This study shows that race/ethnicity significantly explained differences in attitudes toward human resource policies fostering diversity held by faculty at a large public university in the midwestern United States. Overall, whites' attitudes were less positive regarding diversity programs and other human resource policies relevant to women and minorities than Black's, Hispanic's, and Asian's attitudes were. We also found that individual race and ethnicity significantly explained differences in attitudes toward diversity programs to a greater extent than the demography of the organizational work unit.

The Effects of Race and Ethnicity on Perceptions of Human Resource Policies and Climate Regarding Diversity

ELLEN ERNST KOSSEK
SUSAN C. ZONIA
Michigan State University

E mployers today have shifted efforts from tacit compliance with affirmative action programs to actively promoting new organizational cultures that are supportive of heterogeneity. Responding to projections that most of the new entrants to the labor force during the current decade will be female, minority, or immigrant (Johnson and Packer), organizations have implemented human resource policies that are designed to hire, promote, and retain women and individuals of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds. In this article, *managing diversity* and *multiculturalism* refer to employer attempts to create work environments that foster integration of women and minorities.[1]

Because employer actions to foster multicultural environments are voluntary initiatives, the perceptions of organizational members toward issues of diversity are critical to successful implementation. Although many theoretical articles and case studies on employer policies to manage diversity have been published, only a handful of empirical studies have been done, including our recent work. This

319

study was designed to address that gap by exploring racial/ethnic differences between blacks, Asians, Hispanics, and whites in reactions to employer efforts to foster a multicultural work force. Its purpose was to examine how racial/ethnic membership explained variation in attitudes and beliefs about an organization's diversity climate. We also explore the relationship between individual demographics and organizational demography in shaping these attitudes and beliefs.

ASSUMPTIONS OF VALUING-DIVERSITY EFFORTS

Historically, a primary assumption of human resource management practice and research in the United States is that merit and qualifications should be the predominant criteria used in selection, promotion, and reward allocation decision making (Arvey, Bhagat, and Salas). As a result, human resource (HR) systems have "implicitly homogenized the work force resulting in the artificially 'equal treatment' of all" (Schneider and Rentsch 192). These merit-based models helped to preserve racial and sexual injustice in society. Consequently, during the 1960s and 1970s, the government initiated Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and affirmative action (AA) programs that required organizations to scrutinize their HR practices to ensure fairness in procedures and outcomes. As organizations begrudgingly complied with these laws, opposition to affirmative action developed. Some employers viewed AA programs as unnecessary, wasting resources, and compromising performance standards (Loden and Rosener).

Crosby and Clayton observe that whites and people of color have expressed at least some discomfort with affirmative action. Some people view affirmative action as being unfair by resulting in reverse discrimination through the hiring of a member of a protected class with qualifications that are lower than those of a white male candidate (Nacoste). Others object to the fact that affirmative action necessitates that race and gender be taken into account in HR decisions. Some people believe that the accentuation of these categories helps reinforce prejudiced individuals' negative expectancies, particularly if a woman or minority does not perform perfectly (Crosby and Clayton).

Given this background, there are several assumptions of valuing-diversity efforts that are important for understanding how whites, especially white men, may respond to these programs. First, diversity programs can conceptually be linked to AA efforts. Although there are differences between AA and diversity endeavors (a key one being

whether the program is initiated by choice or coercion), clearly, valuing-diversity initiatives built on the foundation of AA efforts to hire and promote individuals who differ from white men. Valuing diversity is not a repudiation of past efforts to foster assimilation but rather involves moving one step beyond affirmative action (Thomas). Diversity programs seek to alter the way that HR systems affect diverse individuals by instilling desired behaviors in a relatively homogeneous, largely Anglo-American male work force. Consequently, current HR systems are viewed as lacking flexibility and having disparate effects on members of racial/ethnic and gender groups who have been traditionally excluded from desirable positions in firms. Like affirmative action, implementing programs to enhance multiculturalism results in changing the status quo, which has historically been more favorable to Anglo males.

Over the short run, if organizations are changed to be more receptive to standards and behaviors embraced by minority cultures, some whites, especially white men, may believe that their firms will become less receptive to their own dominant culture. Similar to AA programs, opposition may be based on the belief that diversity programs have the potential to result in reverse discrimination and the categorization of people based on race, gender, and ethnicity. Diversity programs' focus on racial, ethnic, and gender differences may trouble whites who espouse beliefs in the fairness of "a color-blind and gender-blind world" (Crosby and Clayton 62).

A second characteristic of diversity programs is that they can broaden and/or change the basic historical assumptions of HR models developed in the United States that theoretically emphasize the merit of qualifications to perform the job in question in administration. Creating multicultural cultures involves recruiting and selecting people who not only have the best skills to perform a particular job but who also appreciate individual differences, value diversity, are open to new values and attitudes, and are able to tolerate ambiguity (Schneider and Rentsch). Whites, particularly white men, may hold more negative attitudes toward valuing-diversity efforts because these efforts may adversely affect members who have resistance or are unable to change to embrace multiculturalism. Or whites may believe that it is wrong to have their Anglo-based models of managing changed to multicultural standards.

A third aspect of valuing-diversity efforts that has ramifications for divergence in racial/ethnic reaction to them is that the programs are grounded in values based on the collectivist tradition (Hofstede).

Collectivism-individualism is a feature of national culture that refers to the relation of an individual to the collectivity of society (Hofstede). Members of collective traditions tend to be more likely than individualists to place importance on the needs and goals of a group, exhibit greater cooperation with others, and emphasize social norms and duties (Triandis). The value-in-diversity hypothesis assumes that changing organizations to be more multicultural will result in a win-win phenomenon for organizations (Cox and Blake). Diversity programs implicitly ask members to be open to other cultures and to allow opportunities for diverse individuals for the collective good.

Research has shown that members of diverse ethnic/racial groups tend to differ in their attitudes, values, and norms based on differing cultural backgrounds. Although little research has examined how these differences are reflected in reactions to human resource policies, a recent lab study found that ethnic members from collective cultures, specifically Asians, blacks, and Hispanics, tended to exhibit more cooperative behavior in the well-known prisoner's dilemma task than Anglo-Americans whose traditions generally stress individualism (Cox, Lobel, and McLeod). These findings were in line with previous cross-cultural studies that have found that Anglos tend to be individualists (Hofstede), whereas blacks, Hispanics, and Asians in the United States tend to be collectivists (Triandis, McCusker, and Hui).

In sum, because of the greater tendency to hold values favoring individualism in the white, or Anglo, culture; the fact that Anglos may be disadvantaged in the process of organizational change to greater openness to multiculturalism; and because of possible association with the negative baggage of affirmative action programs, we believe that whites, especially white men, will hold more negative attitudes toward diversity policies than other racial/ethnic groups. Our first hypothesis is that racial membership will significantly explain differences in attitudes toward diversity. Compared with Asians, Hispanics, and blacks, whites will hold less-positive attitudes regarding employer efforts to promote diversity, have a lower regard for the qualifications of diverse individuals, believe that sufficient effort has been made to recruit diverse individuals, and feel that the current level of resource allocation to diverse individuals is fair.

Influence of Organizational Unit Demography

We also thought that attitudes regarding diversity might be influenced by an individual's gender and hierarchical level, and the de-

mography of their work unit. In general, employees who are women and lower level tend to be more favorable to diversity efforts than those who are men or senior level (Kossek and Zonia). Also, the demographic composition of an employee's work unit has key ramifications on perceptions of diversity (Kossek and Zonia). It influences the amount of direct contact that occurs both between and within gender and racial groups. It also affects members' interpretations of the extent to which the organization is actively pursuing its espoused mission of enhancing diversity.

Research on organizational demography has found that similar contexts help foster similarity in attitudes (Pfeffer). Early research by Homans found a positive relationship between frequency of interpersonal interaction with an individual and liking that individual. Building on Homans's work, Blau's research on groups predicted a positive relationship between increased heterogeneity of society and increased contact between diverse groups.[2] Kanter's discussion of tokenism holds that the numerical representation of diverse individuals in organizations influences climate and how members of these groups are viewed. Recently, Ely found that the greater the proportion of women represented in middle and upper levels of organizations, the more positive the relations between all women, regardless of level.

Using this research as a guide, we propose that there is a relationship between organizational unit demography and perceptions of diversity. It is predicted that the greater the gender heterogeneity (i.e., the greater the ratio of women to men) and the greater the racial heterogeneity (i.e., the greater the ratio of minorities to whites), the more favorable the diversity climate. Our assumption is that in work environments where women and minorities are well represented, a greater appreciation of the value of having diverse individuals will exist, both abstractly and in regard to specific co-workers. Hence, our second main hypothesis: The greater the racial and gender heterogeneity in a work unit, the more favorable the attitudes toward diversity policies regardless of race/ethnicity, gender, or level.

METHOD

The sample is drawn from the faculty at a large public midwestern university. The central administration had been engaged for some time in trying to increase the recruitment and retention of women and

minorities among the faculty and to promote a climate that was favorable to diversity. Toward this end, a survey was developed to respond to the following issues: (a) What is the current organizational climate regarding diversity and pluralism? and (b) How successful has the administration been in fostering a climate that places a high value on diversity?

The survey was mailed to a full census of all faculty women and minorities, who were represented in comparatively small numbers in the organization. Given the larger number of white men, a random sample from this group was drawn. A total of 1,529 individuals received the survey. From this, 775 questionnaires were returned. The response rate was 51% for whites and 47% for people of color.

After the survey was administered, exploratory factor analysis with oblique rotations was conducted on the data. The identified factors accounted for 68% of the variance and had eigenvalues between 1.5 and 5.9. Table 1 shows standard deviations, means, correlations, and reliabilities for the seven new scales developed for this study.

Value efforts to promote diversity was measured by six items (alpha = .92) that asked respondents their perceptions of the extent to which institutional excellence was related to the recruitment and retention of faculty who are female, minority, or disabled, and also of the importance of gender and racial diversity to promoting increased cooperation and understanding. Attitudes toward qualifications of people of color was measured by two items (alpha = .77) regarding the research productivity and scholarly qualifications of minority compared with white faculty. Attitudes toward women's qualifications was measured by two items (alpha = .71) regarding the research productivity and scholarly qualifications of female compared with male faculty. Equality of department resource allocation to people of color was measured by three items (alpha = .73) regarding the equality of having graduate assistants, release time from teaching, and receiving salary increases above the average merit rate for people of color compared with whites. Equality of department resource allocation to women was measured by three items (alpha = .76) regarding the equality of having graduate assistants, release time from teaching, and receiving above-average salary increases for women compared with men. Reluctance to recruit people of color was measured by two items (alpha = .67) regarding perceptions of the effort their unit had made to identify and recruit minority candidates. Reluctance to recruit women was measured by two items (alpha = .77) regarding the effort their unit had made to identify and recruit women candidates.

TABLE 1
Characteristics of Measures

Scales	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Attitudes toward qualifications of people of color		.18*	-.42*	-.13*	.19*	.14*	.28*
Attitudes toward women's qualifications			-.13*	-.23*	.14*	.14*	.62*
Equality of department resource allocation to people of color				.49	-.44*	-.34*	-.62*
Equality of department resource allocation to women					-.47*	-.42*	-.63*
Reluctance to recruit people of color						.84*	.64*
Reluctance to recruit women							.63*
Value efforts to promote diversity							
Mean	2.80	3.13	2.02	1.89	2.44	2.18	3.82
Standard deviation	.70	.49	.38	.38	1.22	1.21	.95
Alpha	.77	.71	.73	.76	.67	.77	.92

*Significance < .01.

Individuals also identified their race/ethnicity (black, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, Native American Indian,[3] or Caucasian) and their gender. The respondent's type of appointment was used as a proxy to measure hierarchical level. Faculty with tenure and job security were combined into one category, and faculty without job security were grouped into the other.

Unit heterogeneity was measured in the following way. To each respondent's survey file, we appended data from the university's personnel office on the actual number of women, people of color, and total faculty in the respondent's department. Drawing on the work of Blau, heterogeneity was operationalized as:

$$2 - \left(1 - \frac{\Sigma X_i^2}{(\Sigma X_i)^2}\right)$$

where X is the number of persons in each category/group.[4] For the gender heterogeneity measure, the larger the figure, the greater the representation of women in the unit. For the racial heterogeneity

measure, the larger the figure, the greater the representation of people of color in the unit.

RESULTS

As the means in Table 1 show, the sample as a whole was generally favorable toward employer efforts to promote diversity (mean = 3.82) and although still favorable, it was slightly less positive toward the qualifications of minorities (2.80) and women (3.13). Respondents believed that minorities and women had almost the same chance of receiving department support as white men. Overall, respondents did not believe there was a reluctance to recruit minorities (2.17) or women (2.32).

Table 2 shows a one-way analysis of variance for race/ethnicity for each of the scales. Overall, the first hypothesis was supported. Whites generally had less positive attitudes regarding diversity issues than all other racial/ethnic groups. Ranking from *strong support* to *less support*, blacks and Hispanics were significantly more favorable toward efforts to promote diversity than Asians and whites were ($p \leq$ .0000). Regarding the qualifications of women, there were no significant differences in perceptions by race/ethnicity when the racial groups were analyzed separately. However, significant differences were found by race/ethnicity regarding perceptions of the qualifications of people of color. In order from high to low opinion, Asians, blacks, and Hispanics had significantly more favorable attitudes toward the qualifications of people of color than whites had ($p \leq$ .0000). Blacks and Hispanics were significantly more likely to perceive a reluctance to recruit minorities than Asians and whites were ($p \leq$ .0001). Blacks also were more likely to perceive a reluctance to recruit women than Hispanics, Asians, or whites were. There were no statistically significant differences by race/ethnicity regarding perceptions of the equality of support given to women and people of color.

To demonstrate that the results are not due to interaction with gender and level, Table 3 shows the results of the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) for each scale, the significance levels for three main effects with three two-way interactions (race and gender, level and gender, and level and race). In the MANOVA, a dummy variable for race/ethnicity was used. Whites were combined into one group and Hispanics, blacks, and Asians into the other. There were no

TABLE 2
One-Way Analysis of Variance for Race/Ethnicity

Scale	F Value	MS	White X	Asian X	Hispanic X	Black X
Value efforts to promote diversity (df 3,743)	8.11*	5.67	3.82	3.95	4.39	4.47
Attitudes toward women's qualifications (df 3,666)	2.25**	−.13 .83	3.16	3.02	3.08	2.92
Attitudes toward qualifications of people of color (df 3,608)	13.24*	5.83	2.70	3.31	3.04	3.08
Reluctance to recruit people of color (df 3,686)	6.07*	8.60	2.10	2.31	2.82	2.85
Reluctance to recruit women (df 3,698)	11.74*	16.83	2.22	2.52	3.03	3.36
Equality of department support to women (df 3,650)	.89.	.71	2.99	3.13	3.16	3.06
Equality of department support to people of color (df 3,682)	1.19	.93	3.14	3.13	3.25	2.97

NOTE: Student Newman Keuls test was used to analyze whether differences between means were significant. Breaks in the underline signify groups that are significantly different from each other.
* $p \le .0001$; ** + $p \le .1$.

significant interactions by race with level. Only two significant interactions by gender with race were found. Minority men's attitudes were less favorable regarding the qualifications of women than minority women's were. White women were significantly less favorable regarding the equality of support given to minorities than white men were. Only one significant interaction was found by gender and level. Tenured women were more likely to perceive a reluctance to recruit minorities than women without job security. Because the focus of this article is on racial differences, main effects for gender will not be discussed here (see Kossek and Zonia).

For the second hypothesis, regression analysis was used to investigate the effects of organizational demography and individual demography on attitudes toward diversity. Because larger units are more likely to contain diverse individuals, we controlled for department size. Table 4 shows that for all of the scales, more of the variance was accounted for by individual characteristics of race, gender, or level than the department's structural characteristics of size, gender,

TABLE 3
Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Independent Variable	Value Efforts to Promote Diversity F Value	Attitudes toward Qualifications of People of Color F Value	Attitudes toward Women's Qualifications F Value	Equality of Department Support of People of Color F Value	Equality of Department Support of Women F Value	Reluctance to Recruit People of Color F Value	Reluctance to Recruit Women F Value
Main Effect							
Race	**12.74 (.000)***	**14.02 (.000)**	**4.50 (.034)**	**40.87 (.000)**	**11.31 (.001)**	**21.18 (.000)**	3.10 (.079)
Gender	**41.57 (.000)***	1.21 (.272)	**8.31 (.004)**	**18.28 (.000)**	**70.49 (.000)**	**4.35 (.037)**	6.66 (.101)
Level	.64 (.591)	.55 (.651)	1.18 (.318)	.31 (.821)	.13 (.943)	1.38 (.249)	1.49 (.215)
Two-Way Interaction Effect							
Race by gender	1.18 (.277)	2.32 (.128)	**6.11 (.014)***	**6.63 (.010)***	2.95 (.086)	2.50 (.114)	.82 (.364)
Type of appointment by gender	1.16 (.326)	.37 (.771)	2.36 (.071)	1.26 (.286)	1.14 (.331)	**2.72 (.044)**	1.04 (.375)
Type of appointment by race	1.32 (.266)	.45 (.720)	.59 (.62)	1.40 (.242)	1.38 (.249)	.16 (.922)	1.16 (.324)
	$r^2 = .09$	$r^2 = .11$	$r^2 = .23$	$r^2 = .16$	$r^2 = .15$	$r^2 = .15$	$r^2 = .09$

*Significance levels are indicated in parentheses. Effects that are statistically significant are in boldface ($p \leq .05$).

and racial heterogeneity. Comparing the gender and racial heterogeneity variables, overall, gender heterogeneity was more strongly related to attitudes than racial heterogeneity. Gender heterogeneity was significantly related to the perceived value of efforts to promote diversity, whereas racial heterogeneity was not. The greater the presence of women in the unit, the more likely efforts to promote diversity are valued, regardless of race, gender, or level. However, it is important to note that racial heterogeneity did account for some of the variance in attitudes toward the qualifications of minorities and perceived reluctance to recruit minorities. Regardless of race, gender, or level, the greater the representation of minorities in a unit, the more favorable the perceptions toward the minorities' qualifications and the more likely the respondents perceived a reluctance to recruit minorities.

DISCUSSION

This study shows that individual race and ethnicity significantly explained differences in attitudes toward diversity to a greater extent than organizational demography. Whites held less-positive attitudes regarding employer efforts to promote diversity, had a lower regard for the qualifications of minorities, were more likely to believe that sufficient effort had been made to recruit diverse individuals, and had more-positive views regarding the current allocation of departmental resources to diverse individuals. Three reasons were given for the less favorable views of whites regarding diversity policies: (a) the greater tendency to hold values favoring individualism in the white culture, (b) the notion that whites may be disadvantaged during the process of organizational change to multiculturalism, and (c) the possible greater propensity of whites to assign a negative connotation to diversity efforts by equating such actions to affirmative action. Contrary to our predictions, however, white men's attitudes were not significantly less favorable than white women's attitudes for six of the seven scales. They only differed on perceptions of the equality of support given to minorities. White women were significantly more likely to believe minorities were being given less departmental resources. Overall, the effects of the interaction of race with gender on attitudes toward diversity were limited.

Blacks were significantly more likely to favor diversity than all other groups, and Hispanics' attitudes, although slightly less favor-

TABLE 4
Summary Table of Mean Scores of
Main Effects (Gender, Race, and Level) and
Two-Way Interactions; for Diversity Climate Scales

Independent Variable	Value Efforts to Promote Diversity			Attitudes toward Qualifications of People of Color			Attitudes toward Women's Qualifications		
	Beta	T-Sig.	R^{2*}	Beta	T-Sig.	R^{2*}	Beta	T-Sig.	R^{2*}
Organizational Measures									
1. Size	.00	.949		.02	.630		–.05	.209	
2. Gender heterogeneity	.13	.001		–.05	.301		.00	.957	
3. Racial heterogeneity	.01	.753	.017	.08	.089	.007	.04	.373	.005
Individual Measures									
4. Race	–.21	.000		–.21	.000		.10	.024	
0 = Minority									
1 = White									
5. Gender	–.33	.000		–.00	.941		–.28	.000	
0 = Women									
1= Men									
6. Rank	.00	.971	.136	.02	.599	.043	–.01	.729	.083
0 = Tenured									
1 = Tenured									
Significance of full model	.025			.010			.000		
Total R^2	.178			.060			.088		

able, were relatively similar. Given that diversity efforts are based on collectivist ideals, these findings are consistent with those from other research indicating that the black culture values a sense of community and cooperation (Foreman and Pressley; Washington), and that Hispanics also favor collectivism (Triandis, et al.).

Although more favorable than whites, Asians attitudes toward diversity were often closer to those of whites than they were to those of blacks and Hispanics. A possible explanation for this is that Asians tend to have cultures favoring collectivism similar to blacks and Hispanics, however, Asian cultures also can be typified by a strong need to achieve (DeVos). The values favoring achievement, however, are fundamentally different than those underlying the need for

Reluctance to Recruit People of Color			Reluctance to Recruit Women			Equality of Support for People of Color			Equality of Support for Women		
Beta	T-Sig.	R^{2}*	Beta	T-Sig.	R^{2}*	Beta	T-Sig.	R^{2}*	Beta	T-Sign.	R^{2}*
−.04	.353		−.00	.929		3.41.	.58		−.00+	.065	
.05	.220		.04	.318		−.18	.001		−.13*	.018	
−.09	.036	.010	−.07	.086	.007	.035	.58	.02*	−.02	.784	.018
−.29	.000		−.18	.000		.15	.001		.27***	.000	
	.000		−.19	.000		.25	.000		.12***	.001	
.10	.025	.142	.14	.000	.091	−.06	.00	.18	−.06	.05	.10
.001			.004			.000			.000		
.153			.102			.16			.114		

NOTE: T-Sig. = T significance.
*Variance explained by variables 1-3 and 4-6.

achievement in Anglo societies described in McClelland's classic studies. Although the Western motive is based on the need to achieve for oneself (Weber), in Asian cultures, achievement stems from interdependency as opposed to independence (Glazer). Through achievement, an individual's sense of obligation to those owed, such as the family, school, nation, or work group, can be repaid (Arvey, Bhagat, and Salas). If Asians perceive that diversity efforts lower standards or shut out opportunities for other qualified members of their group as was the case of the University of California Berkeley's limiting of Asian enrollment ("Berkeley"), then diversity efforts may be viewed less positively.

Although we only found partial support for the relationship be-
tween racial and gender heterogeneity and attitudes toward diversity,
over time we anticipate that increasing the numeric representation of
women and minorities will have an effect on attitudes, as Blau's
research suggests. However, our study is cross-sectional, and we do
not know how our results were influenced by unit change in hetero-
geneity occurring prior to the study. Organizational units generally
have had more experience with gender heterogeneity than racial
heterogeneity. Perhaps this longer time period may explain why we
only found a significant relationship between valuing efforts to pro-
mote diversity and gender heterogeneity. It may be that some units
are racially heterogeneous, yet may also have drastic underrepresen-
tation of specific minority groups. Given the racial history of the
United States, it is possible that the widespread integration of blacks
into prestigious research institutions of higher education may have a
key impact on perceptions of diversity climate. Indeed, write-in com-
ments by approximately 10% of the respondents indicated that the
term minority was often interpreted as pertaining solely to blacks. The
lower significance of the racial heterogeneity variable may be due to
the fact that some of the individuals considered to be minority are
foreign-born. It is likely that the attitudes of people of color who were
foreign-born may systematically differ from the attitudes of minori-
ties who have grown up in this country (Porras).

Units with higher racial heterogeneity did view the qualifications
of minorities more positively, which is consistent with Kanter's re-
search that suggests diverse individuals in units with good repre-
sentation of minorities are less likely to be viewed as tokens. Last, the
finding that racial heterogeneity was positively correlated with be-
lieving the organization had made insufficient effort to recruit minori-
ties shows how a unit's structural diversity can be linked to attitudes
toward diversity policies.

NOTES

1. In this article, the terms *people of color* and *minorities* are used when referring to
blacks, Asians, and Hispanics as a group. The terms *Whites, Anglos,* and *Caucasians* are
used interchangeably as Cox, Lobel, and McLeod recommend. Although we recognize
that there are whites who are not necessarily of Anglo descent, we believe the Anglo
culture has had the most dominant influence on the white culture in employing
organizations in the United States.

2. Although some scholars have argued that increased exposure between individuals and groups can foster either loathing or liking, we believe we have cited a sufficient body of research to support Homans's argument that frequency of contact is positively related to interpersonal attraction.

3. Our sample included only three American Indians, so this group was excluded from our analysis because it was too small to use in statistical analysis.

4. The formula has been adapted to permit the measure of heterogeneity to range from 0-1 so that the resulting heterogeneity measure is not unlike the range in a correlation.

REFERENCES

Arvey, Richard D., Rabi S. Bhagat, and Eduardo Salas. "Cross-Cultural and Cross-National Issues in Personnel and Human Resources Management: Where Do We Go From Here?" Ed. G. Ferris and K. Rowland. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* 9 (1991): 367-407.

"Berkeley: Diverse, but Still Divided." *New York Times* 3 Oct. 1990: C1.

Blau, Peter M. *Inequality and Heterogeneity*. New York: Free Press, 1977.

Cox, Taylor, and Stacey Blake. "Managing Cultural Diversity: Implications for Organizational Competitiveness." *Academy of Management Executive* 5 (1991): 45-56.

Cox, Taylor, Sharon A. Lobel, Poppy McLeod. "Effects of Ethnic Group Cultural Differences on Cooperative and Competitive Behavior on a Group Task." *Academy of Management Journal* 34 (1991): 827-947.

Crosby, Faye, and Susan Clayton. "Affirmative Action and the Issue of Expectancies." *Journal of Social Issues* 46 (1990): 61-79.

DeVos, G. *Socialization for Achievement: Essays on the Cultural Psychology of the Japanese*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Ely, Robin. "An Intergroup Perspective on Relationships among Professional Women." Diss. Yale University Press, 1989.

Foreman, A., and G. Pressley. "Ethnic Culture and Corporate Culture: Using Black Styles in Organizations." *Communication Quarterly* 35 (1987): 293-307.

Glazer, Nathan. "Social and Cultural Factors in Japanese Economic Growth." *Asia's New Giant: How the Japanese Economy Works*. Ed. H. Patrick and Rosovsky. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1976. 813-96.

Hofstede, Geert. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980.

Homans, George C. *The Human Group*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950.

Johnson, William B., and Arnold E. Packer. *Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute, 1987.

Kanter, Rosebeth M. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Kossek, Ellen, and Susan C. Zonia. "Assessing Diversity Climate: A Field Study of Reactions to Employer Efforts to Promote Diversity." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 14 (1993): 61-81.

Loden, Marilyn, and Judy Rosener. *Workforce America: Managing Employee Diversity as a Vital Resource*. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin, 1991.

McClelland, David C. *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1961.

Nacoste, Rupert. "Selection Procedure and Responses to Affirmative Action: The Case of Favorable Treatment." *Law and Human Behavior* 9 (1985): 225-42.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. "Organizational Demography." *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Ed. L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw. Greenwich, CT: JAI, 1983. 299-357.

Porras, Jerry I. "Racism in a Research University: Some Observations and Comments." Task Force on the Status of Minorities: Racism in International Settings. National Academy of Management. Miami, FL, Aug. 1991.

Schneider, Ben, and Joan Rentsch. "Managing Climates and Cultures: A Futures Perspective." *Futures of Organizations*. Ed. J. Hage. Lexington, MA, 1988. 181-203.

Thomas. Roosevelt, Jr. "From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity." *Harvard Business Review* March (1990): 107-17.

Triandis, Harry C. "Cross-Cultural Studies in Individualism - Collectivism." Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Cross-Cultural Perspectives. Ed. J. J. Berman. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989. 41-133.

Triandis, Harry C., et al. "Simpatica as a Cultural Script of Hispanics." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47 (1984): 1363-75.

Triandis, Harry C., Christopher McCusker, and C. Harry Hui. "Multi-Method Probes of Individualism-Collectivism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59 (1990): 1006-20.

Washington, C. W. "Acculturation of Minorities in Large Organizations." *The Bureaucrat* 16 (1987): 29-34.

Weber, Max. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Trans. and Ed. by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Ellen Ernst Kossek is an associate professor of human resources and organizational behavior in the School of Labor and Industrial Relations at Michigan State University. She holds a PhD from Yale, an MBA from the University of Michigan, and an AB from Mount Holyoke College in South Hadley, Massachusetts.

Susan C. Zonia is a director with the College of Osteopathic Medicine at Michigan State University. She holds a PhD from Michigan State University and a BA and an MA from the University of Missouri. Both scholars have done considerable work evaluating the organizational behavior implications of policy implementation.