

HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

Wolverhampton (HQ)

122A Ghylls Lane, Wolverhampton, WV3 8DZ,
United Kingdom

Telephone: +44 (0) 1902 763 607
+44 (0) 1902 569 133
Mobile: +44 (0) 7736 147 507
Email: institute@hrodc.com

Websites:
www.hrodc.com
www.hrodc-mobile.com
www.hrodc-business-products-and-services.com



London Office

328 Linen Hall, 162-168 Regent Street, London,
W1B 5TD, United Kingdom

Telephone: +44 (0) 208 133 2760
Mobile: +44 (0) 773 614 7507
Email: institute@hrodc.com

Websites:
www.hrodc.com
www.hrodc-mobile.com
www.hrodc-business-products-and-services.com

HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute - UKRLP Registration



HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute is Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), of the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS).
Its Registration Number is 10019585
and can be verified at <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk/>



HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute is a Division of Human Resource and Organisational Development Consultancy (HRODC) Limited.
It is Registered in England UK, with Registration #6088763
and V.A.T. Registration No. 895876538

Gender, Race and Ethnicity: Key Elements of Unexploited Workforce Diversity' – A Free Research Paper – A Free Empirical Research Article

A Division of HRODC Ltd. UK Reg. No. 6088763. V.A.T. Reg. No. 8958 765 38

Prof. Dr. R.B. Crawford - Director HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

PhD (London), MEd.M. (Bath), Adv. Dip. Ed. (Bristol), PGCIS (TVU), ITC (UWI), MAAM, MAOM, LESAN, MSCOS, MISGS, Visiting Prof. P.U.P.

Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS).



UKRLP Registration No. 10019585
UKRLP Verification: <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk>
Postgraduate Full-Time and Short Courses
London, UK & International Locations

A Paper Presented At:
*'Rethinking Gender, Work and Organisation:
Gender, Work and Organisation Conference -
An International Interdisciplinary Conference'*,
Keele University, Staffordshire, England
June 27-29, 2001

Prof. Dr. R.B. Crawford - Director HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

ABSTRACT

'Organisations are endowed with varying degrees of diversity but this variety is often unexploited'

Gender, Race and Ethnicity have become much of a cliché in relation to institutional discriminatory practices. However, socio-political and economic dynamics have propelled 'inclusion' to a 'survival imperative'. It is a fact that modern organisations make constant effort to improve their effectiveness. This effort incorporates their search for new and innovative ways of operating, necessitating the efficient utilisation of their resources. Efficient utilisation of the workforce means that the organisation values the contribution that diversity can make to the accomplishment of their objectives. Despite the existence of elements of diversity in organisations, some have largely disregarded their importance. Recently, however, many practitioners, consultants and academics have agreed that the diversity within organisations can be exploited to the benefit of organisational effectiveness.

This paper, drawing on empirical evidence from qualitative and quantitative analyses, charts

organisational failings, through under-capitalisation of vital resources, pointing to alternatives for enhanced effectiveness. While citing specific cases where effective diversity management could have spared organisations economic catastrophe, it presents evidence of establishments, internationally, that have succeeded, in this regard, thereby enhancing their effectiveness.

While existing empirical evidence of effective utilisation and under-utilisation of a diverse workforce is meta-analysed, new evidence is produced from a large UK organisation as a demonstration of the intensity of the problem. Data elicitation techniques include questionnaire administration and interviews. All quantitative data is comparatively analysed, chi-squared, with the level of significance taken at $p < 0.05$ (see Wisniewski and Stead, 1996; Kanji, 1993; Lapin, 1990; and Cass, 1973).

It finds that the case study organisation is inherently biased, with regard to gender, race and ethnicity. Consequently, it is deprived of the contribution that its diverse workforce can make to its effectiveness. Specifically, it fails to draw on the valuable marketing intelligence that diversity affords.

Mindful of the need for organisations to have 'social conscience' it reminds them of their legal obligation towards diversity, advising of the political, social and economic implications of their actions. It implores organisations to 'exploit' the opportunity that diversity presents, for the long-term effectiveness of the enterprise.

INTRODUCTION

In a competitive climate, when some organisations can do little more than to ‘survive’, these entities need to be mindful of the factors that contribute to their effectiveness. In their effort to achieve satisfactory organisational objectives, they often develop an awareness of crucial internal and external environmental opportunities and constraints. While availing themselves of the opportunities, they search for ways of circumventing the constraints. In this regard, they need to find ways to boost operational effectiveness, notably through more efficient resource utilisation, while adhering to legal requirements. One issue, which relates to both sides of this equation, is workforce diversity. On the one hand, the organisation has to comply with existing legislation, and meet its own ethical standards. On the other hand, it needs to ‘exploit’ the potential of its diverse workforce.

This Paper draws on empirical evidence from qualitative and quantitative analyses, to suggest organisational failings, due to under-capitalisation of vital resources, and points to alternatives for enhancing organisational effectiveness. It cites cases where effective diversity management may have spared organisations economic catastrophe, and presents evidence that some international establishments have made strides, in this regard – thereby enhancing their organisational effectiveness. It also provides a guide to managers for dealing with a diverse workforce, and focuses specifically on gender, race and ethnicity.

While the paper provides a meta-analysis of the research evidence, both for the effective utilisation and under-utilisation of a diverse workforce, it also presents new evidence from a large UK organisation to further highlight the problem. Data elicitation techniques include questionnaire administration and interviews. All quantitative data is comparatively analysed, chi-

squared, with the level of significance taken at $p < 0.05$ (see Wisniewski and Stead, 1996; Kanji, 1993; Lapin, 1990; and Cass, 1973).

The paper examines relevant Acts of parliament that address sexual, racial and ethnic discrimination and the degree to which they may be effective. Mindful of the need for organisations to have a 'social conscience', it advises that business and non-business organisations have legal obligations towards diversity, and need to be aware of the political, social and economic implications of their actions (see e.g. Stephenson & Lewin, 1996). Given their obligations towards diversity, the challenge for organisations is to 'exploit' the opportunities that such diversity offers for increasing long-term organisational effectiveness.

EXPLORING WORKFORCE DIVERSITY: CONCEPTUAL AND ANALYTICAL BASES

Defining Workforce Diversity

The concept of diversity remains an undefined and fairly ambiguous area. Nevertheless, some bases for an understanding of the issues that it involves do exist. Diversity might be regarded as "the types of dimensions on which an organisation's employees differ" (Hicks-Clarke and Iles, 2000, p.324) or "the vast array of physical and cultural differences that constitute the spectrum of human diversity" (Loden & Rosener, 1991, P.3). It incorporates, but not confined to, equal opportunities, which promotes fairness towards all employees, including women and ethnic minorities. Certo (2000, p. 28) defines diversity as the degree of basic human differences among a given population – suggesting gender, race, ethnicity, religion, social class, physical ability, sexual orientation and age as major areas. Based on the assumption that religion is largely cultural,

relating to ethnicity, this Paper wishes to regard religious affiliation as an inherent aspect of ethnicity – thereby treating it inclusively.

Harvey and Allard's (1995) graphical representation of diversity dimensions, suggests an array of differences in two groups – incorporating two concentric circles – not presented, here, because of the controversy that it creates regarding which attributes are achieved and which ascribed. This is because some of these attributes change over time, with or without an individual's conscious effort. We are inclined to accept Loden and Rosener's (1991) diversity categorisation - one with which Gomez-Mejia, Balkin and Cardy (2001) are in agreement. They suggest two distinct groups of variations, one over which individuals have little or no control. The other category, they suggest, consists of elements over which individuals have some influence. However, like Harvey and Alan's model, it is difficult to be prescriptive because some achieved elements might become ascribed, and ascribed become achieved, in some areas. For example, sex and gender may be changed. Also, while we can improve our health and physique, they may become uncontrollable.

One noteworthy point is that an incumbent (the person enacting a particular role in an organisation – clerk, distribution manager, housing officer, social worker, etc.) belongs to different diversity elements and may face discrimination on the basis of one or more of them. For example, an individual who is discriminated against, on the basis of gender (used interchangeably with sex), may also face discrimination on the basis of race and ethnicity (often treated together). The Paper is specifically concerned with race, ethnicity and gender – primary life chances determiners.

The Legal Parameter and The Impact of Legislation

Divisiveness in the application of policies and procedure has necessitated appropriate legislation, which seeks to outmode discrimination on the grounds of sex (the biological and physiological differences, demarking male and female) and gender (the social and stereotypical behaviours of particular sexes – masculine & feminine, respectively), race and ethnicity. These seek to ensure that workers are treated fairly, irrespective of their ‘distinct element of diversity’ (see e.g. Liff, 1996).

The *Equal Pay Act, 1970*, the *Equal Pay (Amendment) Regulations, 1983*, and the *Sex Discrimination Act 1975* (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2000a), seek to address discrimination against female. The *Sex Discrimination Act (SDA) 1975*, which was amended and expanded in 1986, prohibits sex discrimination in employment, education and advertising or in the provision of housing or goods (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2001). Additional protection is afforded through the *Sex Discrimination (Gender Reassignment) Regulations 1999* (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2000b).

“*The Sex Discrimination (Gender Reassignment) Regulations 1999* make it unlawful to discriminate against a person for the purpose of employment or vocational training on the ground that a person intends to undergo gender reassignment, or is undergoing gender reassignment, or has at some time in the past undergone gender reassignment” EOC (2000b).

In Britain, the SDA provides an exception to the requirements of the Act - allowing a job to be restricted to one sex, where the sex of the worker is a genuine occupational qualification (GOQ). However, it is only an employment tribunal that can give an authoritative ruling as to whether a GOQ is valid.

The *Race Relations Act 1976* provides for the protection of people from discrimination as a result of their race. It specifies that a person discriminates against another if:

- “(a) on racial grounds he treats that other less favourably than he treats or would treat other persons; or
“(b) he applies to that other a requirement or condition which he applies or would apply equally to persons not of the same racial group as that other but-
- (i) “which is such that the proportion of persons of the same racial group as that other who can comply with it is considerably smaller than the proportion of persons not of that racial group who can comply with it; and
 - (ii) “which he cannot show to be justifiable irrespective of the colour, race, nationality or ethnic or national origins of the person to whom it is applied; and
 - (iii) “which is to the detriment of that other because he cannot comply with it” (Home Office, 2000).

The Act is careful to clarify that:

“"racial grounds" means any of the following grounds, namely colour, race, nationality or ethnic or national origins; "racial group" means a group of persons defined by reference to colour, race, nationality or ethnic or national origins, and references to a person's racial group refer to any racial group into which he falls” (Home Office, 2000).

With specific reference to employment, the Act stipulates the following:

“It is unlawful for a person, in the case of a person employed by him at an establishment in Great Britain, to discriminate against that employee-

“(a) in the terms of employment which he affords him; or
“(b) in the way he affords him access to opportunities for promotion, transfer or training, or to any other benefits, facilities or services, or by refusing or deliberately omitting to afford him access to them; or
“(c) by dismissing him, or subjecting him to any other detriment” (Home Office, 2000).

The *Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000*, strengthens the *Race Relations Act 1976* and “makes it unlawful to discriminate against anyone on grounds of race, colour, nationality (including citizenship), or ethnic or national origin. The amended Act also imposes positive duties on many public authorities to promote racial equality” (CRE, 2001), specifically in relation to jobs, training, housing, education, and the provision of goods, facilities and services.

Despite the fact that the above Acts assume direct discrimination, they also protect workers against indirect discrimination – which might manifest in equal treatment, which have a disproportionate effect on one sex, or ethnic group. This application of the Acts protects individuals from being “stripped of their gender and ethnicity for the purposes of organisational decision making” (Liff, 1996, p.12).

Other Industrialised countries, such as USA and most of Europe, have made progress with the establishment of an effective system of promoting equality and equity in employment for the sexes. Gee and Norton (1999, p.420) observe that “federal equivalence legislation was passed in 1977, but it applied only to 10 percent of Canadian employees working either for the federal government or federally regulated industries”. In addition to this factor, only one third of the workforce is covered by the legislation, with women concentrated in lower-paying jobs, with average earnings of 65% of their male counterparts (Gee and Norton, 1999) – segregation that might not be dissimilar to United Kingdom.

Despite the high proportion of women in the workplace, and irrespective of legislation, labour force segregation persists – most of those to which women are ‘confined’ can be categorised as low paid jobs. For example, government survey (LSF survey – cited in EOC, 2000) indicates that women dominated particular occupations or vocation. According to Halim (1993 – cited in Watson, 1995) in 1977 1% of employed women, compared to 62% employed men were in skilled manual, professional and managerial occupations. While 1,247 women, compared with 3,525men, work in manufacturing, 4,187 women and 1,918 men work in public administration, education and health. Even where women are in the majority, organisations tend to be gender biased (Mills, 1998 – cited in Wicks and Bradshaw, 1999) in favour of men. This observation

leads us to the fact that we generally view discrimination on the basis of the majority against the minority group or groups. However, one factor, which is crucial to the management of diversity, is that the minority groups might not relate to the numerical proportion in which they exist. This means that even though, for example, women are in the majority, numerically, they might, in practice, be in the minority because they have no controlling effect on organisational operation – men having dominated the power positions.

Britain's Employment Tribunals appear to be effective in providing deterrence to breaches of the regulation, evidenced by the number of cases that have been successfully upheld and those that were brought before them, in the first place – an exhibition of confidence in the system – and successfully 'disposed of'. 7% and 3% of the cases presented to employment tribunals between 1990 and 2000 (inclusive) were for sex discrimination and racial discrimination, respectively (Employment Tribunal Services, 2000). While there has been an increase in the number of race discrimination cases brought to employment tribunals, 2,746 in 1998/99, compared with 3,246 in 1999/2,000, there has been a decrease in the number of sex discrimination cases – 6,2003 and 4,926 in 1998/1999 and 1999/2000, respectively. The number of sex discrimination cases is, nevertheless, high. Employment tribunals disposed of the 3,809 sex discrimination cases in 1999/2000, as follows: 1,504 (39%) ACAS conciliated settlement; 1,348 (35%) withdrawn; and 233 (6%) successful (Employment Tribunal Services, 2000). 913 (37%) of the race discrimination cases that employment tribunals disposed of in 1999-2000 were resolved through ACAS, while 809 (32%) and 107 (7%) were withdrawn and upheld, respectively. The percentage of actual settlements does not present a good picture of the effectiveness of the system but the fact that a large percentage was settled through conciliation is consoling. However, there are question marks

over those cases that were dismissed before ‘hearing’. One important question, at this stage, is whether the ‘protective mechanism’ has been effective elsewhere.

As was hinted, earlier, while Europe, United States and Australia (Teicher and Spearitt, 1996) are making great strides on equal opportunities legislation, countries such as Canada, it is purported, “lags by about 20 years behind”, suggest Miller and Rowney (1999, p.308). This claim is largely supported by Gee and Norton (1999, p.420), who observe that federal equivalence legislation – creating parity for male and female workers - applied only to 10 percent of Canadian government employees (cited earlier). However, Jain and Verma (1996) present a different picture, with the claim that even though only 6% of organisations in their research sample had included diversity in their mission statements, 81% of them implemented diversity management programmes. Could this be a case of an unrepresentative sample, or empirical evidence suggesting that the private sector leaps ahead of the public sector?

While some Brazilian companies have abandoned efforts or making slow progress towards effective diversity management, others are making excellent progress, numerically and in operational practices, with some attempt towards training (Tereza and Fleury, 1999).

Shapiro (2000) reports that there was little evidence to support TQM meetings or flexible working hours which was designed to cater for the needs of people working at home or part-time (the majority of whom were women). In addition, the writer states that there was no attempt made to ensure, that TQM materials were relevant or appealing to men and women in a majority of organisations in the sample. She also referred to the fact that no attempt had been made to assess whether different groups of employees had different training needs to enable them to participate

in TQM process or whether different processes or approaches required to enable and motivate different groups of staff to become involved.

DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT OR MISMANAGEMENT?

What is Diversity Management?

One important mark of distinction between equal opportunities or affirmative action, on the one hand, and diversity management, on the other, is that with the latter “business performance is emphasized as a reason for diversity rather than the moral imperative” (Sinclair, 2000, p.238) that is associated with the former. However, Kersten (2000, p.245) regards diversity management as “a new version of a much older racial ideology that seeks to obscure real inequalities in favour of a rhetoric of equality”.

As Kramar (1998, p.133) observes, diversity management goes beyond the creation of equal employment opportunity, outcomes and legal compliance.

“It is an approach to management, which is explicitly concerned with the integration of people management issues with business issues and the development of a workplace culture which acknowledges the need to manage the similarities and differences between contributors to the organisation”.

Diversity management involves harnessing the energies, taking advantage of the synergistic effect, of the differences that exist in the workforce, employing appropriate steps to incorporate these, where necessary. “It is about having management skills to allow their different perspectives and views to improve the quality of your decisions” (Kandola & Fullerton, 1994, p.61).

Moore (1999) observes that on the one hand it could be argued that diversity is just a development of rhetoric that is more polished and more appealing in management circles. The adoption of such

generalised knowledge could be seen to be a managerial tactic to avoid action or to deflect attention away from difficult managerial issues. On the other hand, it is a springboard for action.

Not only is the constitution of committees, task forces and focus groups an integral aspect of effective diversity management but so also is the value that is placed on the views of the different diversity elements that are represented. It is, therefore, important that gatekeeping (Moorhead and Griffin, 2001; Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert, 1995) be regarded as a crucial activity in the success of any discourse. This facility encourages the volunteering and evaluation of ideas, enriching the pool of available information. Gatekeeping will also ensure that ‘resonation’ is promptly discouraged, averting the likelihood of ‘withdrawal’ of potentially effective contributors. The researcher would like to describe ‘resonation’ as the situation whereby one member’s view is given little or no attention, or completely dismissed, but is overwhelmingly received when another member represents it. In most cases, no credit is given to the originator of the idea.

Diversity management also means that workers will be encouraged to improve their performance, and, where appropriate, given commendation for achievements. They will be consulted on the basis of their expertise and differences in views, and their marketing intelligence (Kotler and Armstrong, 2001) will be recognised and tapped.

Even the best efforts, in diversity management, as typified by one of Wilson’s (2000, p.248) case study organisations, which encouraged more people into management, can be held in suspicion. In this case, Wilson informs, “the unofficial push to appoint women and ethnic minorities, for the best motives, was not wholly successful as suspicions of tokenism sometimes hung around successful candidates” (see also Kanter, 1993 – cited in Wilson, 2000). But the observers might

be accurate in their analysis because it is becoming increasingly clear that in some organisations women face promotional barriers.

What is often regarded as the ‘glass ceiling’- relates to the point beyond which, consequent to discrimination, women are barred – specifically relating to senior and boardroom management. The glass provides a view of these positions, which are unattainable – because of inherent male chauvinistic attitudes and perceptions. Seven years on from the results of the Institute of Management Survey (cited in McDougall, 1996), when women occupied only 9.8% of managerial positions, one might be mistaken in thinking that the situation has vastly improved. As some would have it, “*there are glass ceilings for women because women, won’t fight the same way as a man will fight*” (Gallese, 1999, p.119) – a point that Dix (1990) intimates. But is the situation changing? According to Robin et al (2000, P 594):

“As women began to share positions of formal authority with their male counterparts, and as men too were rewarded for adopting the more traditionally feminine roles and responsibilities at work, people might begin explicitly to challenge traditional stereotypes and discover aspects of themselves they had to deny in order to comply with traditional gender/work roles”.

Shapiro (2000) regards a critical analysis of recruitment and selection policy and procedure, and organisational culture, as important prerequisites for the removal of the glass ceiling.

Could the discriminatory problem that women face in the workplace have stemmed from, among others, the gender bias of the very courses, which produce graduates in management? This has been the conclusion of four separate research findings, over the last decade (Ashendem, et al., 1995; Gallos; 1995; Sinclair, 1995; Smith, 1998). According to Smith (1998, p.11), “a masculine bias remains in management education, which disadvantages female and male learners in different

ways, and which may deter future managers from capitalising on gender diversity in the workplace”. Mavin and Bryans (1999, p.100) see no role models or mentors for women in these establishments. There is also a “lack of critical mass of women to support each other and promote issues potentially of concern to women”.

As with other acts of discrimination, perpetrators find negative assertions as a basis for denial of opportunity to women. One more recent example, when humour has become a popular management tool, is the suggestion that women use it more sparingly with men than they do with their female counterparts. Empirical research by Smith, Harrington and Neck (2000) has indicated that, given the appropriate environment – free of a male-oriented power base – the ‘gender similarity effects’, did not exist.

Under-utilisation of Diverse Workforce: Organisational Failings Or Disregard For Legislation?

We might consider two bases for an organisational catastrophe, emanating from managers’ neglect of workforce diversity, the first of which is the direct economic cost. The second basis relates to indirect costs, associated with recruitment and selection, training of personnel, operational ineffectiveness and lowering reputation in the ‘market’. Gomez-Mejia, Belkin and Cardy (2001) have highlighted the case of Northern Sigma, with a total of 22, 000 employees. Even though senior managers are committed to the employment of women, there is a high staff turnover in its Chicago plant, the general manager being criticised for not making enough effort to employ and retain them. It estimates that the cost of recruitment and selection, training and operational ineffectiveness exceeds one million dollars annually. One consoling factor, in this

case, is that the company is taking positive steps to resolve the situation – ‘not just window dressing’.

Several empirical studies have revealed that organisational functioning is substantially impaired when the differences that are inherent in the diversity of its members are unrecognised and managed (see e.g. Church, 1995). Often organisations, in their discriminatory practices, severely prejudice their interest. For example, Shapiro (2000) has given an example of employees who work directly with the customer interface, such as women receptionists, were never included in the TQM process although exhibiting the most commitment and enthusiasm towards it. The writer observes that in those organisations the more traditional technical workers, assumedly male, were less enthusiastic – depriving them of the benefits of the system. The degree of ‘developmental retardation’ and under-utilisation of valuable human resource that organisations engineer are a prime contributory factor to organisational ineffectiveness.

As the following examples further illustrate, under-utilisation of diverse workforce can have devastating effects on organisational survival, in an increasingly competitive arena. The writer is careful to represent the spectrum of organisations, because consequent to government reinvention, traditional public sector enterprises are now subject to market dynamics. Some organisations have made attempts to be more inclusive but have made blunders. Stavvaka (March 2000) observed that Burger King had pulled a commercial, following complaints from the Council on American Islam Relations – because of its offensive nature. The advertisement is said to have featured a character using the name of Rasheed, which said the “Peace” and went on to praise the company’s bacon cheddar cheese sandwich. It is not just the cost of the advertisement and resultant loss of income that are of concern but so also is the long-term damage that its actions can cause to

customer relations. If the Islamic workers felt that management was trustworthy and that their views would have been valued, they would have alerted them of the potentially devastating effect that their planned advertising campaign would have caused. The research from which this paper was derived, regards managers' consultation with workers and their demonstration of respect and value for the ideas that they volunteer, as important in organisational functioning. It therefore investigates the extent to which these practices and attitudes are a feature of the case study organisation.

Nike used an Islamic symbol on its footwear, creating fury among Muslims, worldwide. The penalty was a costly product recall, loss of sales and disquiet among those offended. It also tried to enhance its advertising campaign, during the Sydney Olympic, by depicting violence among women. Not only did it create adverse publicity for its 'poor taste' but it also suffered the humiliation of having NBC pull the campaign – in addition to the outrage that it created among the 'civilised' population. Development cost and loss of business in the absence of an appropriate alternative advertisement are also resultant factors. As in the case of Burger King, if workers exhibiting particular diverse characteristics, thought that they were empowered to 'interfere' with management's grand plans, they would have determined that particular advertisements had not passed the 'political correctness test'.

Liz Claiborne incorporated a Quranic verse on the back pocket of its DKNY jeans. This product had to be recalled, following the outcry of the Council on American Islamic Relations. Cost of recall and loss of sales were the visible results, in addition to its loss of reputation in the market. Coca-Cola has been found guilty of racial discrimination against current and former employees and is ordered, by a US District Judge, to pay compensation amounting to \$192.5 million (Pine,

2001). The necessary and positive outcome of this landmark case is that the company had to agree to the establishment of an independent taskforce, headed by Alexis Herman, former US Labour Secretary, to monitor its employment practices and link diversity to executive compensation – an initiative that the company should have taken voluntarily.

The following figure (1) illustrates some of the problems that organisations face when they fail to effectively utilise their diverse workforce. For example, in the case of Nike, Islamic workers were able to warn the company of the infringement that it had caused and of the infuriation that its persistence would have generated among the Islamic Community worldwide – but they may not have thought that in was ‘their place’ to do so. Their intervention would have averted the impending catastrophe – saving the company millions of pounds.

Figure 1: Examples of Cultural Infringements

Organisation	Issue	Consequence/Cost
Nike	Advertisement depicting violence against women – during the Sydney Olympics.	NBC pulled advertisement following first showing. Loss of sales; Cost of intended campaign (Husain, A., Sept. 19, 2000),
Liz Claiborne Incorporated	Inclusion of Quranic verse on the back pocket of its DKNY Jeans	Costly product recall, following outcry from Council on American Islamic Relations (Stavraka, Aug. 16, 2000).
Nike	Use of Islamic symbol on it footwear (trainers).	Costly product recall and loss of patronage from Islamic Community Worldwide.
Burger King	The advertisement is said to have featured a character using the name of Rasheed, which said the “Peace” and went on to praise the company’s bacon cheddar sandwich.	Burger King pulled a commercial, following complaints from the Council on American Islam Relations – because of its offensive nature. The cost is loss of reputation through adverse publicity.
Coca-Cola	Persistent Racial Discrimination (Pine, 2001).	Immediate cost: \$192.5 million to victims; Legal costs; Cost of mandatory task force.

Since many organisations are privileged to have a diverse workforce, it is to their detriment if they ineffectively utilise their knowledge – notably marketing intelligence (Kotler and Armstrong, 2001) – and expertise. Management’s ‘inclusive policy’ will dictate that diversity is mandatory for committees – one issue that the empirical analysis addresses - and focus groups’ constitution.

Improving Organisational Effectiveness Through Workforce Diversity: Some Success Stories

Starting from the premise that ‘value’ is enhanced by admiration, adoration and protection, we might establish the hypothesis that whatever is perceived as valuable in workplaces will be so regarded and treated. We might, therefore, speculate and attempt to establish, theoretically, that organisational assets that are valued are tapped and nurtured to increase its value. This ‘added value’ will transform the organisation products and services, increasing market standing. Organisations that support this notion will not need to be coerced to exercise ‘notional’ regard for workplace diversity – notably gender, race and ethnicity. There should be no need, therefore, for legislation to assure that these elements of workforce diversity are not treated as though they were unwelcome burdens to the organisation. Organisations are obliged to operate within the constraint of existing legislation, which seeks to provide a high degree of deterrence to disregard for ‘human dignity’.

Gee and Norton (1999, p.417) propose that “the ability to understand and manage issues and challenges related to diversity is critical for business success and for positive employee

relations”. Not only is the management of workforce diversity crucial to organisational effectiveness but it is also of inestimable value to a country’s economy (Human, 1996).

Some of the examples in Figure 1 are an illustration that several organisations are unaware of the tremendous ‘marketing intelligence’ that diversity affords. If a company needs to find out information on various markets to perfect its strategy, it has undeniable access to this information, excepting that, constrained by its obsession to ‘discriminate’, it might fail to recognise the business benefits of effectively utilising the appropriate elements of diversity. Effective ‘exploitation’ of diversity can spare an organisation a great deal of embarrassment and even avert impending catastrophe. In the case of Nike, the appropriate element of its diverse workforce might have warned it, prior to the launch of one of its products - on which it had inappropriately represented the Islamic Religion - that it would have infuriated the worldwide Islamic Community. This important issue not having been addressed, prior to product launch, costs the company millions of pounds in its product recall – having also lost its reputation in the market – recovery being a slow process. One pertinent question is whether decision-makers would have accepted workers’ advice and criticism – one of the issues that this report addresses, in analysing Pike International.

Despite years of academic, consultant and practitioner tinkering, diversity management is still thought to be in its infancy (see e.g. Spearitt, 1996). The search continues for a realistic perspective (Wilson, 2000) and sustainable approach or methodology. Effective diversity management ensures that workers are developed in such a way that they make maximum impact on the organisation’s survival. It is an economic imperative, which goes beyond

adherence to its legal obligation. It might be translated into recognition of the potential that differences in views, attitudes, disposition, insights, qualities, perception that individuals, who relate to specific dimensions, bring to an organisation. If we, for one moment, embrace group dynamics (see e.g. Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn, 2000; Dessler, 2001; Robbins, 2000; Naylor, 1999) we will acknowledge that these differences, at the very least, reduce or avert over cohesiveness (Moorhead and Griffin, 2001), groupthink (see e.g. Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert, 1995; Naylor, 1999; Certo, 2000; Robbins, 2000; Dessler, 2001; Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn, 2000), thereby being an unlikely occurrence.

On the other hand, Jones and Shepherd's (2000) study indicates that there are power issues related to globalisation – incorporating the appropriateness of imposing special models of diversity on local culture, with a quite different cultural context for dealing with difference. Maxwell, McDougall and Blair (2000) echo this point, iterating that the movement to improve workforce diversity mirrors the trend towards a more diverse customer base.

In addition, the authors address the issue of 'managing diversity' where the discourse is based on strategic imperatives of large, white male-orientated organisations. Here there is a tension, the writers assert, that produces power brokers who are trying to interpret disempowerment in order to overcome it while operating from a place of power.

According to Robert Loo (1999) the multi-cultural makeup of most countries and the expansion of globalisation provides a basis for international organisations with a diverse workforce to have managers and staff but, in particular, professionals in training in

educational institutions need to be sensitised to cross cultural differences and the need to value both cultural and workplace diversity.

According to Scharff (2000) improvements in health inequalities will not be achieved without a more diverse and well-trained workforce. The writer makes reference to the centres for disease control in the USA having sought proposals to establish minority-training programmes aimed at preparing graduate students in public health and preventative medicine in order to eliminate health disparities.

Shapiro (2000) in a review paper makes reference to research undertaken across 14 organisations in eight European Union Members States. The research findings indicate that through employee involvement, promoting team structures and encouraging staff to use their experience and creativity to contribute to organisational improvements, the differences that exist between staff in areas of functional specialism, hierarchical, educational background and gender, can be of tremendous value to the organisation. Despite increased employee exposure to diversity, the author elaborates, some employees have been slow to develop their skills and capabilities to manage diversity in a positive way, thereby supporting the objectives of employee involvement programmes. There are a number of well-known examples, most of which are 'headline grabbing'. However, Figure 2 presents a few less known ones.

Figure 2: Exploiting Diversity – Some Little-known Examples

Organisation	Initiative
Wall Street Journal	Recently appointed Joan Lipman to its to the position of Managing Editor of its popular weekend journal. She is the highest-ranking editor in the history of the newspaper (Diversity Incorporated, 2001 a).
Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company	Appointed a black woman – Dorie Tuggle – Senior Manager of its Diversity and Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) Programmes, with responsibility for EEO and Urban Community affairs (Diversity Incorporated, 2001 a).
Clairol	Advertising Campaign, portraying women of varying cultures, ages and styles - suggesting that beauty comes in all colours, body shapes and ages (Wallace, L. March 9, 2001).
Quaker Oats; IBM; Ciba-Geigy; Pacific Telesis	Creation of ‘Mommy Tracks’, whereby women are given extended leave, with benefits, for up to three years, with the guarantee of a comparable position to the one they vacated, on their return to work. The women are usually on call for part-time work during this period (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin & Cardy, 2001).
Mercedes Benz	Uses black and white icons of Ella Fitzgerald and Duke Ellington, with the words “What Endures” (Bean, L., March 10, 2000)
Levi Strauss	Instituted a policy prohibiting workers, who ignore diversity and empowerment issues, from getting pay increases (Egge, 1999).

According to Scheinholtz (2000), reporting on the result of an international survey of approximately 800 higher education students, nearly two-thirds of college students believe it is important to work for an organization that values diversity. 58% of respondents indicate that they thought the, corporate world was doing enough to attract and retain a diverse workforce, while 42% said they weren’t doing enough. On the other hand, 64% said it was important to them to work for a diverse organisation while 36% said it was not important.

Other developments, according to Starvaka (April, 2000), include the provision of flexible working arrangements, which appealed to more women. In these instances 655 of New York based professionals stated that they would not have joined the companies if they were not

able to have flexible scheduling options, compressed work weeks, reduced schedules and job sharing. The companies also stated that the programme showed an acknowledgement of the importance of retaining employees while helping them to achieve a work-life balance.

Jose Gomenz corporate director of Wal-Mart, America's largest private sector employer of African Americans and Hispanics, in addition to the company's growing overseas presence, has a unique perspective on diversity (Bean, April 2001). He feels that the workforce should be representative of the wider community to which the organisation's goods and services are marketed.

Harung and Harung (1995) attest that the creation of a strong team or organisation lies in its psychophysiology chemistry, which should be of such that it provides a balanced mixture of different body-mind types. Korac-Kakabadse and Kouzmin (1999, p.307) attempt to correct the misconception about globalisation – not homogeneity or a common culture but a recognition and legitimisation of differences (Pringle, 1994 – cited in Korac-Kakabadse and Kouzmin, 1999). They aptly communicate the thought that the implicit “culture and subcultures require an interpretivist framework allowing for the conceptualisation” of heterogeneity and multiculturalism.

Recent research report has pointed to the increased effectiveness resulting from dedicated diversity management. The Society For Human Resource Management (SHRM), cited in Choi, 2001) analysed responses from 121 human resource professionals from the US 100 top companies. An overwhelming majority of these companies suggest that their diversity

initiatives have had a profound impact on their bottom line. Many had included diversity in their corporate strategy, others confining it to the human resource departments.

Whatever the organisation's motive for embracing diversity management, Shapiro (2000, p. 307), supported by a number of writers including Rennie (1993 and Storey, 1995 – cited in Shapiro, 2000), declares that it is “wrong – legally, ethically and in terms of being a waste of human resources – to discriminate against groups of employees, such as women, ethnic minorities and the disabled”.

THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

The Setting

Pike International, the pseudonym for the case study organisation, is a company limited by guarantee, with share value, having several overseas bases. Its current size is consequent to consistent internal and external growth strategy. It has a wide product base and technology represents both a source of revenue and an effective platform for the delivery of its goods and services. Its technological infrastructure facilitates advanced Material Requirement Planning (see e.g. Hillier, Hillier and Liberman, 2000; Boddy and Paton, 1998) – not precluding Just-In-Time, where practicable. Recognising the need to keep up with operational developments, it meets this challenge with micro and macro organisational change efforts, much of which have been ‘installed’ without cultural infusion, institutionalisation (Crawford, 1994), therefore, not having been achieved.

The company employs just over 2,000 workers, with a masculine to feminine gender mix ratio of 3:1, minority ethnic groups constituting 20% - mainly Blacks - of the total workforce. These proportions of gender and ethnicity are unrepresentative of the regions in which Pike International operates and which its client base supersedes - creating problems with relationship management (see e.g. Brassington and Pettitt, 2000), which might bear similarity with supplier management (Kim and Michell, 1999). Lee and Chun (2000, p.127) observe that “to facilitate effective cross-cultural interactions, multicultural training helps individuals in an organisation acquire both the knowledge and tools needed to reduce misunderstandings and inappropriate behaviour”.

The organisation is structured hierarchically along functional lines, with overseas bases as agencies – rather than being separately incorporated. The structure, nevertheless, facilitates the establishment of teams, leaders having a noticeable degree of power. The organisational structure provides a great deal of opportunity for effective career management. Although positions might enjoy similar horizontal relationship, they may be graded differently – some attracting additional increments. The rationale is that scientific job analysis reveals ergonomic and perceptual (Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert, 1995) differences in role execution. Even then, roles on similar levels enjoy different degrees of prestige and, therefore, horizontal movement, though not attracting additional remuneration, improves the incumbents’ social standing and perceived value within the organisation.

The organisation recognises the need for workers to have additional social skills to function effectively in the agencies abroad and work with international clients and customers, from

the domestic bases. These positions, therefore, attract special provisions, status and remuneration. Although departmental headship is regarded as an important point in an individual's career progression, there are several attractive positions below that level. Departments, themselves, have different budgetary allocations and are positioned to attract different amounts of revenue, which determines their status on the informal hierarchy. There is also a difference between the grading and status of the operator, clerical and administrative, and professional levels.

Teams are usually small, with 5-12 workers, compared with departments, which may exceed 50. They are operationally flexible, numerically and functionally (see e.g. Atkinson, 1984; Buchanan and McCalman, 1993; Dyer, 1998; Goodenham and Nordhaug, 1997; Kathuria, 1998; Parker and Jackson, 1993; Pettinger, 1998; Salmon, 1996; Saundry, 1998; Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert, 1995; Tregaskis, 1997; Wong, 1993), facilitating worker deployment between them, and simultaneous membership of different teams. While departmental meetings are formally scheduled at regular intervals, team meetings are held when necessary, with just one week's notice, excepting in an emergency, when members are immediately 'rounded up' from different locations – to the most convenient venue. To create even greater flexibility, video conferencing facility is being established on all domestic sites.

Methodology

The empirical study was conducted over a two-year period, culminating in the questionnaire administration. Informants were assured of their anonymity and the organisation promised that it would not be named nor any inferences made in this report that would identify it. While

the inclusion of particular excerpts and verbatim would have added richness to the dialogue presented and substantiate ‘grounding’, much of these have had to be withheld or modified, an important issue that other researchers have had to address, when dealing with similarly sensitive issues (Church, 1995) – in the interest of confidentiality and continuing facilitation of ethnographic research.

The researcher’s continued involvement in organisational activities was an important way of demonstrating concern and commitment, workers and management learning to confide in him. His acceptance at different organisational levels, however, did not affect his objectivity or compromise his researcher role. His position of trust gained him access to valuable but sensitive information, at all levels - from the janitorial staff to the boardroom.

150 questionnaires were originally administered, representing a 7.5% sample. 105 questionnaires were returned – a rate of 70%, reducing the sample to 5.25%. A stratified random sample (Clark-Carter, 1997) was attempted, to assure proportionate race and gender representation. It was, however, difficult to achieve a ‘perfect sample’, in that regard, because of the interrelationship between race/ethnicity and gender – there being minority ethnic male and female as well as White male and female. However, it was possible to achieve a sample constituent of 66.7% Whites, compared with 33.3% minority ethnic groups – 27.6% being Blacks (Table 1).

Table1: Ethnicity of Sample

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid White	70	66.7	66.7	66.7
Asian	4	3.8	3.8	70.5
Black	29	27.6	27.6	98.1
Chinese & Other	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

The questionnaire consists of 33 closed ended items, some providing the ‘none of the above’, ‘none’ and ‘other’ categories – reducing their likelihood of becoming ‘forced choice’. The final questionnaire design was facilitated by insights gained from the pilot run. The management of Pike International, the case study organisation, provided the mechanism whereby the researcher made the stratified random selection from the different groups. Questionnaires were distributed to the selected individuals and these returned, anonymously, to the specified ‘point’, within the 48-hour deadline that they were given to complete and return them. The quantitative data analysis was achieved through the use of SPSS (see e.g. Brace, Kemp and Snelgar, 2000) with the purpose of establishing the relationship between specific constants and associated variables. It attempts, therefore, to establish whether the null hypothesis (Clark-Carter, 1997; Kanji, 1994) can be accepted – i.e.

H₀ (1): There is no significant difference between the treatment and perception of the sexes.

H₀ (2): Races and ethnic groups are treated similarly and have similar perceptions about organisational functioning.

The results of analysis were chi-squared, with the level of significance taken at $p < 0.05$.

Approximately 50 tables were generated – the researcher including only some, to reduce the bulk and cost of subsequent journal publication.

The foci of the analysis were to:

- Ascertain the effectiveness of human resource utilisation, based on the degree to which the sexes, races and ethnic groups are ‘represented’.
- To test the reality, and workers’ perception, by sex, race and ethnicity, of the internal environment.

Questionnaire responses were cross-tabulated to facilitate a comparative analysis of the information. For example, question 14 asks: “Of how many committees or task forces have you been a member?” The responses to this question were cross-tabulated with those of question 2 enquiring of respondents’ sex. The product is Table 4, showing the number and percentage of respondents who were members of these groups, at some stage - 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or more, task forces or committees. This process was repeated for race, and ethnicity (Table 5).

The sample represents all the age ranges, closely matching the population, the majority – 29% - between 40 and 46, followed by the 26-32 age-range at 20% (Table 2). 71.4% of the respondents were male and 28.6% female (Table 3).

Table 2: Age Range of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 18-25	11	10.5	10.5	10.5
26-32	20	19.0	19.0	29.5
33-39	18	17.1	17.1	46.7
40-46	29	27.6	27.6	74.3
47-53	17	16.2	16.2	90.5
54-60	7	6.7	6.7	97.1
Over 60	3	2.9	2.9	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Sex of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	75	71.4	71.4	71.4
Female	30	28.6	28.6	100.0
Total	105	100.0	100.0	

THE FINDINGS

Effective Utilisation of Human Resources

Membership of committees and taskforces is just one of the ways through which managers can assemble its workforce's diverse skills, knowledge and expertise – positioned for maximum exploitation. These are not 'just for the show' but are crucial instruments of organisational functioning (Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert, 1995; Boddy and Paton, 1998; Certo, 2000; Robbins, 2001). At Pike International, although workers usually volunteer to become members, managers make the ultimate decisions regarding the individuals who are co-opted. Occasionally there is an open invitation for membership but often announcements are made of individual inclusion, without wider consultation. Whenever a vacancy is created, through

expiration of term, departure – through incapacitation or disillusionment – heads of department usually find a replacement through consultation with the ‘chosen few’. The first section of this analysis enquires into historical and current membership of these groups.

Table 4 presents the analysis of committee and task force membership by sex, over the period that respondents have been in the organisation. Male constitute just over 70% of respondents, who were members of only one of these groups, less than 30% being female. It indicates that almost 80% of male respondents were at some time members of at least one committee or task force, with less than 60% being female. More than 90% of those who belonged to 4 task forces or committees were male and less than 10% female. Some male but no female were ever member of 5 or more of these groups. Chi-square test shows no significant difference in this pattern – based on sex - a probability greater than 0.05, but significantly different in relation to ethnicity (Table 5).

Table 4: Committee Membership By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Committee Membership	1	Count	12	5	17
		% within Committee Membership	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
		% within Sex	16.0%	16.7%	16.2%
		% of Total	11.4%	4.8%	16.2%
	2	Count	11	5	16
		% within Committee Membership	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
		% within Sex	14.7%	16.7%	15.2%
		% of Total	10.5%	4.8%	15.2%
	3	Count	16	6	22
		% within Committee Membership	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
		% within Sex	21.3%	20.0%	21.0%
		% of Total	15.2%	5.7%	21.0%
	4	Count	10	1	11
		% within Committee Membership	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
		% within Sex	13.3%	3.3%	10.5%
		% of Total	9.5%	1.0%	10.5%
5 or more	Count	9		9	
	% within Committee Membership	100.0%		100.0%	
	% within Sex	12.0%		8.6%	
	% of Total	8.6%		8.6%	
None	Count	17	13	30	
	% within Committee Membership	56.7%	43.3%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	22.7%	43.3%	28.6%	
	% of Total	16.2%	12.4%	28.6%	
Total	Count	75	30	105	
	% within Committee Membership	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 8.529, df = 5, p < 0.112$$

Chi-square test confirms that there is no significant difference between current memberships based on sex (Table 6). However, 25.3% of male, compared with 53% female are not currently member of any task force or committee, while 22.7% male and 16.7% female are members of only one task force each. Of the respondents who belong to three and four committees and task forces, 88.2% and over 85%, respectively, are male, compared with 11.8% and 14.3% female. 6.7% male but no female respondents are members of 5 or more committees and task forces.

Even though there is no significant difference between male and female's previous and current membership of committees or task forces there is a significant difference in membership based on race and ethnicity. As Table 5 illustrates, of the respondents who have been members of 2 committees and taskforces, 81.3% were White. Whites also represent 86.4%, 80.9%, and 77.8% of respondents who were members of 3, 4 and 5 committees and task forces, respectively. Those who were never a member of any of these types of group are 21.4% Whites, 48.3% Blacks and 50% Chinese.

Of the respondents who are currently members of task forces and committees, 17.1% Whites, 75% Asians, 20.7% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups are members of only one. Only whites (100%) are currently members of 4 and more of these groups, who also constitute 89.5% of those who are members of 2 groups. Statistically significant, this membership pattern has a chi-square representation of: $\chi^2 = 38.240$, $df = 15$, $p < 0.001$.

Table 5: Committee Membership By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
Committee Membership	1	Count	6	2	9	0	17
		Expected Count	11.3	.6	4.7	.3	17.0
		% within Committee Membership	35.3%	11.8%	52.9%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	8.6%	50.0%	31.0%	.0%	16.2%
		% of Total	5.7%	1.9%	8.6%	.0%	16.2%
	2	Count	13	0	2	1	16
		Expected Count	10.7	.6	4.4	.3	16.0
		% within Committee Membership	81.3%	.0%	12.5%	6.3%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	18.6%	.0%	6.9%	50.0%	15.2%
		% of Total	12.4%	.0%	1.9%	1.0%	15.2%
	3	Count	19	2	1	0	22
		Expected Count	14.7	.8	6.1	.4	22.0
		% within Committee Membership	86.4%	9.1%	4.5%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	27.1%	50.0%	3.4%	.0%	21.0%
		% of Total	18.1%	1.9%	1.0%	.0%	21.0%
	4	Count	10	0	1	0	11
		Expected Count	7.3	.4	3.0	.2	11.0
		% within Committee Membership	90.9%	.0%	9.1%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	14.3%	.0%	3.4%	.0%	10.5%
		% of Total	9.5%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	10.5%
5 or more	Count	7	0	2	0	9	
	Expected Count	6.0	.3	2.5	.2	9.0	
	% within Committee Membership	77.8%	.0%	22.2%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	10.0%	.0%	6.9%	.0%	8.6%	
	% of Total	6.7%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	8.6%	
None	Count	15	0	14	1	30	
	Expected Count	20.0	1.1	8.3	.6	30.0	
	% within Committee Membership	50.0%	.0%	46.7%	3.3%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	21.4%	.0%	48.3%	50.0%	28.6%	
	% of Total	14.3%	.0%	13.3%	1.0%	28.6%	
Total	Count	70	4	29	2	105	
	Expected Count	70.0	4.0	29.0	2.0	105.0	
	% within Committee Membership	66.7%	3.8%	27.6%	1.9%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	66.7%	3.8%	27.6%	1.9%	100.0%	

($\chi^2 = 31.582$, $df = 15$, $p < 0.007$ (Table 5))

Table 6: Current Committee Membership By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Current Com Membership	1	Count	17	5	22
		Expected Count	15.7	6.3	22.0
		% within Current Com Membership	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%
		% within Sex	22.7%	16.7%	21.0%
		% of Total	16.2%	4.8%	21.0%
	2	Count	13	6	19
		Expected Count	13.6	5.4	19.0
		% within Current Com Membership	68.4%	31.6%	100.0%
		% within Sex	17.3%	20.0%	18.1%
		% of Total	12.4%	5.7%	18.1%
	3	Count	15	2	17
		Expected Count	12.1	4.9	17.0
		% within Current Com Membership	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
		% within Sex	20.0%	6.7%	16.2%
		% of Total	14.3%	1.9%	16.2%
	4	Count	6	1	7
		Expected Count	5.0	2.0	7.0
		% within Current Com Membership	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Sex	8.0%	3.3%	6.7%
		% of Total	5.7%	1.0%	6.7%
5 or more	Count	5	0	5	
	Expected Count	3.6	1.4	5.0	
	% within Current Com Membership	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	6.7%	.0%	4.8%	
	% of Total	4.8%	.0%	4.8%	
none	Count	19	16	35	
	Expected Count	25.0	10.0	35.0	
	% within Current Com Membership	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	25.3%	53.3%	33.3%	
	% of Total	18.1%	15.2%	33.3%	
Total	Count	75	30	105	
	Expected Count	75.0	30.0	105.0	
	% within Current Com Membership	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 10.545, df = 5, p < 0.061$$

Membership of committees and task forces is just one step towards facilitating staff's contribution to organisational functioning. However, this effort is futile if members do not accept the views of their colleagues. There is a significant difference between the committees' acceptance of members' views, based on their race and ethnicity (Table 7). While 10% of Whites always had their views accepted at committee and task force meetings, no Asians or Blacks always had their views accepted at these types of meetings. While no White ever had his or her views rejected at committee and task force meetings, those of 41.2% Blacks were rejected. Only Whites very often had their views accepted. Of the respondents whose views committee members very often accept at meetings, over 90% are Whites. Male is also the more represented group of respondents, whose views their members always (87.5%), very often (93.3%) often (85.7%), and seldom (59.1%) accept at these meetings. Also, only 6.5% male, compared with 16.7% female never had their views accepted. Chi-square test indicates that there is a significant difference between these frequencies (Table 8).

Might the pattern of acceptance of views that exists at committee level be any different from that of departmental meetings? On the basis of sex, there is a higher proportion of male than female, whose views were accepted at these types of meetings. Of those whose views were always, very often, often and seldom accepted, the percentages of sample that were male are 100%, 87.5%, 88.2%, and 54.8%, respectively (Table 9). This means that 5.3% of the male and 16.7% female respondents never had their views accepted at departmental meetings. From these percentages, we deduce that female are three times more likely to have their views rejected at departmental

meetings than their male counterparts. These differences, as Table 9 indicates, are statistically significant.

Table 7: View Acceptance At Committee Meetings By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	Always	Count	8	0	0	0	8
		Expected Count	5.8	.4	1.7	.1	8.0
		% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	13.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%
		% of Total	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%
	Very Often	Count	15	0	0	0	15
		Expected Count	10.9	.8	3.2	.2	15.0
		% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	25.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	18.8%
		% of Total	18.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	18.8%
	Often	Count	26	0	2	0	28
		Expected Count	20.3	1.4	5.9	.4	28.0
		% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	92.9%	.0%	7.1%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	44.8%	.0%	11.8%	.0%	35.0%
		% of Total	32.5%	.0%	2.5%	.0%	35.0%
	Seldom	Count	9	4	8	1	22
		Expected Count	16.0	1.1	4.7	.3	22.0
		% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	40.9%	18.2%	36.4%	4.5%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	15.5%	100.0%	47.1%	100.0%	27.5%
		% of Total	11.3%	5.0%	10.0%	1.3%	27.5%
Never	Count	0	0	7	0	7	
	Expected Count	5.1	.4	1.5	.1	7.0	
	% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	.0%	.0%	41.2%	.0%	8.8%	
	% of Total	.0%	.0%	8.8%	.0%	8.8%	
Total	Count	58	4	17	1	80	
	Expected Count	58.0	4.0	17.0	1.0	80.0	
	% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	72.5%	5.0%	21.3%	1.3%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	72.5%	5.0%	21.3%	1.3%	100.0%	

Table 7

$$\chi^2 = 55.588, df = 12, p < 0.000$$

Table 8: View Acceptance At Committee Meetings By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	Always	Count	7	1	8
		Expected Count	6.2	1.8	8.0
		% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
		% within Sex	11.3%	5.6%	10.0%
		% of Total	8.8%	1.3%	10.0%
	Very Often	Count	14	1	15
		Expected Count	11.6	3.4	15.0
		% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
		% within Sex	22.6%	5.6%	18.8%
		% of Total	17.5%	1.3%	18.8%
	Often	Count	24	4	28
		Expected Count	21.7	6.3	28.0
		% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Sex	38.7%	22.2%	35.0%
		% of Total	30.0%	5.0%	35.0%
	Seldom	Count	13	9	22
		Expected Count	17.1	5.0	22.0
		% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
		% within Sex	21.0%	50.0%	27.5%
		% of Total	16.3%	11.3%	27.5%
Never	Count	4	3	7	
	Expected Count	5.4	1.6	7.0	
	% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	6.5%	16.7%	8.8%	
	% of Total	5.0%	3.8%	8.8%	
Total	Count	62	18	80	
	Expected Count	62.0	18.0	80.0	
	% within View Acceptance At Comm Meetings	77.5%	22.5%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	77.5%	22.5%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 9.638, df = 4, p < 0.047$$

Table 9: View Acceptance At Dept Meetings By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
View Acceptance At Dept Meetings	Always	Count	4	0	4
		Expected Count	2.9	1.1	4.0
		% within View Acceptance At Dept Meetings	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Sex	5.3%	.0%	3.8%
		% of Total	3.8%	.0%	3.8%
	Very Often	Count	14	2	16
		Expected Count	11.4	4.6	16.0
		% within View Acceptance At Dept Meetings	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
		% within Sex	18.7%	6.7%	15.2%
		% of Total	13.3%	1.9%	15.2%
	Often	Count	30	4	34
		Expected Count	24.3	9.7	34.0
		% within View Acceptance At Dept Meetings	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
		% within Sex	40.0%	13.3%	32.4%
		% of Total	28.6%	3.8%	32.4%
	Seldom	Count	23	19	42
		Expected Count	30.0	12.0	42.0
		% within View Acceptance At Dept Meetings	54.8%	45.2%	100.0%
		% within Sex	30.7%	63.3%	40.0%
		% of Total	21.9%	18.1%	40.0%
Never	Count	4	5	9	
	Expected Count	6.4	2.6	9.0	
	% within View Acceptance At Dept Meetings	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	5.3%	16.7%	8.6%	
	% of Total	3.8%	4.8%	8.6%	
Total	Count	75	30	105	
	Expected Count	75.0	30.0	105.0	
	% within View Acceptance At Dept Meetings	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 17.259, df = 4, p < 0.002$$

White is the most favoured group at departmental meetings – with 21.4% of its members very often, and 47.1% often having their views accepted at departmental meetings. White is the only ethnic group that contains a percentage of respondents (5.7%) who always had their views accepted at these meetings. 2.9% White, compared with 24.1% Black respondents never had their views accepted at departmental meetings. 97.1% of respondents who often had their views accepted at these types of meetings, were White. Chi-square test indicates that there is a significant difference in to way in which members' views were accepted at departmental meetings, based on ethnicity ($\chi^2 = 49.476$, $df = 12$, $p < 0.000$).

One would have thought that because teams are usually small they would have had a higher degree of cohesiveness (Moorehead and Griffin, 2001) than departments that are larger, creating the likelihood that their members accept others' views. Another factor in support of this expectation is that members work collaboratively, necessitating a high degree of interpersonal skills. This constituent should have furnished them with a more 'inclusive' attitude. However, analysis indicates that this explanation has not been met. Instead, there is a great disparity in the degree to which members – notably the team leaders – accept the views of their counterparts, with division along the lines of sex, race and ethnicity.

There is a significant difference between the degree to which members' views were accepted, at team meetings, on the basis of their sex ($\chi^2 = 29.896$, $df=4$, $p < 0.000$), with all those who always had their views accepted at team meetings being male (100%).

More than 90% male and less than 7% female very often had their views accepted at team meetings. Male also represents 90% of those who often had their views accepted, compared with only 10% female. Those who seldom and never had their views accepted are represented as 40.5% and 62.5% male and 59.5% and 37.5% female, respectively. There is also a significant difference between the extent to which the views of members of different ethnic group are accepted, with Whites fearing better than Blacks (the 2nd major ethnic group). Blacks were three times more likely to have their views rejected at team meetings than their White counterparts, who field 100% of the members who always had their views accepted and over 90% and almost 100% of those who very often and often had their views accepted. The significant difference between the rate of view acceptance, based on ethnicity, is supported statistically: $\chi^2=60.748$, $df=12$, $p < 0.000$.

As the quantitative analysis indicates, male and Whites have a greater chance of having the views that they present at any meeting accepted than any other group. Women, but more so members of minority ethnic groups are very conscious of this situation, some electing to be quiet in meetings because their views are not accorded the same degree of respect as those of other groups are. This can be illustrated by the melancholy tone of one informant, as he reluctantly pulls to 'full view' the agenda, for a meeting that he had no desire to attend but which was mandatory, that was sandwiched between a set of 'working files':

"Why do I need to go?" he questioned.

“If not because I am contractually bound to attend, I would not be ‘making it’! There is no point in turning up just to be recorded as being present. Why don’t they have the meetings privately, then tell us what they decide. In fact, I think the meetings are just for the show. They come to the meeting, after having previously taken a stance and knowing what each other will be saying. On all issues there are previous agreements. They are experts at dramatic arts. It’s like a movie script that has been rehearsed several times before the public performance.

“But I guess I’ll just have to go!”

Another respondent, in an unofficial response to the query, dubbed a ‘citation’, regarding non-attendance at a recent meeting, declares:

“I thought they would be relieved that I was absent. It is a good thing to have only part of the group involved in discussions and taking all the decisions. I am one of the ‘complete observers’ – be there but do not interrupt the proceedings!

“What is most irritating is when, occasionally, you think you have got it! That brilliant idea! Thinking, they will have to listen this time! You present that brilliant idea! Your best ever! But it ‘falls to the floor!’ No one takes any notice – but sometimes, the most disappointing rejection! No consideration given to an idea that guarantees progress!

“But what is really infuriating! What really kills me – makes me want to walk out in protest! Is that my silly, stupid idea is recycled by a White, usually a woman, and this is welcome with open arms! Its as though they had never heard it before! Its as though I had not said it!

“So often people sit beside you to get your ideas, to ‘rock your brain’, just to bring them out to management to get the praise!

“When we receive an occasional visit from higher management at one of our meetings, they say stupid things but gain the recognition. They sometimes ask you what you think before the meeting then get it all out before you have a chance to do so.

“If you try to say something, you are asked to wait but they can interrupt. Sometimes I get interrupted before I finish my statement – they know precisely what I was going to say. I am not given a chance. Now, I conclude that it does not make sense trying. I will be the ‘complete observer’ that they want me to be!”

After glancing, through the text of an old ‘record of meeting’ contained in a previously unopened e-mail, Valerie, smiling broadly, filed it away in a ‘Lever Arch File’. Normal conversation followed this unscheduled interruption. However, approximately ten minutes later, there was lull in the discussion – her side of the discussion. The silence was broken moments later, with the thought:

“I know I might be thinking aloud or retrogressing. However, I cannot help thinking that I could have been made to feel more welcome at these meetings. I am not part of the dominant forces and, therefore, have no control over the situation.

“The least that I would expect is that they would listen to me. Even when I say something positive, my name does not appear on the ‘record’. I am made to feel stupid – but many organisations take the stupid ideas that workers have and make millions. Look at Microsoft! Look at most other corporate giants! They listen to people! They value all contributions!

“We are different, and it is that difference that makes it necessary for us to meet and trade ideas but this is not what is happening! This is the reason that we are literally stagnated! We are in the mire! And management is a sad story! They do not have a ‘clue’! – Completely ‘clueless’!”

In order to secure a wide range of view, to facilitate effective decision-making (Dessler, 2001), managers usually consult their subordinates – though the extent to which they do this depends on their leadership style and the organisational structure that they implement. It is logical, therefore, to assume that the views that they solicit are representative of their diverse workforce. Analysis of the degree to which managers solicit the views of members of their departments, shows gender disparity. On analysis, managers consulted a significantly greater number of male than female. Of those whom managers most frequently consult, more than 95% are male and less than 5% female. As Table 10 indicates, 81% males are seldom consulted compared with less than 20% female. With 40.9% male and 82.1% female, who are never consulted, this significant difference between the sexes means that managers are twice as likely to consult male than female workers.

Table 10: Consultation From Manager By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Consultation from Manager	Often	Count	22	1	23
		Expected Count	16.1	6.9	23.0
		% within Consultation from Manager	95.7%	4.3%	100.0%
		% within Sex	33.3%	3.6%	24.5%
		% of Total	23.4%	1.1%	24.5%
	Seldom	Count	17	4	21
		Expected Count	14.7	6.3	21.0
		% within Consultation from Manager	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
		% within Sex	25.8%	14.3%	22.3%
		% of Total	18.1%	4.3%	22.3%
	Never	Count	27	23	50
		Expected Count	35.1	14.9	50.0
		% within Consultation from Manager	54.0%	46.0%	100.0%
		% within Sex	40.9%	82.1%	53.2%
		% of Total	28.7%	24.5%	53.2%
Total	Count	66	28	94	
	Expected Count	66.0	28.0	94.0	
	% within Consultation from Manager	70.2%	29.8%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	70.2%	29.8%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 14.559, df = 2, p < 0.001.$$

Because consultation on gender basis is weighed in favour of males, we might assume that there could not be a significant difference between the degree with which managers consult the particular ethnic groups. Surprisingly, the practice is very much the same, as with sex, White being the most favoured group. As Table 11 indicates, of the 105 respondents, managers have only ever consulted Whites, with only 27.9%, compared with 100% of other ethnic groups, whom they have never consulted. The figures are represented as: $\chi^2 = 44.750$, $df=6$, $p < 0.000$.

We could cautiously attribute the reasons for this disparity to the size of departments and, therefore, the great number of people with whom managers need to contend (Table 11). Whites being the most represented ethnic group in Pike International could mean that they are most likely to be found or intercepted than their other ethnic counterparts. However, this is unlikely to be a satisfactory explanation to a total neglect of other groups, for the purpose of consultation. While managers might be given the benefit of the doubt, for overlooking Black and other minority ethnic groups, during consultation, it will not be by sheer coincidence that they also neglect one sex in favour of the other (Table 10).

Table 11: Consultation From Manager By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
Consultation from Manager	Often	Count	23	0	0	0	23
		Expected Count	14.9	1.0	6.6	.5	23.0
		% within Consultation from Manager	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	37.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	24.5%
		% of Total	24.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	24.5%
	Seldom	Count	21	0	0	0	21
		Expected Count	13.6	.9	6.0	.4	21.0
		% within Consultation from Manager	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	34.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	22.3%
		% of Total	22.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	22.3%
	Never	Count	17	4	27	2	50
		Expected Count	32.4	2.1	14.4	1.1	50.0
		% within Consultation from Manager	34.0%	8.0%	54.0%	4.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	27.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	53.2%
		% of Total	18.1%	4.3%	28.7%	2.1%	53.2%
Total	Count	61	4	27	2	94	
	Expected Count	61.0	4.0	27.0	2.0	94.0	
	% within Consultation from Manager	64.9%	4.3%	28.7%	2.1%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	64.9%	4.3%	28.7%	2.1%	100.0%	

Table 11

$$\chi^2 = 44.750, df=6, p < 0.000$$

Again, because of the small number of people in each team and the fact that the superior-subordinate relationship is less formal than that which exists in departments, one expects that team leaders will be less biased in their consultation. However, against this expectation and ‘strikingly similar’ to the behaviour of departmental managers, team leaders’ consultation favours White, to a great extent more than Black ethnic group. Of respondents whom team leaders consult very often, and often, Whites feature at 100% - no other group falling in these categories. Whites and Blacks were the only groups who were often consulted, 87.5% and 12.5%, respectively. 22.5% Whites, 10% Asians and 5% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups, have received consultation from team leaders. Chi-square test shows a significant difference between team leaders’ consultation of the different ethnic groups ($\chi^2 = 42.438$, $df = 9$, $p < 0.000$).

No female, compared with 40% of the male respondents said that their team leaders very often and often consulted them. They have never consulted 87% female, compared with 36.4% male, whom they never consulted. These percentages mean that team leaders are twice more likely to consult male than female – a significant difference between them (Table 12).

Table 12: Consultation From Team Leader By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Consultation from Team Leader	Very Often	Count	4		4
		% within Consultation from Team Leader	100.0%		100.0%
		% within Sex	7.3%		5.1%
		% of Total	5.1%		5.1%
	Often	Count	18		18
		% within Consultation from Team Leader	100.0%		100.0%
		% within Sex	32.7%		23.1%
		% of Total	23.1%		23.1%
	Seldom	Count	13	3	16
		% within Consultation from Team Leader	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%
		% within Sex	23.6%	13.0%	20.5%
		% of Total	16.7%	3.8%	20.5%
Never	Count	20	20	40	
	% within Consultation from Team Leader	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	36.4%	87.0%	51.3%	
	% of Total	25.6%	25.6%	51.3%	
Total	Count	55	23	78	
	% within Consultation from Team Leader	70.5%	29.5%	100.0%	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	70.5%	29.5%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 18.182, df = 3, p < 0.000.$$

Corporate managers in Pike International rarely consult workers, presumably because of their busy schedule. However, when they do so very often, only 1.9% of the times that they consult workers, women are favoured at 3.3% compared with their male counterparts at 1.4%. However, females are less popular in the two frequencies of consultation, often and seldom, with males scoring just over 21% and 31%, respectively, compared with 3.3% and 6.7% for female. Table 13 presents these findings, establishing that corporate managers are twice more likely to consult male than their female colleagues. Chi-square test indicates a significant difference: $\chi^2 = 16.232, df = 3, p < 0.001$.

Table 13: Consultation From Corporate Managers By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Consultation from Corporate Managers	Very Often	Count	1	1	2
		% within Sex	1.4%	3.3%	1.9%
	Often	Count	16	1	17
		% within Sex	21.6%	3.3%	16.3%
	Seldom	Count	23	2	25
		% within Sex	31.1%	6.7%	24.0%
	Never	Count	34	26	60
		% within Sex	45.9%	86.7%	57.7%
Total	Count	74	30	104	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 16.232, df = 3, p < 0.001$$

Corporate managers consult 2.9% Whites very often, and 24.3% of them often but 0% Black and other minority ethnic groups, in both frequencies. However, they seldom consult 3.4% of Black and 34.3% White respondents. While corporate managers have never consulted Indian, Chinese and other minority ethnic groups, they have consulted 34% Blacks and 61.4% White respondents. The chi-square result is: $\chi^2 = 32.181, df = 9, p < 0.000$ (see Table 14).

Table 14: Consultation From Corporate Managers By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
Consultation from Corporate Managers	Very Often	Count	2	0	0	0	2
		Expected Count	1.3	.1	.6	.0	2.0
		% within Consultation from Corporate Managers	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	2.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%
		% of Total	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%
	Often	Count	17	0	0	0	17
		Expected Count	11.4	.5	4.7	.3	17.0
		% within Consultation from Corporate Managers	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	24.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.3%
		% of Total	16.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.3%
	Seldom	Count	24	0	1	0	25
		Expected Count	16.8	.7	7.0	.5	25.0
		% within Consultation from Corporate Managers	96.0%	.0%	4.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	34.3%	.0%	3.4%	.0%	24.0%
		% of Total	23.1%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	24.0%
	Never	Count	27	3	28	2	60
		Expected Count	40.4	1.7	16.7	1.2	60.0
		% within Consultation from Corporate Managers	45.0%	5.0%	46.7%	3.3%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	38.6%	100.0%	96.6%	100.0%	57.7%
		% of Total	26.0%	2.9%	26.9%	1.9%	57.7%
Total	Count	70	3	29	2	104	
	Expected Count	70.0	3.0	29.0	2.0	104.0	
	% within Consultation from Corporate Managers	67.3%	2.9%	27.9%	1.9%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	67.3%	2.9%	27.9%	1.9%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 32.181, df = 9, p < 0.000$$

One would have expected that because some workers seldom and never had their views accepted at committees and task forces, team and departmental meetings, and were hardly ever consulted by team leaders and managers, they would be reluctant to volunteer their views, on a one-to-one basis, to these incumbents. To the contrary they did so to a very great extent at Pike International.

While only 2% of Whites in the sample very often volunteered their views to team leaders, 29% Asians and 29.6% Blacks did so very often. 60% Whites, 50% Asians and 55.6% Blacks, and 100% Chinese and other ethnic minority groups volunteer advice to team leaders often, while 36% Whites and 11.1% Blacks seldom did so. Chi-square analysis confirms that these percentages are significant at: $\chi^2 = 24.026$, $df = 9$, $p < 0.004$. A slightly greater percentage of male than female, 98.3% and 92% respectively, volunteer advice to team leaders, showing no significant difference between them ($\chi^2 = 2.691$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.442$). Team leaders reject 60% of the views that female members offer, compared with only 28.1% of those of their male counterparts. Team leaders always accept the volunteered information of 19.3% male but 0% female. 8.8% male and 0% female very often, with 24.6% and 8% male and female respectively, often had team leaders accepting their views (Table 15).

Table 15: Leader's Acceptance of Volunteered Information By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Leader's Acceptance of Information	Always	Count	11		11
		% within Sex	19.3%		13.4%
	Very Often	Count	5		5
		% within Sex	8.8%		6.1%
	Often	Count	14	2	16
		% within Sex	24.6%	8.0%	19.5%
	Seldom	Count	11	8	19
		% within Sex	19.3%	32.0%	23.2%
	Never	Count	16	15	31
		% within Sex	28.1%	60.0%	37.8%
Total	Count	57	25	82	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 15.357, df = 4, p < 0.004$$

There is also a significant difference between the racial and ethnic groups whose information team leaders had accepted - weighing in favour of Whites. 65.35% Whites and 0% minority ethnic groups suggest that team leaders always accept their advice when they

volunteer it. They seldom accept the views of 22.4% White, 25.9% Black and 50% of Chinese and other minority ethnic groups. Statistics indicate that there is a significant difference between the rate with which team leaders accept the views of racial and minority ethnic groups: $\chi^2 = 45.233$, $df = 12$, $p < 0.000$.

Despite the team leaders' non-acceptance of most of the views that members volunteer to them, they often provide information to heads of departments. White is the only racial group that very often-volunteer information to heads of department (1.6%). However, just over 57% of them, 75% of Asians, 70.4% of Blacks, and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups often volunteer information to them. Statistics indicate that these differences, on the basis of ethnicity, are significant (Table 16).

Taken by sex, there is no significant difference in the frequency with which workers volunteer information to heads of departments. Only a small percentage of female (3.6%) and 0% male never volunteer information to them. While 62% of the male and 67.7% of female respondents often do, 30.3% of the former and 32% of the latter seldom volunteer information to their managers. There is, therefore, no significant difference between the extent to which the two groups volunteer information at this organisational level ($\chi^2 = 3.038$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.551$).

Table 16: Volunteering Advice To HOD By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
Volunteering Advice to HOD	very Often	Count	1	0	0	0	1
		Expected Count	.6	.0	.3	.0	1.0
		% within Volunteering Advice to HOD	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%
		% of Total	1.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%
	Often	Count	35	3	19	1	58
		Expected Count	37.6	2.5	16.7	1.2	58.0
		% within Volunteering Advice to HOD	60.3%	5.2%	32.8%	1.7%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	57.4%	75.0%	70.4%	50.0%	61.7%
		% of Total	37.2%	3.2%	20.2%	1.1%	61.7%
	Seldom	Count	22	0	6	1	29
		Expected Count	18.8	1.2	8.3	.6	29.0
		% within Volunteering Advice to HOD	75.9%	.0%	20.7%	3.4%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	36.1%	.0%	22.2%	50.0%	30.9%
		% of Total	23.4%	.0%	6.4%	1.1%	30.9%
	Never	Count	3	0	2	0	5
		Expected Count	3.2	.2	1.4	.1	5.0
		% within Volunteering Advice to HOD	60.0%	.0%	40.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Ethnicity	4.9%	.0%	7.4%	.0%	5.3%
		% of Total	3.2%	.0%	2.1%	.0%	5.3%
5	Count	0	1	0	0	1	
	Expected Count	.6	.0	.3	.0	1.0	
	% within Volunteering Advice to HOD	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	
	% of Total	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	
Total	Count	61	4	27	2	94	
	Expected Count	61.0	4.0	27.0	2.0	94.0	
	% within Volunteering Advice to HOD	64.9%	4.3%	28.7%	2.1%	100.0%	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	64.9%	4.3%	28.7%	2.1%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 26.934, df = 12, p < 0.008$$

With most respondents volunteering information to heads of department, it will be interesting to know the degree to which they welcome the information and whether their acceptance is biased towards a particular sex, race and ethnic group. Analysis indicates that there is a significant difference between the degree to which heads of department accept comments from male and female workers, the former being more favoured. While only 19% of male suggest that their heads of department never accept their advice, 64.3% of the female said that they never do so. These managers always accept the advice of 27% male and 3.6% female. No female respondents indicate that their managers very often accept their advice but 9.5% of the male say that they do. However, 7.1% female and 27% male say that their heads of department often accept their suggestions. Chi-square test indicates a significant difference in the frequency with which managers accept suggestions from the two groups ($\chi^2 = 24.284$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.000$).

Taken on the bases of race and ethnicity, departmental managers are overwhelmingly in favour of Whites, in their acceptance of the information that workers volunteer. Only white respondents indicate that their managers always, very often and often accept their views. This means that members of minority ethnic groups fall in the other two categories, seldom and never, the bulk being in the latter. Managers seldom accept the views of 25% Asians, just over 23% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups. This means that they never accept the advice that 75%, almost 77% and 50% of these groups, respectively. Statistical analysis indicates that these differences are significant (Table 17).

Table 17: HOD's Acceptance Of Views By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
HOD's Acceptance of Views	Always	Count	18				18
		% within Ethnicity	30.5%				19.8%
	Very Often	Count	6				6
		% within Ethnicity	10.2%				6.6%
	Often	Count	19				19
		% within Ethnicity	32.2%				20.9%
	Seldom	Count	10	1	6	1	18
		% within Ethnicity	16.9%	25.0%	23.1%	50.0%	19.8%
	Never	Count	6	3	20	1	30
		% within Ethnicity	10.2%	75.0%	76.9%	50.0%	33.0%
Total	Count	59	4	26	2	91	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 51.542, df = 12, p < 0.000$$

Based on the assumption that senior managers do not have all the answers, specifically those related to diversity issues, they sometimes seek advice from people at different organisational levels. The concern of this investigation is to establish which categories of the diverse workforce, if any, they most favour in their search for information, with which to formulate important policy and strategy.

Analysis indicates that there is a significant difference between the rate at which senior managers consult racial and ethnic groups, on diversity matters. Black and White are the only groups that senior managers have consulted, with 3.4% of the former and 0% of the latter suggesting that senior managers very often consult them. While these managers very often consult 1.4% Whites and 0% Blacks, they seldom consult 22.9% of the former and 3.4% of the latter. The difference between the rates at which senior managers consult particular racial groups is significant at: $\chi^2 = 45.431$, $df = 12$, $p < 0.000$.

Senior managers consult a total of 13.3% female respondents, compared with 54.1% of their male counterparts. Therefore, they have never consult almost twice as many females (86.7%) as males (45.9%). The frequency with which they consult the two groups is also different. While they very often consult 3.3% female and 1.4% male, they often consult 21.6% male and just 3.3% female. In addition, they also seldom consult 31.1% male and 6.7% female. Chi-square test indicates a significant difference in the pattern with which corporate managers consult the sexes ($\chi^2 = 16.232$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$).

Analysis, has, so far, focused on respondents' volunteering of suggestions in group and individual contexts, and the degree to which team leaders and managers accept them, based on sex, race and ethnicity. The research now assesses the degree to which workers perceive that they possess information crucial to organisational survival. When asked "to what extent do you think that you have access to important information from outside your organisation that would improve its chances of success?", an overwhelming 80% female, compared with just under 25% male suggest that they do so to a great extent. Just over 50% male and 16.7% female agree that they possess this information – interpreted as marketing intelligence - to a fair extent. Chi-square test reveals a significant difference between the responses of the two groups (Table 18).

Table 18: Workers' Access To Marketing Intelligence By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Access to External Information	To a Great extent	Count	26	24	50
		% within Sex	34.7%	80.0%	47.6%
	To a Fair Extent	Count	38	5	43
		% within Sex	50.7%	16.7%	41.0%
	To a Limited Extent	Count	6		6
		% within Sex	8.0%		5.7%
	Not at All	Count	5	1	6
		% within Sex	6.7%	3.3%	5.7%
Total	Count	75	30	105	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 18.114, df = 3. p < 0.000$$

27.1% Whites, 100% Asians, 86.2% Blacks and 100% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups, suggest that, to a great extent, they possess marketing intelligence. 55.7% Whites, 0% Asians, 13.8% Blacks and 0% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups suggest that, to a great extent, they possess marketing intelligence. Only 8.6% White and 0% of other ethnic groups thought that they did not possess marketing intelligence. Chi-square test indicates that there is a significant difference between the extent of

marketing intelligence that particular ethnic groups think that they possess ($\chi^2 = 36.094$, $df = 9$, $p < 0.000$).

Having made decisions, from available information, managers and team leaders need to be able to effectively implement them. Question 33 enquired of the frequency with which managers or team leaders sought respondents' advice on decision implementation. Analysis shows that 27.1 % Whites, 100% Asians, 86.2% Blacks and 100% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups say that, managers and team leaders, to a great extent, consult them. 55.7% Whites, 0% Asians, 13.8% Blacks and 0% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups say that they consult them, to a fair extent. 8.6% White and 0% of the other groups suggest that they have never consulted them. Chi-square test indicates that these differences are significant at: $\chi^2 = 52.671$, $df = 12$. $p < 0.000$.

Managers and team leaders' solicitation of decision implementation advice from workers is biased in favour of males, with 65.3% of them being consulted compared with less than 15% female. This means that they have never consulted more than 85% female, compared with only 34.7% male. The difference between the degree to which managers and team leaders consulted the two groups is significant ($\chi^2 = 27.523$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.000$).

Workers' Perception, and Reality, of the Internal Organisational Environment

This section of analysis attempts to establish the nature of Pike International's work environment and workers' perception of a number of issues associated with its functioning. It comparatively analyses these factors in relation to the sex, race and

ethnicity of respondents. The researcher posed two questions on internal promotion – one on the number of times that respondents applied for promotion and the other on the number of times that they had been successful.

10.7% male and 16.7% female never sought promotion in the organisation. 25.3% male and 20% female applied for promotion 1-4 times, while 54.7% and 33.3% male and female, respectively, applied for promotion 5-9 times. The remaining 9.5% male and 30% female applied for promotion 10 or more times. These percentages represent significant differences between the sexes at: $\chi^2 = 8.893$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.031$.

There is no significant difference between the times that members of different ethnic groups applied for promotion. 8.6% Whites, 25% Asians, 17.2% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups never applied for promotion. 31.4% Whites, 25% Asians and 6.9% Blacks (no Chinese, etc.) applied for promotion 1 – 4 times. 50% Whites, 25% Asians, 51% Black and 0% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups applied for promotion 5 - 9 times. No Chinese, 10% Whites, 25% Asians, 24% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups applied for promotion 10 or more times. Chi-square test indicates that there is no significant difference between the times that members of particular ethnic groups applied. This is represented as: $\chi^2 = 15.965$, $df = 9$, $p < 0.68$.

Having established the extent of individual bids for promotion, based on respondents' sex, race and ethnicity, analysis now examines the degree to which workers had been successful in these attempts. Of those who applied for promotion, 73.1% of female, compared with 32.9% of male, were never successful. 43.8% male and 23.1% female

were successful in their application for promotion on 1-4 occasions. 23.3% male and 3.8% female have been successful in their application 5-9 times. As Table 19 shows, there is a major difference (40.2%) between males and females who had never been successful in their application for promotion. There is also a disparity, in favour of males, between the times that respondents had been successful in their search for promotion. For example, analysis indicates that females are more than twice as likely to be unsuccessful in their application for promotion as their male counterparts.³³ The difference in the success rate of the two groups is significant at: $\chi^2 = 13.271$, $df = 2$, $p < 0.001$.

Table 19: Times Successful In Bid For Promotion By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Times Successful	None	Count	24	19	43
		% within Sex	32.9%	73.1%	43.4%
	1-4 Times	Count	32	6	38
		% within Sex	43.8%	23.1%	38.4%
	5-9 Times	Count	17	1	18
		% within Sex	23.3%	3.8%	18.2%
Total	Count	73	26	99	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 13.271, df = 2, p < 0.001$$

Chi-square test indicates a significant difference between individual promotion success and their membership of particular ethnic group. While no Asian or Chinese and other minority ethnic groups have ever been promoted, less than 12% Blacks and over 70% Whites have been promoted, at least once (Table 20).

Table 20: Times Successful In Bid For Promotion By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
Times Successful	None	Count	14	4	23	2	43
		% within Ethnicity	20.9%	100.0%	88.5%	100.0%	43.4%
	1-4 Times	Count	35		3		38
		% within Ethnicity	52.2%		11.5%		38.4%
	5-9 Times	Count	18				18
		% within Ethnicity	26.9%				18.2%
Total	Count	67	4	26	2	99	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 40.979, df = 9, p < 0.000$$

Many workers have expressed their disappointment with the system that is in place for internal promotion, some, even those benefiting from it, threatening to stage a boycott. Some informants accuse the selection panels of customising job descriptions and personnel specifications to ensure that their preferred candidates ‘un-mistakably’ match the ‘engineered profile’, others suggesting that panel members are “downright discriminatory”. One informant claims:

“Management has a way of trying to explain away what is openly their highly discriminatory practices!

“But one ‘think’ that they forget is that the people that they try to ‘brainwash’ with their ‘crap’ are far more intelligent than they are. They don’t even realise that with a ‘discipline’ like mine, I turn them ‘inside out’

“They do try to insult one’s intelligence – to a great extent they do! But
 ‘The less said’.”

On return from visiting an overseas 'agency', and having received briefing on another round of appointments, a furious informant exclaimed:

“Why do you think that I have never applied?! It does not matter how lucrative the position, it will never be my entitlement. I am not certain who ‘calls the shots’ but ‘liiii’ think ‘thhhaaa’ ‘a’ ‘haave’ a fair idea.

“Why ‘don’ they follow the ‘management succession chart’ that they have created, and to which no one else but they have access? Why do they waste our time?”

As the quantitative analysis suggests, women and minority ethnic groups are worst off in these exercises. After another ‘fatal’ attempt to secure the promotion to which she had long aspired, and for which she thought that she was ideally suited, Millie stormed out of her office, on receiving the unwelcome news. She sighed effortlessly - in an unforgiving tone, and spoke unerringly:

“I am not now certain what is required of me!

“I am that person! I fit the profile - like none other! – Yet, I was denied the opportunity to advance!

“This is not a mistake! It is deliberate! I ‘coo’d’ do that ‘jooob’. Very well but has got everything to lose.. I should be valued – taken seriously. I have quite overstepped my bounds, this time. I wasted my time and ‘their’s””

“I could have done better with my time! It’s ok!

“I will live long enough to see fail.”

Many minority ethnic workers have ‘traumatic’ experiences of events leading up to and including their denial of internal promotion. One worker, who was denied promotion to a supervisory position, complained that he was asked to train the new appointee, who had no experience in that sphere of work. He remarks:

“I really don’t mind training or helping colleagues and juniors to be more efficient in the performance of their tasks, but to be asked, by my manager, to train a new appointee, who could not undertake the job, in the first instance, is very ridiculous. I cannot understand how he got the job in the first place. If I do not do as I am told – to train, train, train! – I will have no job. To whom do I complain? Absolutely no one! I expect to be reward for my technical achievement and dedication to task but that will be outside of this organisation. In this place, the anti-discriminatory laws have no effect!”

During the questionnaire administration period, one black female worker approached the researcher, smiling broadly, and after her normally polite salutation, punctuated by a brief moment of silence, declared:

“I am on my way out! I feel quite well until I enter these ‘enclosures’. It is difficult to explain but there does not appear to be any formal procedure for appointments and promotion. My supervisor left and my manager simply had a ‘quiet word’ with one of my colleagues, a ‘white girl’. Before I realise, she was ‘acting-up’. The next thing is that she got the job. We did not as much ‘has’ got a note to tell us that we had a new supervisor – she just started telling us what to do. That is really life – Aint it!?”

Even when workers have not been promoted, they still expect some degree of intrinsic motivation, least of which is commendation on their performance – when they deserve it. Question 13 asks: “How often does your manager commend you on your work performance, when you think you deserve it?” While 10% Whites, 50% Asians, 48.3% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups had never been commended, 8.6%, 52.9% and 28.6% Whites had received commendation very often, often and seldom, respectively. 50% Asians, 48.3% Blacks and 50% Chinese and others said that they had seldom received commendation from their manager, when they thought that they deserved it. The chi-square test result, showing significant difference between these frequencies, is: $\chi^2 = 40.979$, $df = 9$, $p < 0.000$.

While managers have never commended 17.3% male and 40% female, they often commend 46.7% of male and 6.7% female. 29.3% male and 50% female said that their managers seldom commend them but 6.7% male and 3.3% female said that they very often receive commendation from them. Statistics represent a significant difference between these frequencies, with a chi-square representation of: $\chi^2 = 17.368$, $df = 3$. $p < 0.001$.

Even where managers fail to commend workers on their performance, when they deserve it, all is not lost because colleagues might offer the type of feedback that is likely to be realistic, as a result of their close association. But how do respondents interpret the feedback that they receive from them? On the bases of race and ethnicity, only Whites (18.6%) feel that they receive a fair balance of comments. 10% Whites, 25% Asians, 3.4% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups feel that the feedback that they receive from their colleagues is harsh but justifiable. 32.9% Whites, 0% Asians, 6.9% Blacks and 0% Chinese and other groups feel that the feedback is positive. These percentages compare with 21.4% Whites, 75% Asians, 69% Blacks and 0% Chinese and other groups who say that they received negative feedback. 12.9% Whites, 0% Asians, 10.3% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other groups receive constructive feedback. These percentages are matched by 4.3%, 0%, 10.3% and 0% of the respective racial and ethnic groups, who claim that the feedback, that they receive from their colleagues consists of a mixture of all the categories indicated above. These figures are significant at: $\chi^2 = 39.190$, $df = 15$, $p < 0.001$.

There is, however, no significant difference between the types of feedback that colleagues provide their counterparts, based on their sex. For example, while 26.7% of male and 16.7% female say that the comments that they receive are positive, 34.7% and 40% of them, respectively, say that the comments are negative. However, only 5.3% male and 6.7% female thought that the comments that they receive are a mixture of the different categories. The chi-square representation is: $\chi^2 = 3.506$, $df = 5$, $p < .623$.

Because general organisational operation of Pike International appears to be more accommodating of particular groups of workers, White and male, analysis attempts to determine respondents' impression of the work atmosphere. They were asked: "How would you describe the atmosphere within your organisation?" (question 24). Only Whites (25.7%) describe the atmosphere as very friendly. While 48.6% of them also describe the atmosphere as friendly, Blacks (6.9%) are the only other ethnic group that describe it similarly. However, 20% Whites, 50% Asians, just over 44% Black and all Chinese and other groups describe it as unfriendly. All Chinese describe the situation as unfriendly, followed by 50% Asians, 44.8% Blacks and 20% Whites. 50% Asians, 48.3% Blacks and 5.7% Whites say that the atmosphere is intolerable - Table 21 illustrating the significant difference between informants' perception.

Table 21: Work Atmosphere By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
Work Atmosphere	Very Friendly	Count	18				18
		% within Ethnicity	25.7%				17.1%
	friendly	Count	34		2		36
		% within Ethnicity	48.6%		6.9%		34.3%
	Unfriendly	Count	14	2	13	2	31
		% within Ethnicity	20.0%	50.0%	44.8%	100.0%	29.5%
	Intolerable	Count	4	2	14		20
		% within Ethnicity	5.7%	50.0%	48.3%		19.0%
Total	Count	70	4	29	2	105	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 51.885, df = 9, p < 0.000$$

Is it possible that male and female have different perceptions about the atmosphere of Pike International? Lets examine the statistics. 24% male and no female describe the atmosphere as very friendly, while 40% male and 20% female think that it is friendly. The remainder of respondents think that it is either unfriendly or intolerable, the former being the perception of most female. As Table 22 indicates, these differences are statistically significant.

Table 22: Work Atmosphere By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Work Atmosphere	Very Friendly	Count	18		18
		% within Sex	24.0%		17.1%
	friendly	Count	30	6	36
		% within Sex	40.0%	20.0%	34.3%
	Unfriendly	Count	17	14	31
		% within Sex	22.7%	46.7%	29.5%
	Intolerable	Count	10	10	20
		% within Sex	13.3%	33.3%	19.0%
Total	Count	75	30	105	
	% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 18.381, df = 3, p < 0.000$$

Even though particular sex, race and ethnic groups view the atmosphere of their organisation differently, it is possible that they receive reasonable assistance from their colleagues. Question 25, solicits: “How might you describe the degree to which your colleagues assist you in the performance of your role?” 20% male but no female describe their colleagues as extremely supportive, while 40% male and 10% female think that they are supportive. 8% male, compared with 26.7% female find their colleagues to be fairly supportive, with 28% male and 63.3% female suggesting that their colleagues are unsupportive. These differences are significant at: $\chi^2 = 25.848, df = 3, p < 0.000$.

Whites are the only ethnic group (21.4%) who find their colleagues extremely supportive. 50% Whites, 0% Asians, 3.4% Blacks and 0% Chinese and others describe their colleagues as supportive. 10% White, 25% Asian, 17.2 Black and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups regard them as fairly supportive. Asians (75%) and Blacks (79.3%) largely view their colleagues as unsupportive - a view shared by 18.6% Whites and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups. The significant difference between these perceptions is confirmed by chi-square test, at: $\chi^2 = 47.423, df = 9, p < 0.000$

Question 26 is similar to question 25 but refers to respondents' managers instead of their colleagues. 18.6% of the White respondents, and none of the other groups, find their managers extremely supportive. 48.6 Whites, 0% Asians, 3.4% Blacks and 0% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups find their managers supportive. While 14.3% Whites, 0% Asians, 10.3% Blacks and 0% Chinese and others attest that managers are fairly supportive, 18.6%, 75%, 86% and 100% of these racial and ethnic groups, respectively,

suggest that they are unsupportive. Chi-square test reveals the significant difference that exists between their perceptions. The result of the chi-square test is: $\chi^2 = 73.341$, $df = 12$, $p < 0.000$.

As in the case of race and ethnicity, there is disparity in the extent to which the sexes perceive managers as helpful. Just over 17% male and no female perceive their managers as extremely supportive. 90% of the female respondents and less than 30% of the male describe their managers as unsupportive. As Table 23 indicates, these differences in perception are significant.

Table 23: Assistance From Managers By Sex

			Sex		Total
			Male	Female	
Assistance from Managers	Extremely Supportive	Count	13		13
		% within Sex	17.3%		12.4%
	Supportive	Count	32	3	35
		% within Sex	42.7%	10.0%	33.3%
	Fairly Supportive	Count	8	5	13
		% within Sex	10.7%	16.7%	12.4%
	Unsupportive	Count	22	21	43
		% within Sex	29.3%	70.0%	41.0%
5		Count		1	1
		% within Sex		3.3%	1.0%
Total		Count	75	30	105
		% within Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

$$\chi^2 = 23.837, df = 4, p < 0.000$$

The researcher is fund of including a question, in this type of organisational analysis, which assesses the degree of worker commitment. The question (#28) asks: “If you had a choice, would you rather:

1. Be at home now
2. Go on a long vacation
3. Work more hours

4. Work less hours
5. Work elsewhere
6. Have the situation remain the same?"

The problem with this question is that the interpretation of responses is not as straightforward as it might appear. For example, it is possible that those people who choose alternative 1, depending on the time of day that they completed the questionnaire, might have been really tired and would just like to relax for a while. In this case, they would have been refreshed by the following day.

Those who chose alternative 2 might have been tired of having had to contend with consistent changes within the organisation and would like to get away on a vacation, hoping that this will be mentally, physically and emotionally stimulating. Alternatively, their holiday might really be overdue for work related and personal reasons. It is understandable, therefore, if they would like to 'get-away' for an extended period.

Those who elect to work more hours (alternative 3) might need to boost their pay packets. This is because operators and some clerical and administrative workers are allowed to claim overtime but this has to be approved by their line managers. As has been the case at Pike International, it is one way of earning extra cash to make additional purchases, go on holidays, or undertake needed home improvement. This privilege is denied other categories of staff – often a source of contention, illustrated by one informant, thinking aloud, muttering:

“I cannot understand the logic of some people being allowed overtime and others have to work extra hours for nothing. They are paid less and end up getting more for less work – mostly less quality!

“This is an issue that needs urgent attention but no one dares to raise it – neither will I! I will not be the only beneficiary of any positive outcome!”

Workers who choose alternative 4 are probably under a great deal of work pressure, as James, a professional worker announced, just after a departmental meeting, at which ‘individual plan of action’ was discussed:

“Welcome to Cuckoo Land!

“Is it that they really do not understand, or are they just trying to be obstructive? Every day, weekends inclusive, I have to take home boxes of files – not for the show”.

Pausing briefly, he grasped his attaché case, snapped it open, documents flung in, and in ‘lightning swift’ succession securing the ‘flip locks’ – unscrambling their combination. Shrugging his shoulders vertically, smiling broadly, he bacons to the researcher – a signal to leave the room. Slamming his office door – locking it ‘ratchet quick’ – he turns to the long corridor ahead, nods to the researcher, and in a most apologetic voice, suggests:

“Lets’ go”.

Having walked across the annex, overlooking the car park, the researcher enquires:

“Are you on your way home?”

His unexpected response bellows as we advanced towards the car park:

“I wish I could really say! – Home or work!”

Then pointing to the vacant lot, towards the sunset, exclaimed:

“There goes my social life! My family life is already gone! My was right – I ‘aam’ married to ‘mmy’ job.

“But is not the only one who thinks so!?”

“I do believe that there is a limit, a time separation between work and leisure! That work-life balance!

“I must be daft! Very daft!”

Then in an instant, after bidding:

“Cheers!”

He deactivated his security system, prized his front door open, and offloaded his luggage. Entering his car with a smile, he soon fastened his safety belt and turned the ignition on. Affording a final but firm wave, he started the ignition, and with an instantaneous movement, sped off as though to ‘ride into the sunset’ or ‘meet one’s destiny’.

If we make allowance for those ‘light’ responses, then we can concentrate on the two really important ones – 5 and 6. These are the two that test morale and commitment. Those who elect to have the situation remain the same could be either ‘cosy’ or highly motivated. Those who express a desire to leave the organisation must be experiencing a low level of morale – choosing to disassociate from that establishment. They are likely to be frustrated with the existing situation.

Because of the complexity of interpretation of the analysis of these responses, rather than a value of $p < 0.05$, the researcher would like to suggest $p < 0.005$ as the level of significance. 25.3% and 30.7% of male respondents subscribe alternatives 5 and 6, respectively. In the same order, similar categories of responses for female are 50% and 16.7%, respectively. 17.3% male and 16.7% female elected to work fewer hours, while 10.7% male and 3.3% female would rather work more hours. More male (at 8%) than female (at 3.3%) would rather go on a long vacation but 8% and 10% of them, respectively, would have liked to be at home. Chi-square test shows no significant difference between the preferences of the two groups: $\chi^2 = 7.751$, $df = 8$, $p < 0.170$.

As Table 24 indicates, there is a significant difference between the preferences of the racial and ethnic groups. Let us compare the percentage of respondents who would like to work elsewhere: 17.1% White; 50% Asian; 65.5% Black; 50% Chinese and other.

Table 24: Worker Commitment By Ethnicity

			Ethnicity				Total
			White	Asian	Black	Chinese & Other	
Worker Commitment	Be at Home Now	Count	5		4		9
		% within Ethnicity	7.1%		13.8%		8.6%
	Go on Long Vacation	Count	7				7
		% within Ethnicity	10.0%				6.7%
	Work More Hours	Count	8	1			9
		% within Ethnicity	11.4%	25.0%			8.6%
	Work Less Hours	Count	13	1	3	1	18
% within Ethnicity		18.6%	25.0%	10.3%	50.0%	17.1%	
Work Elsewhere	Count	12	2	19	1	34	
	% within Ethnicity	17.1%	50.0%	65.5%	50.0%	32.4%	
Have the situation remain the same	Count	25		3		28	
	% within Ethnicity	35.7%		10.3%		26.7%	
Total	Count	70	4	29	2	105	
	% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

$$\chi^2 = 34.030, df = 15, p < 0.003$$

Frustrated with his/her low-level of utilisation, one informant observes:

“When my manager needed quality assurance award, ... ‘paraded’ me and used my influence to gain accreditation. However, as soon as the organisation gained its enviable status, I was no longer of any importance to them

“They would have expected that my memory would have been as conveniently short as theirs. However, I cannot help but remember how important I was to them before

they achieved their current status. Not only does my ‘wretched deployment’ hurts but it stifles me!”

Another worker, having achieved first-level supervisory status remarked:

“One would have thought that the fact that we are paid fairly handsomely – I have never groused over the ‘pay issue’ – we would be expected to produce ‘our worth in gold’. Unfortunately, the non-recognition of our potential contribution in particular spheres – ones to which we are known to be able to make a valuable contribution – is something that is beyond my comprehension.

“Irrespective of how ‘obnoxious’ managers perceive particular groups of workers, it is their technical expertise and the quality of their contribution that should really count. In the end, it is the organisation, which loses out, strategically and operationally. There were many occasions when things have gone wrong and I am convinced that I am able, and willing, to help but no one asks me.

“I have stopped volunteering because of being turned down for tasks that one is competent to undertake, and for which one is not being paid, adds insults to injury. The excuses that one is given insult, and suffocates, one’s intelligence!”

One recently promoted informant, already frustrated with his/her new role, remarks:

“I have had complaints from colleagues that they are ‘stretched to the limit’. For me, that could not possibly be a complaint. They are overworked and under-paid but I am under-utilised! I do not mind ‘them’ holding back a slice of my salary, if I felt that I was satisfactorily assigned”.

Pike International’s illegal discriminatory practices, possibly unintentionally, extends to ‘working times’. Several informants complain of receiving unreasonable requests from managers to work extra hours, for which, unlike others, they are not paid. Some are called back to work before the expiration of their lunch break.

On one occasion, while having lunch with a female minority ethnic worker, she looked at her watch and remarked:

“Sorry! But I really have to go! I was not supposed to have been at lunch in the first place. It is against the rule but my manager insists that I eat on the premises and get back to my desk as soon as I am finished. I do not fancy being out of a job!. I know of the Tribunals but nobody knows how these things might turn out!.

“I am very sorry but I really have to go! Bye!”

Pike International’s Efforts Towards Diversity Management

Rather than taking practical steps to manage diversity, the organisation has bought itself membership of an external body, which seeks to publicise its alliance – a marketing

opportunity. However, workers, clients and customers, who are aware of the significance of this membership, suggest that the organisation has misinterpreted the whole issue. In addition to this initiative, and in an effort to record a strategic commitment, for the purpose of misguiding its owners and sponsors, the organisation has established a focus group. While the group meets fairly regularly, many members are sceptical of its real purpose because, rather than learning from the experiences of its participants, management often uses the occasion to ‘smooth away the rough edges’ – hoping that the presumed sheen that remains will ‘snowball’ internally and externally. Any positive steps that management embarks upon, emanating from the focus group, represent ‘window dressing’, without any real impact on the status quo.

No lessons that have been learnt from diversity internally and externally have affected policy and no guidance is provided for managers. Pseudo-measures are in place at operational level that seek to address recruitment and selection but they are not adhered to and no attempt is made to enforce them. Operational directors and managers feel that they have nothing to fear if they ignore all that is merely ‘rhetoric for public consumption’.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In practice, Pike International is inherently discriminatory, particularly in relation to sex, race and ethnicity. This factor compromises the effectiveness of its human resource utilisation. Valuable skills, knowledge and expertise that exist within its workforce might remain untapped, resting within the neglected and largely excluded groups. Male workers

are more likely to be involved in organisational activities, rewarded, consulted, encouraged, and valued than their female counterparts. Wherever there is a choice between the races, the order of preference for general involvement, reward, consultation, encouragement, and value is Whites, Blacks, Asians, and Chinese and other minority ethnic groups. Combining these groups, White male is the most favoured for all these 'treats'.

Empirical analysis clearly establishes that there is a great disparity between the degree to which different groups within Pike International have been utilised, as demonstrated by the degree to which they gain membership of committees and task forces, and their views are accepted at these and departmental and team meetings. Workers' utilisation is also tested in relation to the degree to which operational and corporate managers consult workers and accept the suggestions that they, periodically, make to them.

Chi-square test shows no significant difference in the pattern of membership of committees and taskforces over the years, based on sex - a probability greater than 0.05 ($\chi^2 = 8.529$, $df = 5$, $p < 0.112$). However, it is worth considering that almost 80% of the male respondents, compared with less than 60% female, were members of at least one committee or task force. More than 90% of those who belonged to 4 task forces or committees were male and less than 10% female. Some males, but no female, were members of 5 or more of these groups.

Even though there is no significant difference between male and female's previous and current membership of committees or task forces, there is a

significant difference in membership based on race and ethnicity. As Table 5 illustrates, 81.3% of the respondents who have been members of 2 committees and taskforces, were White. Whites also represent 86.4%, 80.9%, and 77.8% of respondents who were members of 3, 4 and 5 committees and task forces, respectively. 21.4% Whites, 48.3% Blacks and 50% Chinese were never members of any of these types of groups.

17.1% Whites, 75% Asians, 20.7% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups are members of only one task force or committee. Only whites (100%), who also constitute 89.5% of the members of 2 groups, are currently members of 4 and more of these groups. Statistically significant, this membership pattern has a chi-square representation of: $\chi^2 = 38.240$, $df = 15$, $p < 0.001$.

Wastage of human resource is further illustrated by bias in acceptance of the contributions that individuals make to meetings, males and Whites being the most favoured groups. For example, there is a significant difference between the extent to which the views of the sexes are accepted, at team meetings ($\chi^2 = 29.896$, $df=4$, $p < 0.000$), those who always had their views accepted being male (100%). More than 90% male and less than 7% female very often and 90% male and 10% female often had their views accepted.

Whites, compared with 0% of other ethnic groups, always had their views accepted at committee and task force meetings. No White ever had his or her views rejected at these meetings but 41.2% of the views of Blacks were rejected. Whites were the only ethnic group who very often had their views accepted. Over 90% respondents' views that

committee members very often accept at meetings are those of Whites (Table 7). Male is also the more represented group of respondents whose views their members always (87.5%), very often (93.3%) often (85.7%), and seldom (59.1%) accept at these meetings. Only 6.5% male, compared with 16.7 female never had their views accepted. Chi-square test indicates that there is a significant difference in the pattern of acceptance of views (Table 8).

Analysis indicates that female are three times more likely to have their views rejected at departmental meetings than their male counterparts. These differences, as Table 9 indicates, are statistically significant.

While the basis of committees constitution is wide representation and that of task force expertise (Naylor, 1999; Certo, 2000; Robbins, 2001), one pertinent question is: Why constitute the groups in the way that they are, if there is scepticism regarding the value of the contribution of particular individuals? The impression that women and minority ethnic groups cannot make effective contributions in these types of meetings is not borne out in reality at Pike International, since some of the views that are accepted at these meetings are those that were presented by members of less or least favoured group or groups. These views having been ignored on their first presentation are later accepted, after being resonated by members of a more or most favoured group. This situation is exemplified by the fact that if a member of Black or other minority ethnic group presents what is eventually lauded as the most brilliant idea, it is played down or outrightly rejected. However, when this same idea is again represented, this time by a White member, it is overwhelmingly accepted. This is a situation where the view presented the second time

round is not repackaged, often missing one or more key points from its first presentation – obviously because the resonator has little comprehension of the implicit ideas. Resonation occurs in the male vs. female scenario but is not as common as White vs. minority ethnic groups. Therefore, as evidenced by Pike International, a White male, firstly, and a White female, secondly, can be successful resonators.

White is the most favoured group at departmental meetings – with 21.4% of its members very often, and 47.1% often having their views accepted. White is the only ethnic group of which a percentage of respondents (5.7%) always had their views accepted at these meetings. 2.9% White, compared with 24.1% Black respondents never had their views accepted at departmental meetings. 97.1% of respondents who often had their views accepted at these types of meetings, were White. Chi-square test indicates that there is a significant difference between to way in which members' views were accepted at departmental meetings, based on ethnicity ($\chi^2 = 49.476$, $df = 12$, $p < 0.000$).

Comparing the qualifications and experience of workers based on sex and ethnicity, it is clear that female and minority ethnic groups have qualifications and experience that are equal, or superior, to those of their male and White counterparts. Blacks have three times as many PhDs as Whites. 82.7% of Black, compared with 61.4% White respondents hold undergraduate degrees and above – these percentages being closely related to the population. Despite the fact that the number of males with PhDs is just over 3% more than female, 73.3% female, compared with 66.7% male respondents have qualifications at degree level and

[Gender, Race and Ethnicity: Key Elements of Unexploited Workforce Diversity' - Page 83 of 108](#)

A Division of HRODC Ltd. UK Reg. No. 6088763. V.A.T. Reg. No. 8958 765 38

Prof. Dr. R.B. Crawford - Director HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

PhD (London), MEd.M. (Bath), Adv. Dip. Ed. (Bristol), PGCIS (TVU), ITC (UWI), MAAM, MAOM, LESAN, MSCOS, MISGS, Visiting Prof. P.U.P.

Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS).



UKRLP Registration No. 10019585
UKRLP Verification: <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk>
Postgraduate Full-Time and Short Courses
London, UK & International Locations

above. What logic prevails, therefore, for the fact that Blacks are three times more likely to have their views rejected at team meetings than their White counterparts, who field 100% of the members who always had their views accepted and over 90% and almost 100% of those who very often and often had their's accepted? (a significant difference at: $\chi^2 = 60.748$, $df=12$, $p < 0.000$). Women are also 1.5 times more likely to have their views rejected at these meetings as their male counterparts (represented, statistically as: $\chi^2 = 29.896$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.000$).

Table 11 further illustrates the extent of under-utilisation of Pike International's workforce. It indicates that of the 105 respondents, managers only ever consult Whites, and are three times as likely to consult male (59.1%) as female (17.9%). The bias in consultation is extended to team leaders, who often consult Whites and Blacks - 87.5% and 12.5%, respectively. They only ever consult 13% of the females (Table 12). Corporate managers do not paint a better picture, being twice more likely to consult male than female (a significant difference represented as: $\chi^2 = 16.232$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.001$ – Table 13). They consult only two ethnic groups, Whites and Blacks - 61.4% and 3.4%, respectively (Table 14). This means that they are 18 times more likely to consult Whites than Blacks and highly unlikely to consult any other ethnic group.

Despite the great extent to which they have been 'excluded' from committee and task force membership, their views have been rejected at meetings, and have been neglected in consultation, what represents a demonstration of the degree to which they are determined to make a contribution, female and minority ethnic

groups are desirous of providing advice, on an individual basis, to managers and team leaders.

While only 2% of Whites in the sample very often volunteer their views to team leaders, 29% Asians and 29.6% Blacks do so very often. 60% Whites, 50% Asians and 55.6% Blacks, and 100% Chinese and other ethnic minority groups volunteered advice to team leaders often, while 36% Whites and 11.1% Blacks seldom do. Chi-square analysis confirm that these percentages are significant at: $\chi^2 = 24.026$, $df = 9$, $p < 0.004$.

A slightly greater percentage male than female, 98.3% and 92% respectively, volunteer advice to team leaders, showing no significant difference between them ($\chi^2 = 2.691$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.442$). However, team leaders reject 60% of the views that female members offer, compared with only 28.1% of those of their male counterparts present, a significant difference at: $\chi^2 = 15.357$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.004$.

There is also a significant difference between the racial and ethnic groups whose information team leaders accept, weighing in favour of Whites, (65.35%) - the only group whose views they always accept. They seldom accept the views of 22.4% Whites, 25.9% Blacks and 50% of Chinese and other minority ethnic groups (a significant difference at: $\chi^2 = 45.233$, $df = 12$, $p < 0.000$).

92.6% Blacks, 91.5% White, 75% Asians and all Chinese and other minority ethnic groups in the sample volunteer information to their heads of department (Table 16) but they reject, a large proportion of those from minority ethnic groups - 75% Asians, almost 77% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups (Table 17). 96.4% female and 100% male volunteer information to heads of department but they accept 81% of those proposed by male, compared with only 35.7% of the female.

Workers command marketing intelligence to varying degrees, which organisations should be delighted to 'exploit'. Unfortunately, for Pike International, the groups, which claim to possess the most marketing intelligence, are the ones, which are least consulted, whose views are largely ignored and who are denied membership of committees and task forces. Although the quantitative element of the research did not explore the type of marketing intelligence that workers possess, it can be deduced from qualitative – not anecdotal – evidence that they have extensive knowledge regarding product and service development, demand, and placing. They are aware of the needs and wants of their particular group, and are, consequently, 'experts' at advising on the direction of new product development, enhancement of existing products, their placing and final delivery.

An overwhelming 80% female, compared with just under 25% male, suggest that they have a great deal of marketing intelligence. Just over 50% male and 16.7% female agreed that they possess this information, to a fair extent – a significant difference between them (Table 18). Despite this factor, senior managers consult 13.3% of the female respondents, compared with 54.1% of their male counterparts. Therefore, they have neglected to

consult almost twice as many female (86.7%) as male (45.9%). The frequency with which they consult the two groups is also different. While they very often consult 3.3% female and 1.4% male, they often consult 21.6% male and just 3.3% female. In addition, seldom consult 31.1% male and 6.7% female. Chi-square test indicates a significant difference between the extent to which corporate managers consult the sexes ($\chi^2 = 16.232$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$).

Compared with Whites, members of minority ethnic groups possess a great deal of marketing intelligence. If nothing, the very groups that are largely excluded from most of the processes should be the ones that are given maximum inclusion. Only 27.1% Whites, compared with 100% Asians, 86.2% Blacks and 100% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups, possess a great deal of marketing intelligence (significant difference, at: $\chi^2 = 36.094$, $df = 9$, $p < 0.000$), a case of managers 'barking up the wrong tree'.

Even though frustrated with their low level of inclusion, the determination of female and ethnic minorities to get fully involved in organisational process is demonstrated in the degree to which they seek promotion. 83. % of female and 89.3% male applied for promotion, even though 73.1% female, compared with 32.9% male, were unsuccessful, a difference significant at: $\chi^2 = 13.271$ · $df = 2$, $p < 0.001$. While 91.4% Whites, 75% Asians, 82.8% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups applied for promotion, no Asian or Chinese and other minority ethnic groups had ever been promoted, with less than 12% Blacks and over 70% Whites succeeding, at least once (Table 20).

Disparity with the promotion system in Pike International is just part of the bias of the reward system. Albeit intrinsic, offering commendation to workers, when they deserve it, is one way that managers can encourage workers to maintain and improve their performance. It is difficult to think, therefore, the rationale that they have for operating this system along sexist and racial lines. Only 10% Whites, compared with 50% Asians, 48.3% Blacks and 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups had never been commended. Managers, therefore, consulted 90% Whites. While they have never commended 17.3% male and 40% female, they often commend 46.7% of male but only 6.7% female.

Because they receive little encouragement from managers, workers will certainly look forward to their colleagues' feedback, which they expect to be fair. However, while the feedback to Whites is generally favourable or justifiable, those to 21.4% Whites, compared with 75% Asians and 69% Blacks are negative.

The empirical analysis has pointed to sex, race, and ethnic exclusion from the advice, support and encouragement that their colleagues and managers offer. Although this factor does not affect the extent to which they volunteer information to them, they appear to affect their perception of the work environment and their commitment to the organisation. All the above experiences will certainly lead workers to formulate an impression of their environment.

Only Whites (25.7%) and male (24%), whom the system most favours, describe the atmosphere as very friendly. However, 100% Asians 93.1% Blacks and 100% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups (Table 21) describe the system as unfriendly or intolerable. 28% male and 63.3% female suggest that their colleagues are unsupportive (Table 22). Whites are the only ethnic group (21.4%) which found their colleagues extremely supportive. 75% Asians and 79.3% Blacks view their colleagues as unsupportive, with only 18.6% Whites giving this description.

Pike International plays out the situation where those who derive most benefit from the system and are made to feel cosy and welcome, are desirous of maintaining association with the organisation. Those who benefit least, are discriminated against, are frustrated with the system, will most likely to elect to leave. As Table 24 indicates, there is a significant difference between the preferences of the racial and ethnic groups. Let us compare the percentage of respondents who would like to work elsewhere: 17.1% White; 50% Asian; 65.5% Black; 50% Chinese and other minority ethnic groups ($\chi^2 = 34.030$, $df = 15$, $p < 0.003$).

Effecting Diversity Management: Towards Coherent Policy and Strategy

The Under-utilisation Of Diverse Workforce has been established, theoretically and empirically, both as organisational failings and disregard for legislation. Often organisations, in their discriminatory practices, severely prejudice their interest. An 'inclusive policy' will dictate that diversity is mandatory for the constitution of

committees, task forces and focus groups. This ‘added value’ of diversity will transform the organisation’s products and services, increasing its market standing. When organisations support this notion, it will not need to be coerced to exercise ‘notional’ regard for workplace diversity – specifically gender, race and ethnicity. As this research has established, effective ‘exploitation’ of diversity can spare an organisation a great deal of embarrassment and even avert impending catastrophe - ensuring that workers are developed in such a way that they make a maximum impact on its survival efforts.

Several writers have offered help in managing diversity, not least of whom is Rifkin and Fulop (1997), who advocate the recognition of diversity through the more familiar and non-reflexive language through which management fads are popularised. They, nevertheless, warn that they must create a space for multiple voices to be represented – thematising, rather than minimising racial issues (Kersten, 2000, p. 246) and differences. Groschl and Doherty (1999) advocate a conceptually based diversity strategy.

According to Flood and Romm (1996, p.161) “managing the increasing diversity of models, methodologies and theories that continue to come to the fore, thus improving the increasing diversity of issues confronted” is a necessary managerial responsibility.

Emerging from the empirical study of Hemphill and Haines (cited in Phomphakdy and Kleiner, (1999, pp. 44-45), on diversity training, with 500 senior executives, directors, managers and 100 internal and external consultants and trainers, is the prescription that organisations should institute a:

- Zero tolerance policy for discrimination practices

Gender, Race and Ethnicity: Key Elements of Unexploited Workforce Diversity' - Page 90 of 108

A Division of HRODC Ltd. UK Reg. No. 6088763. V.A.T. Reg. No. 8958 765 38
Prof. Dr. R.B. Crawford - Director HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute
PhD (London), MEd.M. (Bath), Adv. Dip. Ed. (Bristol), PGCIS (TVU), ITC (UWI), MAAM, MAOM, LESAN, MSCOS, MISGS, Visiting Prof. P.U.P.

Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS).



UKRLP Registration No. 10019585
UKRLP Verification: <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk>
Postgraduate Full-Time and Short Courses
London, UK & International Locations

- Baseline workplace behaviour standards expected of all employees
- Supportive workplace relationship skills programme.

D’Netto and Sohal (1999), in reference to Jackson et al (1995) suggest the need for managers to understand that a diverse workforce, in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, age, national origin and other personal characteristics, means that members exhibit different attitudes, needs, desires, values and work behaviours.

However, Gill (1996) asserts that adopting a strategy of managing diversity means actively considering employees as heterogeneous, rather than the traditional methods based around homogeneity. Even though the author warns that it is labour intensive, the resultant increased morale and motivation will boost retention rates – a contribution to direct and indirect costs, enhancing organisational effectiveness. As Perks and Sanderson (2000) discovered, in reference to the JVC Start-up Project in Indonesia, cultural diversity has synergistic value.

Egge (1999, p.25) observes that diversity policy and procedure statements “will not prevent discrimination and harassment from occurring but will state the employer’s stance on such issues that hopefully will encourage employees to conduct themselves accordingly”.

The researcher joins Horwitz, Boemaker-Falconer and Searll (1996, pp.134-35) in advocating a combination of soft and hard approaches to ensure an effective diversity management but that we move in swift succession from the former to the latter. The soft

[Gender, Race and Ethnicity: Key Elements of Unexploited Workforce Diversity' - Page 91 of 108](#)

A Division of HRODC Ltd. UK Reg. No. 6088763. V.A.T. Reg. No. 8958 765 38

Prof. Dr. R.B. Crawford - Director HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

PhD (London), MEd.M. (Bath), Adv. Dip. Ed. (Bristol), PGCIS (TVU), ITC (UWI), MAAM, MAOM, LESAN, MSCOS, MISGS, Visiting Prof. P.U.P.

Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS).



UKRLP Registration No. 10019585
UKRLP Verification: <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk>
Postgraduate Full-Time and Short Courses
London, UK & International Locations

approach will focus on consciousness or awareness raising, in an effort to generate a better understanding, by attempting to change individuals' attitudes and values – without expecting any lasting change.

The hard approach will assume that meaningful change occurs through challenging organisational or institutional policies – advocating “the implementation of more appropriate recruitment and selective training and development, promotion rewards and performance management systems, which reinforce desired behaviours”. This approach requires that diversity is an inherent aspect of policy and strategy. It suggests that there are monitoring and control systems that surpass the idea of equal opportunities. These will ensure that workers are given clear directives to avert any claim of ignorance. They will incorporate a mechanism for the elicitation and dissemination of information crucial to the continuance and enhancement of the process. Organisational design and redesign effort will take account of the ‘structure-culture symbiosis’ and its effect on race and gender issues. As is the practice in Levi Strauss, internalisation of diversity issues must be a prerequisite for any reward – incremental or large-scale. People should not be allowed to remain in, or appointed to, positions crucial to effective diversity management, where they are a snob to the process.

While we make progress towards the management of diversity, the first thought is usually about training – which might resolve only some problems, if any. As a word of caution, it can damage relations - generating animosity among workers – if the content, activities and objectives are not systematically addressed. As Phomphakdy and Kleiner (1999) discovered, from their empirical research, the quality of training and trainers are often

very poor, generating real post-delivery problems. In particular, we must be wary of sensitivity training, which several consultants have attempted with devastating consequences. Where this approach is used, expert attention is desirable. Gomez-Mejia, Balkin and Cardy (2001) warn of the over-dramatisation of diversity in some diversity training activities - representing an issue that Njeri highlighted as early as 1989 - that risks the creation of inaccurate assumptions, which can be offensive when they are applied to specific employees.

Although presented seven years ago, the following excerpts should seek as a lasting reminder of the nature of diversity training in an effort to reclaim our position in a world, where workforce diversity is a legal obligation, a moral obligation and a survival imperative:

“Diversity training requires people to talk about ... previously hidden topics. This inevitably brings up “unspeakable” fears of being racist, sexist or offensive. the very tensions that some participants and organisations feel are uncomfortable are the very ones that must be addressed in order for organisational change to occur.

“Diversity training ideally provides a voice for the undiscussable. Without this voice, the discourse of the organisation remains mired in unexamined assumptions and acts in ways that ignore or exacerbate the hidden tensions of race, gender and other differences” (Lindsay, 1994, pp. 20-21). It must be driven by the needs of individuals – not individually tailored (see e.g. Allen, 1994).

With specific reference to the empirical research, might the respondents' differing interpretation be a result of their cultural dissimilarity and expectation of reality? Or, by what standard should reality be adjudged? While there are pertinent and intervening questions – ones that subsequent research might address – Pike International has an inherent cultural problem, manifesting in gender and racial biases, which it urgently needs to address if it is to continue to represent a hallmark of a traditional 'British Institution'.

Pike International is similar, in several respects, to many 'reputable' British organisations. If their practices and preferences are also similar, then not only do they represent an infringement of United Kingdom's attempt to create a free and fair society, in which people are treated with respect, but by operating at reduced efficiency, through the creation of 'wastage' – evidenced by the under-utilisation of their diverse workforce – they cannot count themselves among the effective contributors to a striving economy.

REFERENCES

- Allen, R. (1994). 'The need for diversity in corporate training'. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 26(10): 15-17.
- Ashenden, D., Milligan, S. and Quinn R. (1995), 'Objective profiles of business schools' in Ashenden, D., Milligan, S. and Quinn R., *Industry Taskforce on Leadership and Management Skills Enterprising Nation: Research Report*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra. 1:393-468.
- Atkinson, J. (Aug. 1984). 'Manpower strategies for flexible organisations'. *Personnel Management*, 28 - 31
- Bean, L. (March 10, 2001), *Mercedes Grabs Black Starmark Buyer With Timeless Icons Ella, Duke*, Diversity Inc.
- Bean, L., (April 17, 2001) Case Study: Wal-Mart Makes Diversity a Retailing Philosophy. DiversityInc.com
- Boddy, D., and Parton, R. (1998) *Management: an Introduction*. Prentice Hall.
- Brace, N., Kemp, R., and Senelgar, R. (2000) *SPSS For Psychologists*. Pelgrave.
- Brassington, F., and Pettit, S. (2000) *Principles of Marketing*. Prentice Hall.
- Buchanan, D. & McCalman, J. 1993. Digital Equipment, Scotland: 'The VLS story'. In D. Gower, K Legge and C. Clegg. *Case Studies In Organisational Behaviour and Human Resource Management*: 21-29. London: PCP.
- Certo, S. (2000). *Modern Management*. Prentice Hall: London.
- Choi, C. (June, 2001), *Diversity On Corporate Agendas, In HR and Marketing Survey Shows*, New York, Diversity Incorporated.

- Church, A. H. (1995). 'Diversity in workgroup settings: A case study'. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 16(6): 3-9.
- Clark-Carter, D. (1999) *Doing Quantitative Psychological Research: From Design To Report*. London, Psychological Press Ltd.
- Commission For Racial Equality (2001), *Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000*, London
- Crawford (1994) *Matrix and Hierarchical Structures: A Comparative Analysis...*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University Of London, London
- Crawford (1998) *Fundamentals of Organisational Analysis*, Wolf Network, University of Wolverhampton.
- D'Netto, B., and Sohal, A. S. (1999). 'Human resource practices and workforce diversity: an empirical assessment'. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(8): 530-547.
- Dessler, G. (2001) *Leading People and Organisation In The 21st Century*. London, Prentice Hall.
- Dessler, G. (2001). *Management Leading People And Organisations In The 21st Century*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Diversity Incorporated (2001 a), *Earnest and Young, Wall Street, Kmart & More Are Promoting Diversity*, New York, Diversity Incorporated.
- Dix, C. (1999), *A Chance To The Top: The Lives of Women Business Graduates*, London, Bantam Press.
- Dyer, S. (1998). 'Flexibility Models: A critical analysis', *International Journal Of Manpower*, 19 (4): 223-233.

- Egge, S. A. M. (1999). ‘Creating an environment of mutual respect within the multicultural workplace both at home and globally’. *Management Decision*, 37(1): 24-28.
- Ely, R. J. and Meyerson, D. E. (2000) ‘Advancing gender equity in organisations: The challenge and importance of maintaining a gender narrative’, *Organization*. 7 (4): 589-608.
- Employment Tribunal Services (2000), *Annual Reports and Accounts*, London, The stationary Offices Limited
- Equal Opportunities Commission (1999), *The Labour Market*, EOC, Manchester
- Equal Opportunities Commission (2000) *Good Practice Guides Genuine Occupational Qualifications*, London
- Equal Opportunities Commission (2000a), *Sex Discrimination and Equal Pay Acts*, EOC, Manchester
- Equal Opportunities Commission (2001), *Sex Discrimination Act (SDA) 1975; 1986*, London
- Fleury, M. T. L. (1999). ‘The management of culture diversity: lessons from Brazilian companies’. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 99(3): 109-114.
- Flood, R. L. and Romm, R. A. (1996) ‘Contours of diversity management and triple loop learning’. *Kybernetes* 25 (7/8): 154-163)
- Frankel, B., (2000). *Domestic Partner Benefit Multiplying*, New York, DiversityInc.
- Fullerton H.N. (1989). *New Labour Force projections, spanning 1988 to 2000*.
- Fullerton, H.N. (1989). “*New Labour Force projections, spanning 1988 to 2000*”.

- Gallese, L.R, (April 1991). *Why Women Aren't Making It To The Top*. The Conference Board, New York.
- Gallos, J. V. (1995), 'When authority = she: A male student meets a female instructor', *Journal of Management Development*. 14 (2): 65-76
- Gee, M. V., and Norton, S. M. (1999). 'The confluence of gender and culture: sexual harassment in the international arena'. *Management Decision*, 37(5): 417-423.
- Gill, P. (1996). 'Managing workforce diversity- a response to skill shortages'. *Health Manpower Management*, 22(6): 34-37.
- Gómez-Mejía, L. R., Balkin, D. B., and Cardy, R. L. (2001). *Managing Human Resources*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Goodenham, P. N. and Nordhaug, O. 1997. 'Flexibility in Norwegian and UK firms: Competitive pressure and institutional embeddedness'. *Employee Relations*, 19 (6): 568-580
- Griffin, M., (2001) *Organizational Behavior: Managing People And Organizations*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Gröschl, S., and Doherty, L. (1999). 'Diversity management in practice'. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(6): 262-268.
- Harung, H., Harung, L. M. (1995). 'Enhancing organizational performance by strengthening diversity and unity'. *The Learning Organization*, 2(3): 9-21.
- Harvey, C. et al. (1995). *Understanding Diversity*. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Hicks-Clarke, D., and Iles, P. (2000). 'Climate for diversity and its effects on career and organisational attitudes and perceptions'. *Personnel Review*, 29(3): 324-345.

- Hiller, F. S., Hiller, M. S., and Lieberman, G.J. (2000) *Introduction to Management Science: A modelling case studies approach with spreadsheets*. London, McGraw-Hill International Editions.
- Home Office (2000), *Race Relations Act 1976*, London
- Horwitz, F. M., Boemaker-Falconer, A., and Searll, P. (1996). 'Human resource development and managing diversity in South Africa'. *International Journal of Manpower*, 17(4/5): 134-151.
- Human, L. (1996). 'Managing workforce diversity: a critique and example from South Africa'. *International Journal of Manpower*, 17(4/5): 46-64.
- Husain, A. (Sept. 19, 2000), *Olympic Nike Ad Pulled For Depicting Violence Against Women*, New York, Diversity Incorporated
- Jain, H. C., and Verma, A. (1996). 'Managing workforce diversity for competitiveness the Canadian experience'. *International Journal of Manpower*, 17(4): 14-29.
- Jones, D., Pringle, J., and Shepherd, D. (2000). 'Managing diversity meets Aotearoa/new Zealand'. *Personnel Review*, 29(3): 364-380.
- Kandola, R. and Fullerton, J. (1994), "*Managing the Mosaic*". IPD House, London.
- Kandola, R. and Fullerton, J. (1994), "*Managing the Mosaic*". IPD House, London.
- Kanji G. K. (1994), *100 Statistical Tests*, London, Sage Publications
- Kathuria, R. 1998. 'Managing for flexibility: A manufacturing perspective', *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 98 (6): 246-252.
- Kersten, A. (2000). 'Diversity management dialogue, dialectics and diversion'. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13(3): 235-248.

- Kim, J., and Mitchell, P. (1999). 'Relationship marketing in Japan: the buyer-supplier relationships of four automakers'. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 14(2): 118-129.
- Korac-Kakabadse, N., and Kouzmin, A. (1999). 'Designing for cultural diversity in an IT and globalizing milieu: Some real leadership dilemmas for the new millennium'. *The Journal of Management*, 18(3): 291-319.
- Kotler, P. and Armstrong, G. (2001), *Principles Of Marketing*. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall
- Kramar, R. (1998). 'Managing diversity: beyond affirmative action in Australia'. *Women in Management Review*, 13(4): 133-142.
- Lapin L.L. (1990), *Statistics For Modern Business Decisions*, London, Academic Press.
- Lee, C., and Chon, K. (2000). 'An investigation of multicultural training practices in the restaurant industry: The training cycle approach'. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(2): 126-134.
- Lesser, R. (1998), *Management Development Through Cultural Diversity*, London, Prentice- Hall
- Liff, S. (1996), 'Two routes to managing diversity: individual differences or social group characteristics'. *Employee Relations* 19 (1): 11-26
- Lindsay, C. (1994), 'Things that go wrong in diversity training: Conceptualisation and change with ethnic identity models'. *Journal of Organisational Change Management* 7 (60): 18-33.

- Londen, M. and Rosener, J, (1991). *Workforce America: Managing Employee Diversity as a vital resource*, Homewood, Business One Irwin,
- Loo, R. (1999). 'A structured exercise for stimulating cross-cultural sensitivity'. *Career Development International*, 4(6): 321-324.
- Mabey, C et al (1998), *Strategic Human Resources*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Mabey, C. et al. al (1998). *Strategic Human Resources*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Mavin, S., and Bryans. (1999). 'Gender on the agenda in management education?' *Women in Management Review*, 14(3): 99-104.
- Maxwell, G., McDougall, M., and Blair, S. (2000). 'Managing diversity in the hotel sector: the emergence of a service quality opportunity'. *Managing Service Quality*, 10(6): 367-373.
- McDougall, M. (1996). 'Equal opportunities versus managing diversity: another challenge for public sector management?' *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9(5): 62-72.
- Miller, G. E., and Rowney, J. I. A. (1999). 'Workplace Diversity Management In A Multicultural Society'. *Women in Management Review*, 14(8): 307-315.
- Monthly Labour Review, November 3-11.
- Moore, S. (1999). 'Understanding and managing diversity among groups at work: key issues for organisational training and development'. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 23(4/5): 208-217.
- Naylor, J. (1999). *Management*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Njeri, I. (April 2, 1989), 'When different groups convene, the ignorant and the curious can be unexpectedly rude', *Times* 6:1, Los Angeles.

- Parker, S. K. and Jackson, P. R. 1993. The implementation of high performance work teams. In D. Gowler, K. Legge. and C. Clegg. *Case Studies In Organisational Behaviour and Human Resource Management*: 42-55. London: P. C. P.
- Perks, H., and Sanderson, M. (2000). 'An international case study of cultural diversity and the role of stakeholders in the establishment of a European/Indonesian joint venture in the aerospace industry'. *The Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 15(4): 275-290.
- Pettinger, R. 1988. *The Flexible Workforce*. London: Cassell
- Phomphakdy, R., and Kleiner, B. H. (1999). 'How to eliminate discrimination in the workplace'. *Equal Opportunities International*, 18(2): 43-36.
- Pine, J. I. (May, 2001), *Coca-Cola Agreement OK'd by Judge, Largest Race Discrimination Settlement*, New York, Diversity Incorporated
- Rifkin, W., and Fulop, L. (1997). 'A review and case study on learning organizations'. *The Learning Organization*, 4(4): 135-148.
- Robbins, S. (2001) *Organizational Behaviour*. Prentice Hall International Inc.
- Robbins, S. P. (2000). *Management Today*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S.P et al. (2000), *Management*, London, Prentice- Hall
- Salmon, J. 1996. 'Bargained flexibilisation: The dynamics of change towards new work organisation'. In A. McGoldrick (ed.). *Cases In Human Resource Management*. London: Pitman:
- Saundry, R. 1998. The limits of flexibility: the case of UK television. *British Journal of Management*, 9: 151-62.

- Scenholtz, D., (Aug. 16, 2000) *What Do College Students Want? Ernst & Young Reveals Priorities*, Diversity Inc.
- Scharff, D, P and Kreuter, M. W., ‘Training and workforce diversity as keys to eliminating health disparities,’ *Health Promotion Practice*, July 2000 Vol. 1, No 3, 288-291.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., and Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Organisational Behaviour*, New York: Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Shapiro, G. (2000). ‘Employee involvement: Opening the diversity Pandora’s box?’ *Personnel Review*, 29(3): 304-323.
- Sinclair, A. (1995), ‘Sex and the MBA’, *Organization*. 2 (2): 295-317
- Smith, C. R. (1998). ‘Best practice in management education: capitalising on gender diversity awareness’, *Journal of Management*, 17(1): 6-16.
- Smith, D. A. (1999), *Leading Diversity: Benchmarking Successful Practices For The Global Marketplace*, Linkage Research Group/J. Howard Associates
- Smith, W. J., Harrington, K. V., and Neck, C. P. (2000). ‘Resolving conflict with humour in diversity context’. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(6): 606-625.
- Stavrika, C (Aug. 16, 2000), *Muslim Customers Offended By Jeans: Liz Claiborne Faces Nationwide Recall*, New York, Diversity Incorporated
- Stavrika, C (March 16, 2000) *Burger King Pulls Offensive Ad*, Hemisphere Inc.
- Stavrika, C., (April, 200) *Retaining Diverse Talent In The Information Age*. Hemisphere Inc.

- Stephenson, K., and Lewin, D. (1996). 'Managing workforce diversity: macro and micro level hr implications of network analysis'. *International Journal of Manpower*, 17(4): 168-196.
- Stoner, J. A. F., Freeman, R. E. and Gilbert, D. R. (jr) (1995), *Management*. Prentice-Hall, London
- Teicher, J., and Spearitt, K. (1996). 'From equal employment opportunity to diversity management: The Australian experience', *International Journal of Manpower*, 17(4/5): 109-133.
- Torrington, D., Hall, L., and (1998), *Human Resource Management*, Prentice-Hall, London.
- Tregaskis, O. 1997. 'The "non-permanent" reality'. *Employee Relations*, 19 (6): 535 –554)
- Wallace, L., (March 9, 2001) *Viewing Beauty Through A New Lens: Clairol's Bold Multiethnic Ad Campaign*, New York, Diversity Incorporated
- Watson, T. J. (1995) *Sociology Work and Industry*. London, Routledge.
- Wicks, D., and Bradshaw, P. (1999). 'Gendered organizational cultures in Canadian work organizations: Implications for creating an equitable workplace'. *Management Decision*, 37(4): 372-380.
- Wilson, E. (2000). 'Inclusion, exclusion and ambiguity: The role of organisational culture', *Personnel Review*, 29(3): 274-303.
- Wisniewski, M., and Stead R. (1996). *Quantitative Methods for Business*, Pitman Publishing: London.

- Wong, D. 1993. 'The permanent search for temporary staff'. In D. Gowler, K Legge and C. Clegg. *Case Studies In Organisational Behaviour and Human Resource Management*:_75-81. London: P. C. P.

HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

A Postgraduate Training Institute, based in United Kingdom, with International Operation, **HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute** is registered with the **UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP)**, of the **Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS)**, formerly **Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS)**. Its **Registration Number is: 10019585** and can it be **Verified** at: <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk/>.

It has been engaged in Postgraduate Training and Consultancy since 1996. Our Institute offers over 800 Diploma – Postgraduate – Short Courses, and 57 Postgraduate Diploma Programmes.

1. Our websites are:
 - a. www.hrodc.com
 - b. www.hrodc-mobile.com
 - c. <http://www.hrodc-business-products-and-services.com/index.html>
2. We admit full-time students and delegates (short course participants) with academic qualifications ranging from Undergraduate Degrees to PhDs;
3. Classroom-based Diploma – Postgraduate Short Courses are of a minimum of 5 days (30 Credit-Hours);
4. The equivalent Video-Enhanced On-Line (Video-Enabled Face-to-Face) delivery for a 5-day course is 10 days, based on 3 hours per day;
5. Intensive Full-Time {5 days (30 hours) per week direct lecturer-contact} Postgraduate Diploma Programmes last 3 months (360 Credit-Hours);
6. Full-Time (15 hours direct lecturer-contact) Postgraduate Diploma Programmes are of 6 months' duration (360 Credit-Hours);
7. Video-Enhanced On-Line Postgraduate Diploma Programmes (360 Credit-Hours) last 20 weeks. This delivery is based on direct lecturer contact for 3 hours per day, 6 days per week (<http://www.hrodc-business-products-and-services.com/>);

Gender, Race and Ethnicity: Key Elements of Unexploited Workforce Diversity' - Page 105 of 108

A Division of HRODC Ltd. UK Reg. No. 6088763. V.A.T. Reg. No. 8958 765 38

Prof. Dr. R.B. Crawford - Director HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

PhD (London), MEd.M. (Bath), Adv. Dip. Ed. (Bristol), PGCIS (TVU), ITC (UWI), MAAM, MAOM, LESAN, MSCOS, MISGS, Visiting Prof. P.U.P.

Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS).



UKRLP Registration No. 10019585
UKRLP Verification: <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk>
Postgraduate Full-Time and Short Courses
London, UK & International Locations

8. Students who successfully complete the Postgraduate Diploma will progress to a Postgraduate Degree – MA, MBA, MSc - by a 15,000 to 20,000 words supervised dissertation, the prerequisite for which is course #7 (Research Methodology);
9. Courses are delivered in over 30 Cities including Dubai, Kuala Lumpur, Paris, Milan, Caracas, Manila, Manama, Istanbul, Jakarta;
10. The UK Deliveries are usually in Central London and occasionally in Manchester, Birmingham and Wolverhampton;
11. Hotel ‘Academies’, Conference and Meeting Rooms are utilised for course delivery purpose.

The Programme and Course cost does not include living accommodation. However, delegates are treated with the following:

- Free Continuous snacks throughout the Event Days;
- Free Hot Lunch on Event Days;
- Free City Tour;
- Free Stationery;
- Free On-site Internet Access;
- HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s **Postgraduate Diploma**; or
- Certificate of Attendance and Participation – if unsuccessful on resit.

HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s Complimentary Products include:

1. HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s **Leather Conference Folder**;
2. HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s **Leather Conference Ring Binder/ Writing Pad**;
3. HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s **Key Ring/ Chain**;
4. HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s **Leather Conference (Computer – Phone) Bag** – Black or Brown;
5. HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s **8GB USB Flash Memory Drive**, with Course/ Programme Material;
6. HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s **Metal Pen**;
7. HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute’s **Polo Shirt**.

Prof. Crawford’s Qualifications and Affiliations

Gender, Race and Ethnicity: Key Elements of Unexploited Workforce Diversity' - Page 106 of 108

A Division of HRODC Ltd. UK Reg. No. 6088763. V.A.T. Reg. No. 8958 765 38

Prof. Dr. R.B. Crawford - Director HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

PhD (London), MEd.M. (Bath), Adv. Dip. Ed. (Bristol), PGCIS (TVU), ITC (UWI), MAAM, MAOM, LESAN, MSCOS, MISGS, Visiting Prof. P.U.P.

Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS).



UKRLP Registration No. 10019585
UKRLP Verification: <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk>
Postgraduate Full-Time and Short Courses
London, UK & International Locations

Professor Dr. Crawford is a Director of HRODC Ltd. and Director of HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute.

He is a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), from University of London; holding:

- MEd. Management from University of Bath;
- Advanced Diploma in Science Teacher Education from University of Bristol; with a
- Diploma in Doctoral Research Supervision, from University of Wolverhampton;
- Postgraduate Diploma in Information Systems from Thames Valley University; and
- Initial Teaching Certificate.

He is a:

- Fellow of the Institute of Management Specialists;
- Human Resources Specialist, of the Institute of Management Specialists;
- Member of Academy of Management (MAoM), within the following Management Disciplines:
 - ◆ Human Resources;
 - ◆ Organization and Management Theory;
 - ◆ Organization Development and Change;
 - ◆ Research Methods;
 - ◆ Conflict Management;
 - ◆ Organizational Behavior;
 - ◆ Management Consulting;
 - ◆ Gender & Diversity in Organizations; and
 - ◆ Critical Management Studies.
- Member of the Asian Academy of Management (MAAM);
- Member of the International Society of Gesture Studies (MISGS);
- Member of the Standing Council for Organisational Symbolism (MSCOS);
- Life Member of Malaysian Institute of Human Resource Management (LMIHRM);
- Member of ResearchGate Community;
- Member of Convocation University of London;
- Professor HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute.

Gender, Race and Ethnicity: Key Elements of Unexploited Workforce Diversity' - Page 107 of 108

A Division of HRODC Ltd. UK Reg. No. 6088763. V.A.T. Reg. No. 8958 765 38
Prof. Dr. R.B. Crawford - Director HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute
PhD (London), MEd.M. (Bath), Adv. Dip. Ed. (Bristol), PGCIS (TVU), ITC (UWI), MAAM, MAOM, LESAN, MSCOS, MISGS, Visiting Prof. P.U.P.

Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS).



UKRLP Registration No. 10019585
UKRLP Verification: <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk>
Postgraduate Full-Time and Short Courses
London, UK & International Locations


HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute's Global Telephone Numbers

+44 7736147507 +442081332760 +44 1902569133 +44 1902 763607
 +44 2071935906 +442071932721 +60 173755824 +63 9399287113

Our Website Communication and Social Media Links! Please Click as is Desires

 Live Chat ● We are Online.	 Live Chat ● We are Online.	 Live Chat ● We are Online.
		
 Our Mission	 Free! Research Papers - Articles << Click to Download >>	 HRODC Mobile Site www.hrodc-mobile.com
 Delegate Comments	 Director's Profile	 Institute's Profile
 facebook	 Linked in	 facebook
 You Tube	 twitter	 Study Tours << Click to Inquire >>
	 Course Application Form << Download HERE >>	


Our Website Communication and Social Media Links! Please Click as it Desires



HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute
Registered with the UK Register of Learning Providers (UKRLP), of the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), formerly Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS). Its Registration No. is 10019585 and can be verified at <http://www.ukrlp.co.uk/>

OFFERS:

- ✓ Over **800** Diploma - Postgraduate - Short Courses
- ✓ More than **50** Postgraduate Diploma Programmes
- ✓ Postgraduate Degree - MSc, MA, MBA, & Executive MBA
- ✓ **20-Week Video-Enhanced On-Line Postgraduate Diploma Programmes**

website: www.hrodc.com / Telephone: +441902763607  **Inquire NOW!**

With Kindest Regards,



Prof. Dr. Ronald B. Crawford
Director
HRODC Postgraduate Training Institute

