

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. 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