. (2011). *Managing diversity: toward a globally inclusive workplace*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Nelson, T. E., Acker, M., & Manis, M., 13-38. (1996). Irrepressible stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 32(1), 13-38.

Nielsen, B. B., & Nielsen, S. (2013). Top management team nationality diversity and firm performance: A multilevel study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(3), 373-382. doi: 10.1002/smj.2021

Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. (2012). Understanding organizational diversity management programs: A theoretical framework and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(8), 1168-1187. doi: 10.1002/job.1792

Pickett, C. L., Bonner, B. L., & Coleman, J. M. (2002). Motivated self-stereotyping: heightened assimilation and differentiation needs result in increased levels of positive and negative self-stereotyping. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 82(4).

- Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion in Organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(2), 212-236. doi: 10.1177/1059601104273064
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.*: Free press.
- Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2010). Acculturation: When Individuals and Groups of Different Cultural Backgrounds Meet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 472-481.
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1262-1289. doi: 10.1177/0149206310385943
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, 33(47).
- Thomas, R. R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard business review*, 68(2), 107-117.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretative sociology* (Vol. Vol. 1): Univ of California Press.
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR*, 20, 77-140.
- World Trade Organization, W. (2008). Trade in a Globalizing World. http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/anrep_e/wtr08-2b_e.pdf