1996

Cultural diversity training : corporate stratification or cultural diversity

Judy Lynn Carrico
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Carrico, Judy Lynn, "Cultural diversity training : corporate stratification or cultural diversity" (1996).
Master's Theses. 1208.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.35jf-w3qp>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1208

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

CULTURAL DIVERSITY TRAINING:
CORPORATE STRATIFICATION OR CULTURAL DIVERSITY

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Social Sciences

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Judy Lynn Carrico

May 1996

UMI Number: 1379323

**Copyright 1996 by
Carrico, Judy Lynn**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 1379323
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

© 1996

Judy Lynn Carrico

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Dr. Charles N. Darrah

Dr. J. A. English-Lueck

Dr. Michael Otten

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

CULTURAL DIVERSITY TRAINING:
CORPORATE STRATIFICATION OR CULTURAL DIVERSITY
by Judy Lynn Carrico

American corporations are attempting to manage their increasingly and explicitly diverse workforce. In their efforts to do so, they are implementing changes that target organizational systems and processes. In addition, they have created a vehicle to conceptualize employee difference and to effect behavioral and attitudinal changes in individuals: cultural diversity training. This research has explored whether these efforts to manage diversity promote a particular world view that is not shared by all members of the corporation. This case study used ethnographic methods of participant observation and qualitative study. Diversity program and training managers, an instructor and fourteen students participated in this study.

Research results indicate that the corporation has unwittingly bred cynicism by focusing on what many employees see as the "wrong" diversity. Employees consistently identified the most formidable diversity-related problems as those divisions and conflicts between nonprofessional employees and management rather than between race or ethnicity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this thesis could not have been accomplished without the efforts of many people; to them I wish to express my deep appreciation and gratitude. I am especially grateful to my husband, Michael Kuhn, who enthusiastically supported, coached, and encouraged me through an extremely challenging period of my life. To him, I owe everything.

I am also most grateful to Diana and Phillip Drews, my dear friends, who provided me with their "Dr. Jones" room, a computer and a month's worth of encouragement while I wrote Chapter Four and Five.

I would especially like to acknowledge High Tech's Workforce Diversity and Training Department management and diversity class participants, the subjects of this research.

I owe a great debt to Dr. Charles Darrah, Department of Anthropology, San Jose State University, who guided me long distance through my first anthropological research project. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Jan English-Lueck, Dept. of Anthropology and Dr. Michael Otten, Dept. of Sociology.

I would also like to acknowledge my mother, Dorothy E. Carrico. The appreciation, respect, admiration, and love I hold for her is immeasurable. She has taught me through example that the strength, courage, understanding, encouragement and love of a mother is infinite.

And lastly I would like to acknowledge the memory of my father, Lt. Col. Allen C. Carrico, who provided me with my first international experience and in doing so taught me about ethnocentrism and truly valuing cultural diversity.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Problem	1
Diversity and Demographics.....	5
Corporate Approaches to Diversity.....	9
Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity.....	9
Valuing diversity.....	10
Managing diversity.....	11
Multiculturalism	12
Culture and Ethnicity.....	15
Diversity Training	19
Conclusion	30
Chapter 2: Methodology	32
Chapter 3: A View From the Top.....	45
Corporate Objectives and Implementation.....	46
Semiconductor Products Sector (SPS) Workforce Diversity Program.....	48
Austin's Workforce Diversity Program.....	52
Training Department.....	55
Workforce Diversity Instructor Objectives	60
"Valuing the Diverse Workforce."	61
"White Men."	64
"Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior."	65
Conclusion	67
Chapter 4: Looking From Below.....	68
Class Enrollment.....	68
How and why employees enrolled.	69
Employee position and class selection.	73
Pre-class Interviews.....	75
Participation in study.....	75
Diversity viewed negatively.....	77
Perceived value of diversity class.....	88
Class Participant Observations.....	91
Contradictions.	91

Valuing sameness vs. difference.....	97
Where's management?.....	99
Post-class Interviews.....	103
Defining diversity.....	104
Value of class: before and after.....	106
Punishment.	108
Conclusion	109
Chapter 5: Summary and Implications.....	111
Summary.....	111
Implications	119
Employees.....	119
Workforce Diversity and Training and Development	
Departments.....	120
The corporation.....	121
Beyond High Tech.	122
References.....	124
Appendix A: Employee Demographics.....	134
Appendix B: Interview Questions, Workforce Diversity Managers.....	135
Appendix C: Interview Questions, Training Managers	136
Appendix D: Interview Questions, Class Facilitators.....	137
Appendix E: Pre-class Interview Questions, Class Participants	138
Appendix F: Post-class Interview Questions, Class Participants.....	139

Chapter 1: Problem

American corporations confront a workforce that is increasingly and explicitly diverse. This thesis is a case study of one corporation's response to this diversity and its perceived problem of diversity. The corporation, High Tech, has acknowledged that its workforce will continue to be increasingly diverse and is concerned about the impact of that diversity on its business. It has approached workforce diversity as a problem in need of management.

High Tech's recent efforts to cope with diversity have gone beyond Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action approaches and have included the implementation of changes in organizational systems and processes. In particular, the company has adopted diversity training aimed at effecting behavioral and attitudinal changes in individual employees. This thesis will examine how these corporate efforts to manage diversity depend upon a world view that is not shared by all members of the corporation. High Tech's diversity program presents itself as a neutral, inclusive process that provides employees with skills for working in a diverse environment. This study will examine how the program actually affects those employees who participate in it. The study suggests that programs that aim to foster sensitivity to cultural differences among people may also promote a traditional corporate culture focused on issues such as organizational stratification-differences, power, authority, status and privileges.

Therefore, this study will outline one company's objectives for addressing a perceived diversity problem, examine the implementation of a program designed to meet those objectives, and determine the effects of that program on individual employees. It will assess the diversity program's

effectiveness in achieving its stated objectives, as well as the broader lessons and consequences for participants in the training program.

Interestingly, this research found that employees who participated in this study identified a different set of concerns as they talked in interviews about diversity at High Tech. While they recognized the increasing demographic changes in the workforce, they consistently identified the most formidable diversity-related problems as those divisions and conflicts between nonprofessional employees and management. They emphasized conflicts between occupational categories, rather than racial/ethnic groups, as the most pressing concern in the workplace.

Implications for the corporation as a whole are evident in the research results. The corporation has unwittingly bred cynicism by focusing on what many employees see as the "wrong" diversity. Although the corporation may have had only good intentions in implementing the Workforce Diversity program, that program seems not to have met its stated intentions of fostering sensitivity and understanding. The corporation has focused on racial and ethnic diversity among employees, whereas the nonprofessional employees see the important diversity as that between themselves and management. It becomes apparent, therefore, that what really matters, at least to the employees interviewed for this study, is not racial/ethnic diversity but instead economic class, and how it is reflected in the corporation.

Workforce demographics have changed with the entry of new workers into the workforce. Minorities now make up a larger share of new entrants into the labor force. Immigrants represent the largest share of the increase in the population and the workforce since the first World War. With the

gradual elimination of gender barriers and the passage of enlightened legislation, such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Act and Affirmative Action, more women and other non-traditional workers are entering the workforce. Workforce diversity will continue to increase; women, minorities and immigrants are expected to constitute more than five-sixths of the net additions to the workforce between 1985 and the year 2000, though they represented only half of the workforce in 1985. In 1987, the Hudson Institute projected that at least 600,000 immigrants are likely to enter the U.S. each year for the balance of the century. Immigration at this rate will add about 9.5 million people to the U.S. population and approximately 4 million to the U.S. labor force (Hudson Institute, 1987). These new workers will bring with them core identities comprised of values, beliefs, and world views that may differ from those who founded the corporations they will work in.

While differences in core identities result in diverse expectations, priorities, and concerns, most U.S. corporations historically have not formally recognized employee diversity. Instead of acknowledging the pervasive influence of culture on employee behavior, attitudes, work, and productivity, corporations have assumed that equal treatment in the workplace meant simply treating each employee identically. This oversimplification has led corporations to attempt to encourage those employees who do not fit the dominant group profile to change and thus assimilate into the corporate culture.

Today, many individuals may be less willing to adapt to that dominant corporate culture in order to succeed. As increasing numbers of workers from different backgrounds enter the workplace, many are demanding that their

lifestyles be given credence, that their needs be addressed, and that their perspectives be recognized in order to enlarge the pool of acceptable alternatives.

Although this diversity may bring stimulation, challenge, and energy to the workplace, it does not always lead to harmony. This mix of cultures, genders, lifestyles, and values often becomes a source of misunderstanding and conflict. In many cases, conflict between employees has often been explained away as either "cross-culturally," "interculturally," or "racially" based. The corporation's response to conflict has therefore been driven by accepted categories of diversity, and the role of organizational dynamics in exacerbating conflict may have been concealed. Accordingly, corporations increasingly focus on the diversity of their employees as a source of many employee relations issues. Managing employee diversity has become central to implementing organizational changes directed at reducing conflict. This effort to change is largely implemented through training programs. Specifically, diversity training is seen as the vehicle for creating a work environment where perceived diversity-related conflict is minimized.

While the primary goal of diversity training programs is to reduce conflict in the workplace, such programs often have additional, unrecognized consequences. In diversity training programs, differences among people are explained in terms of the specific models of culture prevalent in the field of diversity training. The model of culture used in a particular training program can significantly influence the program's effectiveness. While some models embrace variation within the culture, others do not: they tend to

categorize everyone within the culture as identical. Ironically, attempts to address diversity may actually result in subtle stereotyping.

In addition, the proliferation of diversity training programs represents a significant attempt by organizations to define and shape individual and group identity within the corporation. Participants in such programs are given conceptual and "practical" tools to manage their interactions with others, but these tools can also be used to define their own identities. The effect of these programs on how individuals and groups construct identities for themselves thus becomes an issue for consideration. Although a corporation's diversity training may nominally honor the individual, it also represents an unprecedented effort by the corporation to mold employees and to enculturate corporate goals.

Diversity and Demographics

Within the popular literature, diversity has been defined as those human qualities that are different from our own and outside the groups to which we belong (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993; Loden & Rosener, 1991). Loden and Rosener (1991) have expanded this definition by suggesting that diversity is a complex set of primary and secondary human dimensions or variables that shape our values, experiences, and behavior. Primary dimensions are those immutable differences that exert an important impact on us throughout life. These primary dimensions, which help to form our core identities, include age, ethnicity, gender, physical abilities/qualities, race, and sexual orientation. Secondary dimensions of diversity are often described as being more mutable. Some exert an impact on us as we grow and develop early in life; others affect us more as adults. These dimensions of human

difference may include educational background, geographic location, income, marital status, military experience, parental status, religious beliefs, and work experience. Some secondary dimensions can change throughout life, and others may have such a powerful impact on individuals and groups that they become primary dimensions. Therefore, Loden and Rosener suggest that diversity refers primarily to differences in age, ethnic heritage, gender, physical ability, race, and sexual orientation. In a practical sense, diversity may actually be seen as a barrier to corporate success.

Past, recent, and projected demographic changes suggest that the workforce of the near future will display one major characteristic: diversity (Johnson & Packer, 1987). Recent census data from the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics shows dramatic changes in the civilian labor force over the last several decades (U.S. Census Bureau, 1995). In 1960, male workers constituted 67% of the total civilian labor force. This percentage has been reduced to 54% in the year 1994. Women in the total civilian labor force have increased their number over two and one-half times since 1960. Data from the same source shows the following absolute rates of increase from 1980 to 1994 in terms of race and ethnicity: White = 19%, Black = 33%, and Hispanic = 95%.

In an executive summary, Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century (1987), the Hudson Institute projected that the workforce would grow slowly, becoming older, more female and more disadvantaged. The report predicted that only 15% of the new entrants to the labor force between the years 1985 and 2000 would be American-born white males, compared to 47% in that category in 1985 (Table 1).

Table 1

Labor Force Demographics (1985 and 1985 - 2000)

	1985 Labor Force	Net new workers 1985-2000
Total	115,461,000	25,000,000
Native White Men	47%	15%
Native White Women	36%	42%
Native Non-white Men	5%	7%
Native Non-white Women	5%	13%
Immigrant Men	4%	13%
Immigrant Women	3%	9%

(Hudson Institute, 1987, p. xxi)

The Hudson Institute reported that almost two-thirds of the new entrants into the workforce between 1985 and 2000 will be women, and 61% of all women of working age are expected to have jobs by the year 2000. The report concluded that women would still be concentrated in jobs that pay less than jobs held by men; nonetheless, women are expected to be rapidly entering many higher-paying professional and technical fields. Because of the increase in women in the workplace, the report envisioned that demands for day care and for more time off from work for pregnancy leave and child-rearing duties would certainly increase, as would interest in part-time, flexible, and stay-at-home jobs. These demands could therefore impact current corporate personnel policies.

The Hudson Institute also projected that minorities would constitute an increasingly large share of new entrants into the labor force: non-whites would make up 29% of the new entrants into the labor force between 1985 and the year 2000, twice their current share of the workforce.

In addition to women and minorities, the Hudson report suggested that immigrants would represent the largest share of the increase in the population and the workforce since the first World War. Approximately 600,000 legal and illegal immigrants are projected to enter the United States annually throughout the balance of the century. In addition, the report projected that at least two-thirds of working-age immigrants would probably join the American workforce.

These demographic changes suggest that new workers coming into the workforce between now and the year 2000 will include non-whites, women, and immigrants; these groups will make up more than five-sixths of the net additions to the workforce, although they made up only about half of it in 1985.

The startling statistics of the much-discussed Hudson Institute report may have stripped away the last vestiges of denial from corporate America. In factories and cubicles everywhere, the existing system is changing. The complexion of the once predominantly white, Anglo Saxon, Protestant company is transforming as women, older employees, people of color, individuals with physical limitations, and immigrants are becoming more the norm than the exception. The metaphorical melting pot is now more accurately described as a layer cake. Individuals from diverse groups are less willing to shed their rich cultural identities as they integrate into a more

traditional corporate structure. Rather, they seek a work environment that will accommodate the cultures of their disparate roots while they simultaneously adopt norms of mainstream culture. In doing so, they have relied on Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action laws to protect their rights.

Corporate Approaches to Diversity

Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity.

Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity have been extensively discussed in the literature (see Arvey & Faley, 1988; CCH Editorial Staff, 1989; Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993; Jackson, 1992; Levin-Epstein, 1987). In addition, the distinctions between Affirmative Action, valuing diversity, and managing diversity have been described by Gardenswartz and Row (1993) and Jackson (1992). Gardenswartz and Row have attempted to distinguish Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity, valuing diversity and managing diversity from one another by describing them as stages in an evolutionary sequence which began in the 1960s with the development of Affirmative Action (Gardenswartz & Row, 1993).

In describing the distinctions between these efforts, Gardenswartz and Row (1993) note that Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity have historically focused on quantitative change. In particular, they suggest that Equal Employment Opportunity is a legalistic response to workplace discrimination, originally mandated by the federal government; Affirmative Action programs are outgrowths of Equal Employment law. Generally, such programs consist of specific hiring and promotion goals and timetables that are intended to correct demographic imbalances in an organization's

workforce resulting from long-term patterns of employment discrimination. Gardenswartz and Row believe that while such programs have led to changes in the composition of the American workforce, they have not been tied to changing organizational cultures. Hence, they believe that many organizations that are in compliance with Affirmative Action goals and timetables nevertheless continue to use the strategy of assimilation to manage increased employee diversity.

Valuing diversity.

Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993) believe that valuing diversity strategies build upon the foundation created by Equal Employment law and Affirmative Action programs. By focusing on the quality of the work environment and on improved utilization of the skills of all employees, valuing diversity attempts to move beyond Affirmative Action. It recognizes that hiring and promoting diverse people does not automatically lead to mutual respect, cooperation, and true integration. In order to achieve these goals, Gardenswartz and Rowe suggest that organizations need to realize that all employees contribute in ways that are equally valuable. In other words, the concept of valuing diversity facilitates a process that focuses on the utilization of the skills of all employees. However, this goal may be difficult to realize, despite the sincere efforts of Human Resources personnel. Thus, in practice, valuing diversity may be simply a concept that is marketed to the workforce while the corporation continues its efforts to win the "numbers game" of Affirmative Action.

Managing diversity.

In addition to Equal Employment/Affirmative Action, with its focus on quantitative indicators of equality, and valuing diversity, with its vague and unrealizable goals, a third corporate strategy is managing diversity. Managing diversity has been defined as the organizational change effort intended to alter a corporate culture's norms, policies, and procedures. The change effort is based on the extent to which the current norms, policies, and procedures impede the creativity, productivity, and advancement of all employees, however different they may be (Elashmawi & Harris, 1993; Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993; Geber, 1990; Gordon, 1992; Harris & Moran, 1991; Jackson, 1992; Loden & Rosener, 1991). The effort usually consists of an emphasis on building specific skills and creating new policies and procedures. Therefore, managing diversity is behavioral in nature as compared to the more quantitative approach of Affirmative Action. It is also more strategically driven than valuing diversity, since behaviors and policies are seen as contributing to organizational goals and objectives and, in many cases, are even tied to incentives and results. The belief is that if old policies and procedures are changed (i.e., promotion), there will be more opportunities for legally protected employees (i.e., women and minorities).

Although efforts have previously been made to manage diversity, they have been driven by Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity legislation. More recently, there has been a shift toward treating the workforce as if it is multicultural.

Multiculturalism

Recent corporate efforts at managing diversity reflect not only demographic changes, but also social changes in the recognition and evaluation of differences among people. The concept of multiculturalism is itself ill-defined, but it can at least be said that multiculturalism explicitly acknowledges and even celebrates "cultural" differences among groups, while placing individuals firmly within those groups.

The concept of multiculturalism has been discussed by many in the literature (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993; Harris & Moran, 1991; Hoopes, 1981; Loden & Rosener, 1991; Nixon, 1985; Schneller, 1989; Wurzel, 1988). The term has also been used interchangeably (sometimes incorrectly) with cross-cultural, intercultural, diversity, and valuing diversity. David Hoopes (cited in Pusch, 1981) has defined multiculturalism as

that state in which one has mastered the knowledge and developed the skills necessary to feel comfortable and communicate effectively (1) with people of any culture encountered and (2) in any situation involving a group of people of diverse cultural backgrounds. (p. 21)

Hoopes goes on to define comfortable as:

without the anxiety, defensiveness and disorientation that usually accompany the initial intercultural experience. In other words, the multicultural person is the person who has learned how to learn culture--rapidly and effectively. (p. 21)

Wurzel (1988) proposes that multiculturalism is actually used in two senses. In the first sense, multiculturalism simply refers to the fact that human existence is inherently and universally multicultural, even though mankind has resisted recognizing it throughout history. Wurzel suggests that this resistance probably stems from the survival imperative and its ethnocentric impulse; submerging oneself in similarities has been seen as a

surer road to survival than trying to cope with differences. In the second sense, Wurzel proposes that multiculturalism can also be seen as a set of principles, a "multicultural perspective" by which people act within the context of a multicultural society. He suggests that these principles can be defined and learned. However, he believes that the key to multiculturalism is awareness. Wurzel explains, "Since the ethnocentric impulse is buried deeply and entwined with unconscious and culturally determined behaviors and patterns of thinking, most people have powerful built-in barriers to accepting society as multicultural" (p. 1). Thus, before one can learn the appropriate behaviors for multicultural living, one must (a) become aware of one's own ethnocentric conditioning, and (b) accept the fact that society is indeed multicultural.

Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993) add to the discussion by suggesting that an organization's commitment to embracing diversity necessitates a transformation from a monocultural to a multicultural organization. In the monocultural stage, the authors suggest that the organization acts as though all employees were the same: "While the staff may be somewhat diverse, there is an expectation to conform to a standard that is, in most cases, the white male model, which puts white men at an advantage" (p. 274). Gardenswartz and Rowe believe that success is achieved by following the expectations and norms of this model. Women, people of color, and immigrants are expected to assimilate, to adopt the dominant style of the organization. Differences are underplayed, and there is an attempt to be "color blind."

As the organization evolves, it reaches the second stage: the nondiscriminatory stage. Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993) argue that governmental regulations and the threat of employee grievances cause organizations to consider Affirmative Action requirements and Equal Employment Opportunity regulations. In this phase, corporations focus on meeting hiring and promotion quotas and on removing roadblocks that inhibit diverse groups from moving in and up. The goal is to eliminate the unfair advantage of the majority group. Training in gender equity and reducing stereotypes and prejudice is often done during this period. Non-traditional employees often experience a tension between a need to assimilate and a desire for the organization to accommodate their needs. Compromises are usually the method of resolving these conflicts, with each side giving a little in order to gain some as well. This may be the stage most corporations are currently in.

Sooner or later, because of workforce changes in ethnicity, life-style, and values, the organization comes to the third stage: the multicultural stage. In this stage, there is not only a recognition that there are clear differences in culture, background, preferences, and values, but also a valuing of those differences. Assimilation is no longer the model for success. Rather, new norms are created that allow more leeway for employees to do things their own way. Organizational policies and procedures are flexible enough to suit everyone, and no one is put at an exploitative advantage. Corporations that hope to reach this stage of development have recognized the role of corporate change in this process.

However, corporations may be attempting to reach the multicultural stage of corporate development by using change processes designed around older approaches to diversity. As employees are expected to participate in these change efforts, the corporation will be challenged to manage this change through the incorporation of new policies and procedures that reflect new multicultural realities.

Culture and Ethnicity

Multiculturalism is based on the concept of culture, although it uses the concept in idiosyncratic ways. The concept of culture has been defined and discussed in the literature of most social science disciplines (Giovannini, 1990; Hall, 1973; Hoopes, 1975; Hoopes & Pusch, 1981; Langness, 1980; Singer, 1987; Wurzel, 1988). Although these definitions vary, they share some of the basic elements of culture as defined by anthropologists.

In 1970, Margaret Mead commented on the misuse of the culture concept:

Today there is almost no resemblance between the concept of culture based on the work of the field anthropologist . . . and the concept based on his work that is used in contemporary scientific thought. From the standpoint of what the psychologist, sociologist, or historian attempts to understand, the model of culture has lent itself to a kind of extrapolation that is crude, deterministic and reductionist. (p. xxiii)

Similar misuses of the culture construct may exist in the contemporary business world. When diversity trainers discuss the importance of culture, it is not clear what they mean. For example, the phrase "corporate culture" is frequently used to describe the general beliefs and values of an organization. This popular usage can be grossly misleading when it overlooks organizational diversity and reduces workplace beliefs, values, and behavior

to a homogeneous, monolithic entity created by senior management. As a result, management may be led to believe that they can change corporate culture overnight with a few interventions, speeches, or training programs.

Although attempts to arrive at consensual definitions of frequently used concepts and categories have been made by multiculturalists (Etzioni, 1969; Jackson, 1970; Martin, 1986), the concept of culture remains poorly defined. In his article, "Why Do Multiculturalists Ignore Anthropologists?", Richard Perry (1992) calls attention to this problem: "The new multiculturalists' concept of culture is often simplistic. Despite their genuflection to the validity of other cultures, they fail to comprehend their complexity" (p. A52).

A simplistic concept of culture necessarily leads to flawed, superficial approaches in diversity training programs. One such approach is the emotionally charged adversarial approach, wherein participants are challenged to acknowledge their biases and stereotypes. Without the foundation of culture and an understanding of how it generates meaning, these sessions may turn out to be opportunities to "complain-and-blame," ending the inquiry altogether.

A second approach in diversity training programs relies on anecdotal tales and simulated cultural encounters. This approach falls short of conveying the complexity of culture; instead it offers only superficial information. Rarely do critical cultural events occur in patterns that can be simulated: there are usually subjective nuances that cannot be anticipated. Simulation, role play, and anecdotal tales may be useful in helping students understand the significance of culture, but they are only a first step.

A third approach to diversity training programs uses cross-cultural discussions that draw upon ethnic groups as examples of group cultures. The effectiveness of this approach, however, is compromised by the fact that the terms cross-cultural and ethnicity are complex and often misunderstood in the literature, as well as in training programs. If diversity classes discuss ethnic groups as examples of cultures, participants may develop an inaccurate, even stereotypical understanding of how groups, and the participants themselves, define their identities.

Verma and Mallick (1984) suggest that the use of the term cross-cultural presents problems of operational definition. Other interchangeable terms such as intercultural, cross-ethnic, and multicultural are also in constant use. Jahoda (1970) has attempted to distinguish between a cross-cultural approach, involving studies confined to peoples "contrasting sharply in modes of life and ecology such as Ashanti and Scots, excluding comparative studies of culturally similar populations like the French and English which are more properly called cross-national" (p. 1). In many of the earlier studies, the term cross-cultural referred to both the cultural and ecological environments. Many researchers, however, have failed to draw a distinction between cross-cultural and cross-national research because of a confusion between the concepts of ethnicity and culture. In other words, there appears to be confusion about the relationship between culture and ethnicity, and ethnic groups are often discussed as cultural groups.

Ethnicity is also blurred in its usage (Verma & Mallick, 1984). The term has been loosely defined as membership in a group that is distinctive in terms of cultural identity, language, religion, and life style (Verma & Mallick, 1984).

De Vos and Romannucci-Ross (1975) suggest that ethnicity refers to a self-perceived group of people who hold in common a set of traditions not shared by others with whom they are in contact. In addition, this membership is distinguished by racial, territorial, economic and aesthetic uniqueness. However, the term ethnicity is often used interchangeably with ethnic identity as an umbrella category, bringing together discussions of such diverse topics as ethnic boundaries, traits and cultures (De Vos & Romanucci-Ross, 1975; Royce, 1982).

In a more recent study, Keefe (1992) suggests that there are general dimensions of ethnicity and ethnic identity that are more usefully reserved for the symbolic dimension of ethnicity. Keefe argues that these dimensions must be analytically separated from cultural (ethnic culture) and social (ethnic group membership) dimensions. Whereas ethnic culture is the component of ethnicity that refers to the pattern of behaviors and beliefs that sets a group apart from others, ethnic group membership refers to the network of people with whom an individual is in contact and the ethnic affiliation of those people and the groups they form (Keefe, 1992). Ethnic identity, on the other hand,

encompasses the perceptions of and personal affiliation with ethnic groups and cultures. Specifically, ethnic identity consists of: the perception of differences among ethnic groups; the feelings of attachment to and pride in one ethnic group and cultural heritage as opposed to others; and, at least where there are perceived physical differences between groups, the perception of prejudice and discrimination against one's own ethnic group. (Keefe, 1992, p. 35)

In addition, Keefe suggests that ethnic identification may come about through both self-motivated allegiance and forced identity due to prejudice and discrimination. Her research indicates that while ethnic culture is the most

substantial component of ethnicity for recent immigrant groups, ethnic group membership and identity are more significant in defining established American ethnic groups. While she admits that the family figures most significantly in the individual's initial identification with an ethnic group, Keefe proposes that experiences outside the family, especially in school or the workplace, play an important secondary role in shaping identity. This process often works more through exclusion from other groups than through positive reinforcement of ethnic ties.

The literature is rich in its discussion of ethnic identity (De Vos & Romanucci-Ross, 1975; Mead, 1975; Nagel, 1994; Rorty, 1994; and Strauss, 1992). Ethnicity and ethnic identity have been defined and contrasted (De Vos & Romanucci-Ross, 1975; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Keefe, 1992; Nagel, 1994), and various dimensions of ethnic identity have been identified (Keefe, 1992). The impact of change in context on identity maintenance, the implications of maintenance efforts for group identification, and the effects of perceived threats to identity on self-esteem associated with group membership have also been examined (Ethier & Deaux, 1994). In addition, the ways in which ethnic identity and culture are created and recreated in modern societies have been explored (Nagel, 1994), as has the separation of ethnic identity from ethnic personality (De Vos & Romanucci-Ross, 1975). Ironically, the role of workplace diversity training in defining and redefining ethnic identity is conspicuously absent in the literature.

Diversity Training

Loden and Rosener (1991) outline a comprehensive three phase approach for changing an organization's culture. In the first phase, the

authors suggest that in order to set the stage for culture change, organizational leaders must take an early, active, and visible role. In particular, their role must focus on (a) acknowledging the fundamental difference between Equal Employment Opportunity and valuing diversity, (b) endorsing the value of diversity and communicating this throughout the organization, and (c) articulating a pluralistic vision. Loden and Rosener's second phase includes a systematic process of awareness development, part of which includes providing diversity awareness education. The third phase involves ongoing maintenance activities which might include (a) periodic cultural audits that examine organizational practices, norms, and so on, and their impact on diverse employees; (b) periodic employee opinion surveys to identify emerging diversity issues and measure effectiveness of current activities; and (c) annual survey feedback of individual managers, identifying specific pluralistic leadership strengths and areas for improvement. The second phase of Loden and Rosener's change culture approach--education and change implementation--is the subject of this section.

Loden and Rosener (1991) believe that once the stage has been set by senior managers and other organizational leaders, a systematic process of awareness development and culture change can begin. They have proposed several major steps in their blueprint for culture change, the first of which is providing awareness training to minimize culture clash and to improve work relationships among all employees.

Wurzel (1991) suggests that cultural conflict occurs when the interpretation of cultural patterns of information is not shared with others. Conflict is reflected in the internal (personal) and interactional (social)

tensions that arise when different systems of knowledge confront one another. Therefore, awareness is the key to minimizing this conflict. Wurzel believes that valuing diversity becomes possible when awareness is instilled and conflict is minimized. Although increased awareness and reduced conflict certainly may contribute to the overall goal of improved employee interaction, Wurzel's assessment may be overstated.

Training is widely used as a tool for creating awareness and changing an organization's culture. A fundamental premise here is that diversity training interventions can contribute to the amelioration of cultural conflict and the development of a perspective that values diversity, although this has yet to be established empirically.

There has been much discussion of diversity training (Batchelder & Warner, 1977; Bennett, J., 1986; Bennett, M., 1986; Brislin, 1986; Casse, 1979; Caudron, 1993; Forsberg, 1993; Hoopes, 1981; Hughes-Wiener, 1986; Ingram, 1993; Kohls, 1987; Martin, 1986; Pusch, 1979; Schneller, 1989; Stolovitch & Lane, 1989; Swierczek, 1989; Weeks, Pedersen, & Brislin, 1977). Harris and Moran (1991) describe diversity training as a tool that creates awareness of cultural differences or the cultural factors affecting behavior. Diversity training develops sensitivity and skill, not only in coping with such factors, but also in promoting cooperation and collaboration with people who are different from each other. Because diversity training has been identified as the tool used for organizational change, an entire professional field has emerged to provide organizations with this tool (Martin, 1986).

Diversity training is built on a multidisciplinary foundation. Theoretical perspectives, conceptual frameworks, and methodological

strategies have been developed using psychological, educational, intercultural communicational, and anthropological concepts. Each discipline has provided concepts to the field, and this linking of conceptual frameworks has contributed to a holistic foundation of models, tools, and techniques used by diversity trainers. This interdisciplinarity has also introduced inconsistencies in concepts and methods.

The field of psychology has contributed a theoretical understanding of the individual processes of sojourner adjustment (Brein & David, 1971; Brislin, 1981; Church, 1982; David, 1972; Triandis, 1977) and an understanding of the various coping strategies of individuals in transition experiences (Barna, 1983).

The field of education has attempted to provide a better understanding of the learning processes involved in cross-cultural education (Hughes, 1983; Kolb, 1984). Wasilewski and Seelye (1981) have attempted to increase curricular relevancy, and Pusch, Seelye and Wasilewski (1981) have identified multicultural education competencies. Education has also provided methods and techniques for cross-cultural training (Hoopes & Pusch, 1981). Educators have also considered how diversity training should be evaluated (Nixon, 1985; Renwick, 1981).

Intercultural communications has contributed a plethora of theoretical, research and conceptual frameworks. Intercultural communications experts have attempted to identify the cultural variables that influence the communication process (Porter & Samovar, 1985; Sarbaugh, 1979); they have defined theoretical perspectives for understanding intercultural interaction (Howell, 1979); and they have identified the dimensions of intercultural

effectiveness (Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978; Ruben, 1977). The intercultural communications discipline has also discussed approaches to developing cross-cultural preparedness in adults (Kohls, 1989), defined a conceptual framework for cross-cultural training as education, and identified examples of intercultural communication training (e.g. Intercultural Communications Workshops, Hoopes, 1975).

In anthropology, Hall (1963) provided the first comprehensive analysis of the relationship between communication and culture, the cultural use of space, and the practical value of cross-cultural analysis. The field of diversity training has also been influenced by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) research on variations in value orientations (Hoopes, 1981) and Stewart's (1977) elaboration of their research, in which he analyzed American mainstream culture from a cross-cultural perspective. The subsequent theoretical framework was used for training military personnel going abroad. Downs (1969, 1970, 1978) examined guidelines and techniques for training, as well as the myths, preferences, and failures in cross-cultural training (Downs, 1969).

Although the field of diversity training is only 25 years old, psychologists, educators, and intercultural communications specialists have engaged in an ongoing self-examination as they assess the directions being taken in the field. Communication specialists, psychologists, and educators are attempting to identify appropriate diversity training methodologies and their related theoretical foundations while integrating current theory, research, and practice (Brislin, Landis, & Brandt, 1983). As a result, theoretical models, training methodologies, pedagogical assumptions, trainer

competencies, and program effectiveness evaluations have been researched and reported on extensively in the diversity training literature (Albert, 1986; Bennett, J., 1986; Bennett, M., 1986; Brislin, 1986; Caudron, 1993; Deane, 1993; Kohls, 1987; Martin, 1986; McCaffery, 1986; Paige, 1986; Schneller, 1989; Stolovitch & Lane, 1989; Swierczek, 1988).

There have been many attempts by psychologists, educators and communication specialists to reach consensus on the theoretical models and training methodologies most effective in the diversity classroom (Etzioni, 1969; Jackson, 1970). For instance, Kohls (1987) attempted to draw a sharp distinction between four contemporary approaches to preparing adults to function in another culture. He believed that in doing so, ambiguous terms that are used very haphazardly and interchangeably in the field would be clarified. Definitive differences in the four learning study modes (orientation, briefing, education and training) could be seen, as each mode was discovered to have its own distinctive strengths and shortcomings. Each mode was assessed on its applicability to the learning requirements of any given situation; its overall purpose; the means of achieving its purpose; the time required to achieve its purpose; and the roles of instructor and learner. This method allowed Kohls to assess each mode's suitability for a particular audience under these conditions.

The traditional differences between education and training have been compared, both in the literature and in the field, over the last two decades (Bennett, J., 1986; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Harrison & Hopkins, 1967). Whereas education is well suited for large bodies of content knowledge and for developing in-depth mastery of one or more subjects, training has been

found to be effective for developing competency in performing skills or meeting specified objectives in a cost-effective manner (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Harrison & Hopkins, 1967); thus, training is appealing to companies.

The purpose of training is to provide practical, results-oriented learning. It is aimed at achieving predetermined and clearly stated objectives which are measured after training to determine whether they have been met. In most cases, training uses experiential and participant-centered exercises that emphasize hands-on experience, practice, and drills to achieve their purposes. It is the most active and involving of Kohl's four modes.

Training has created a major learning industry, and it is believed to have had broad effects on human resource development in the private sector (Kohls & Burssow, 1995). Leonard Nadler (cited in Harris & Moran, 1991) of George Washington University characterizes human resource development as a "series of organized activities, conducted within a specified time, and designed to produce behavioral change. . . . Its most common manifestations are training (learning for the present job) and education (learning for the future job)" (p. 283). Human resource development encompasses a wide range of learning efforts, from formal systems of education and training to self-instruction. The subject matter can cover everything from international business and comparative management to technical instruction, and human resource development has been associated with cross-cultural (diversity) learning since training's inception in the mid-1960s.

Within diversity training there has been an ongoing attempt to identify major theoretical models (Larson, 1977) and to assess the many

disparate training methods used in order to create a coherent framework for the field (Bennett, J., 1986; Brislin & Pedersen, 1976; Gudykunst, Hammer, & Wiseman, 1977; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Shizuru, Landis, & Brislin, 1983).

The diversity training literature reveals several distinct models that have emerged in the field of cross-cultural training and education. These major approaches to training (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976; Downs, 1969; Gudykunst, Hammer, & Wiseman, 1977; Landis & Brislin, 1983; Newmark, 1979) have been widely discussed, although disagreement about what constitutes appropriate training continues.

What has been called the Intellectual (Classroom or University) Model (Harrison & Hopkins, 1966) has dominated the field of diversity training. Predicated on the belief that cognitive understanding of a culture is essential for effective performance abroad, the approach stresses cognitive goals, culture-specific content, and traditional education processes. This model has gained popularity because it matches the trainees' previous educational experiences. The trainer is not asking the participants to shift their attitudes toward learning, but to learn in the way they have probably always learned, with an emphasis on rationality, abstract knowledge, emotional development and verbal skills (Harrison & Hopkins, 1966). However, the limitations of this model are related to the lack of congruence between an individual's living experience abroad and the classroom environment. In short, the traditional Intellectual Model fails to teach the trainees "how to learn."

Another approach which shares the goals of the Intellectual Model is the Intercultural Sensitizer (ICS), or Culture Assimilator, developed by social

scientists (Albert, 1986; Brislin, 1986). Its main purpose is to teach individuals from one culture to see and interpret situations from the perspective of members of the other culture. As a method of orienting persons for cross-cultural interactions, the ICS falls within the broad category of cognitive approaches to training. Yet, it can also have experiential and behavioral components, making it a versatile method of cross-cultural training.

In both of these models, the trainer needs to convey general information about the culture. This lack of specificity leaves the Intellectual Model open to the criticism of failing to address the reality of cross-cultural situations, criticism which has been leveled by a number of writers (Brislin & Pedersen, 1976; Downs, 1969; Harrison & Hopkins, 1967; Hoehn, 1968).

One response to such critics has been the Area Training Model, or Simulation Model. This cross-cultural training model emphasizes affective goals, culture-specific content, and experiential processes. In contrast to the Intellectual Model, trainees in the Area Training Model are active participants in the learning, which is derived from the trainees' everyday experiences. By deriving attitudes and skills from their experiences, trainees are expected to develop new behaviors and approaches to problem solving that will increase their effectiveness abroad. Wight (1970) lists several advantageous elements of the model: (a) it is trainee-centered rather than trainer-centered; (b) it requires trainee responsibility for the learning process; (c) it is based on problem solving skills rather than information transmission; and (d) trainees learn how to learn.

The Cross-cultural Training Model addresses these essential elements by involving the participants in gathering data to solve problems within the

community. By forcing the trainees to develop these research skills, the program has a built-in impetus for them to form relationships with the host nationals. As a consequence of this formula, the role of the trainer becomes one of providing resources for the participants, creating enthusiasm and interest in the effort involved, and providing structural frameworks for information-seeking strategies.

A totally different approach to training is taken by the advocates of the Self-Awareness or Human Relations Model of training. This approach uses experiential processes, has affective goals, and is so general in its cultural content that "culture" learning must be seen as an extrapolated outcome. The underlying assumption of this model is that the individual who understands himself better will understand his culture better and will, consequently, be more effective in intercultural situations (Gudykunst, Hammer, & Wiseman, 1977). Emphasis is placed on the group of participants as a functioning unit, and attention is given to the roles assumed and responsibilities met. Trainers in this model use T-group (Training-group) and role playing methods to heighten participants' awareness of their own feelings, emotions, and unconscious responses to unstructured activities that are designed to encourage change in the individuals' self-perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors (Althen, 1981; De Crow, 1969; Downs, 1969; Foster & Danielian, 1966).

This model has its limitations. A T-group is at face value an American invention, built on such American values as openness, equality, individuality, and directness. Furthermore, in addition to the ethnocentric origins of the T-group concept, each group typically establishes its own norms,

thus encouraging individuals to adapt not only to an intrinsically American model, but to a group with its own member-based idiosyncrasies.

Another frequently mentioned limitation of the Self-Awareness Model is that it fails to supply the participants with a framework of conceptual knowledge with which to analyze future situations. The model does not stress "learning how to learn," but instead stresses self-awareness of what has already been internalized. Abstract notions of perception, value difference, and cultural relativity remain unaddressed. James Downs, an anthropologist who was active in Peace Corps training, speculated that the support for the Self-Awareness Model was an artifact of the involvement of behavioral scientists who tended to emphasize the individual, when the actual issue was a cultural one (Downs, 1970). He believed that sensitivity groups were "in all probability...counterproductive" in intercultural training (Downs, 1969, p. 7). Down's anthropological perspective may have contributed to new models.

In contrast to the Self-Awareness Model, which depends upon and perpetuates American norms, the Cultural Awareness Model attempts to bring this very ethnocentrism into focus. In the Self-Awareness Model, emphasis is on the individual self, and a general understanding of culture is an expected result. In the Culture Awareness Model, by contrast, emphasis is on cultural insight, with increased individual awareness an expected by-product. Few authorities in the field of diversity training would dispute the value of participants' increased awareness of the role that culture plays in influencing their thoughts, attitudes and behaviors. Indeed, the logic of the approach is widely endorsed (Downs, 1969; Harrison & Hopkins, 1966; Pusch, 1981; Stewart, 1966). The method typically moves from educating individuals

about their own values, to analyzing contrasts with other countries, and finally to applying the insights gained to improving the effectiveness of interaction.

The Cultural Awareness Model is employed in a wide variety of training modes, and it has received attention through Stewart's (1966) work on the Contrast American Model, Hoopes' (1975) and others' discussions of the Intercultural Workshop (ICW), and Alfred Kraemer's (1973) study of cultural self-awareness training. While both the Contrast American Model and ICW have limitations, each addresses an issue that may be paramount to the trainer and class participant: learning about one's own and other cultural perspectives. In other words, it could be said that cultural self-awareness serves as an important prerequisite to learning another culture's world view.

Taken at face value, the literature and the field of diversity training look fairly comprehensive. However, such training generally prepares trainees to work effectively overseas, while still retaining their own identities. It assumes that interaction occurs between an individual and a culture. The organizational context in which training is offered is conveniently omitted from discussion. Thus, the literature reflects a technical, neutral focus on providing people with tools to work in alien environments. The transformation of identity and the intrusion of corporate goals remain unaddressed.

Conclusion

I have discussed the changing workforce demographics and the challenges employers face in attempting to create a work environment in which this diverse workforce will be productive. In doing so, I have

discussed the legal context within which adjustment to diversity occurs. In addition, I have discussed how corporations are attempting to manage the diversity within their workforce. I have also suggested that some corporations may now treat their workforce as if it is multicultural. The role of diversity training in achieving this stage has been presented.

The literature suggests that companies are making efforts to change their current work environments. They are doing so in response to the growing diversity in their workforces and the perceived need to assist their employees in working more effectively with one another. These changes represent a corporate effort to mold employees in a way that assists in the enculturation of corporate goals.

The remainder of this thesis is devoted to exploring how a training program that is presented as a neutral process, providing workers with the tools for life in a diverse organization, actually affects those who participate in it. Specifically, I examine one such program from the perspectives of management, trainers, and students. This approach allows me to assess not only the effectiveness of the program in achieving its stated objectives, but also the wider lessons learned by those who participate in the program.

Chapter 2: Methodology

In order to examine how corporate efforts to address a diverse workforce may affect employees, I conducted fieldwork in one corporation. The focus of my research was the design and implementation of a diversity training program. The corporation I studied is located in the southwest portion of the United States, a region where many immigrants have settled. The number of foreign-born residents in the southern states grew by 120% from 1970 to 1980, and by 97% in the Western states. As they have in the past, most of these new residents were expected to cluster in the cities and states where employment opportunities were greatest. More than half of these foreign-born residents have settled in three states--California, New York, and Texas.

Texas is a state that has undergone profound changes in the ethnic composition of its population. The Non-Hispanic White population, which was once the dominant racial and ethnic group, has decreased from 68.7% of the population in 1970 to 60.6% in 1990 (Elliot, 1992). By 2026 it has been projected that this population, which represented more than two-thirds of Texas' population in 1970, will constitute only 46%, while Hispanics will make up 38.1%. Asians, Native Americans and other minorities will make up 4.1%, double their current proportion (Elliot, 1992). In Travis County alone, where the present study took place, the Hispanic population comprises 21% of the population, a 68% increase since 1980 (Elliot, 1992).

As in the United States generally, where the shift in population composition also changes the composition of the local labor force, Travis county is clearly characterized by a multi-ethnic workforce. This diversity is

amplified by differences in socioeconomic status within the county, with new arrivals ranging from impoverished illegal aliens to well-to-do engineers and entrepreneurs.

In the state capital of Austin (located in Travis County), the economy has recently created jobs at better than 3% a year. Austin is ranked second in the state in the number of new manufacturing facilities added between 1988 and 1993, and the city's 12.2% economic growth led the nation from 1990 to 1993. For these reasons, High Tech, Inc. provides an ideal site in which to examine the integration of a diverse workforce. The company has committed significant resources to managing its diverse workforce in order to attempt to provide an environment where diversity is valued. The company's Human Resource Organization has a Workforce Diversity Department as well as a Training and Development Department, both of which have been involved in addressing the needs of the diverse workforce.

High Tech, Inc. is a Fortune 500 electronics manufacturer with headquarters in the midwest. Incorporated in 1928, it is currently one of the world's leading providers of wireless communications (cellular telephone, two-way radio, paging), advanced electronic systems and services (data communications, personal communication, automotive, defense and space electronics, and computers), and semiconductor technology (used to power millions of consumer products) for global markets. The corporation is divided into six major operating units that are responsible for the design, engineering, and manufacturing of these product groups. The multinational corporation currently employs over 120,000 people worldwide and reported corporate sales of \$22 billion in 1994.

With \$6.9 billion in semiconductor sales in 1994, High Tech, Inc. has become the world's third largest producer of semiconductors and integrated circuits (IC) products, including microprocessors, microcomputers, and memories, to serve the advanced systems needs of the computer, consumer, automotive, industrial, and federal government telecommunications markets. The corporation's Semiconductor Products Sector is headquartered in the southwest. The sector employs 47,000 people in 26 major facilities around the globe.

High Tech's strongly promulgated corporate culture is an integrated system of symbols, shared values, and behavior patterns or styles that are manifested in the company's logo, publicity, policies and procedures. As communicated in a High Tech official publication, the company's mission statement addresses some of these values:

In each of our chosen arenas of the electronics industry, we will grow rapidly by providing our worldwide customers what they want, when they want it, with Six Sigma quality and best-in-class cycle time, as we strive to achieve our fundamental corporate objective of Total Customer Satisfaction and to achieve our stated goals of best-in-class people, marketing, products, software, hardware and systems, manufacturing and service; increased global market share; and superior financial results.

The chief executive officer (CEO) believes that High Tech can achieve its vision by conducting business with "uncompromising integrity" ("High Tech" document). High Tech recognizes that in order to achieve this standard, it must attract, employ and retain the best global workforce. In order to retain this workforce, the CEO believes that the company's management must exhibit constant respect for the people it employs. In an effort to achieve that objective, High Tech, Inc. developed the Premier

Employer initiative in 1989. The Premier Employer initiative focuses on three areas related to people and employment conditions: leadership, quality, and diversity. Company-wide programs addressing each area have been developed and implemented globally. Each corporate sector has been instructed to address the new initiative in a manner befitting its local community and organization, while also conforming to broader mandates defined by the corporation.

A diversity program was developed to address parity within the company. The purpose of the program was to focus attention on increasing the number of professional promotions of minority employees within certain job levels. Although this diversity program was implemented as part of the Premiere Employer Initiative, the company's diversity program, or "Workforce Diversity," as the company now knows it, was developed in the Semiconductor Products Sector and became the model for the entire corporation. This program expanded the definition of a diversity program: although it addressed the parity and promotion issue, the program also broadened the scope of the diversity model by implementing a program among all employees that emphasized "valuing diversity." This program soon became institutionalized throughout the corporation. The present study examined the Workforce Diversity Program at one Semiconductor Products Sector site in Austin, Texas.

The central Texas site commenced operation in 1974, when a single plant on the east side of Austin began designing and engineering the first products. As the east side facility expanded its product and employee base, a second facility was built 17 miles from the original one in the southern

section of Austin. Today, these two facilities, or "campuses," constitute the world headquarters for two large semiconductor technology groups that employ 10,000 employees, 4,300 of whom are employed at the 220 acre east side campus.

Located at this east side campus are four research and design operations. A fifth operation consists of four wafer fabrication factories. These four "wafer fabs" support the four research and design operations. All four operations have played a crucial role in the success of High Tech, Inc. worldwide. Research and design engineers, recruited from around the world, have contributed to innovative product designs. Product engineers, technicians and operators, working within the wafer fabs, have developed manufacturing technology that enables High Tech to produce smaller, efficient, lower-cost devices.

The east side facility has an extremely diverse work force, according to High Tech's Human Resources Department. While 60% of the total workforce are classified as White, the remaining workforce is 18% Hispanic, 13% Black, 9% Asian, and less than one percent Native American. Ten percent of the workforce are classified as officials/managers. The remaining 90% include crafts people, laborers, office/clerical staff, operators, non-management professionals, service workers, sales persons and technical staff. In addition, the employees at the east side facility have diverse educational backgrounds and experience as well as a broad range of ages and years with the company.

In order to determine how the ideals and intentions of the corporation are manifested in the diversity training program, and the effect of that

training on employees, I used a method of research that allowed me to compare the program's formal objectives with the experiences of employees who attend the diversity classes. The research methodology appropriate for this challenge is that of ethnography.

The literature is extensive in its discussion of ethnographic methods (Agar, 1980 and 1982; Altmann, 1974; Babbie, 1983; Becker & Geer, 1960; Bernard, 1994; Bogdan, 1972; Deutscher, 1973; Fetterman, 1989; Foster, Scudder, Colson, & Kemper 1979; Gans, 1968; Jorgensen, 1989; Le Compte & Preissle, 1993; Rohner, De Walt & Ness, 1973; Spradley, 1979 and 1980; Stephenson & Greer, 1981; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Sturtevant, 1959; Wax, 1971), and these methods have been used extensively during a long history of industrial ethnography (Schwartzman, 1993). In addition, the National Association of Practicing Anthropologists and the Anthropology of Work Review have published many articles about ethnographers studying in corporate settings.

While Malinowski was suggesting that ethnography was a method for grasping "the native's point of view" (Malinowski, 1922), ethnographers working within the United States were developing innovative ways to use fieldwork techniques in some of the earliest behavioral science investigations of organizations and industries (Schwartzman, 1993). For example, the ethnographic approach played a role in the Hawthorne study of the 1920s and 1930s (see Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). One part of this study was designed as a "direct observation study" that would focus on the overt behavior of a group of operators working in one shop. Researchers were specifically interested in supplementing interviews with direct observations

that would inform them not only about what workers said they did, but also about what they actually did in a work context. Roethlisberger and Dickson were influenced by the anthropologist W. Lloyd Warner, who suggested that the work group could be examined as a type of small society, and as such was amenable to the observational techniques of fieldwork. It was this research that first legitimated the field of organization behavior research--what is now termed industrial ethnography. The present study fits into this tradition of industrial ethnography, as the data were collected through open-ended interviews and direct observation.

The study of complex organizations in the traditions of industrial ethnography and ethnology has included the investigation of bureaucracies and the culture of corporations and occupations (see Briody & Baba, 1991; Britan & Cohen, 1980; Dubinskas, 1988; Gamst, 1980; Gregory, 1983; Nash, 1989; Safa, 1986; Schwartzman, 1989; Van Maanen, 1982). In addition, ethnographic methods have been used in research on a variety of organizations in the United States, including studies in high-tech industries, occupations, and communities, such as computer professionals in Silicon Valley (Schwartzman, 1993).

Ethnography requires researchers to examine the implicit but important assumptions that influence the ways in which lives are lived and constructed in organizational contexts. Because ethnographers examine both what people say and what they do, it is possible to understand how everyday routines constitute and reconstitute organizational and societal structures. In addition, such studies can capture the multiple perspectives of different organizational members. Researchers from a number of different theoretical

traditions have begun to recognize the value of linking these micro-level, interactional processes with macro-level structures, and ethnography provides researchers with the kind of data necessary to make this link (Schwartzman, 1993).

The present study uses ethnographic methods to develop a case study of corporate diversity training. The use of case studies is widely used in social science research (Bolgar, 1965; Campbell, 1975; Eckstein, 1975; George, 1979; Kennedy, 1976; Llewellyn, 1948; Lucas, 1974; Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1983, and 1991; Yin & Bateman, 1983; and Yin & Heald, 1975). In general, the case study method is the preferred strategy when "how" or "why" questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context.

During this 12 month investigation, I examined the objectives and goals of the company's diversity training program, and how these intentions were manifested in the workforce diversity classroom. In addition, I examined the effects of training on the student employees who attended two diversity classes: "White Men, Minorities and Women: Culture and Power" ("White Men") and "Valuing the Diverse Workforce."

Because I am a Senior Organization Development and Training Specialist for High Tech, Inc., I was granted access to the company, its diversity classes, the student employees, class instructors, and human resource managers. Permission to conduct the study was granted by High Tech's management, provided that company documents be treated in a confidential manner and not cited specifically. Therefore, all data collected

from High Tech publications, reports and other corporate documents will be cited throughout this report as a "High Tech" document.

Informants for this study were employees of the company and one contract diversity class instructor. The Training and Development Department provided a computerized enrollment list of all student employees registered for two of the three diversity classes. These two classes were part of the company's Workforce Diversity curriculum. The classes were "Valuing the Diverse Work Force," scheduled for January 28, 1994 and "White Men," scheduled for January 11, 1995.

Although I had already observed the third class, "Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior," the class was dropped from the diversity training curriculum. When the Director of Austin's Human Research Organization attended the class, he ordered it dropped because he felt that the instructor's negative portrayal of High Tech's diversity efforts was highly inappropriate and inaccurate. Consequently, all scheduled sessions of the class were canceled, and I was thus unable to conduct interviews with class participants. I provide further discussion of this class in Chapter 3 of this study.

I telephoned 30 student employees and asked them to participate in a study investigating the impact of the Workforce Diversity Training Program on defining individual and group ethnic identity. Participation was explicitly voluntary. Eighteen student employees declined to participate; four agreed but participated only in pre-class interviews; eight agreed and participated in both pre- and post-class interviews (see Appendix A: Employee Demographics). Of these eight, two were male and six were female. The range in age of those participating was 20 to 50 years. During pre-class

interviews, informants who participated in both pre- and post-class research identified themselves as either White, American, Hispanic, or German. Eight were non-management student employees. The average length of employment at High Tech, Inc. was 11 years, with a range of 1 to 18 years.

In addition to the informants who participated in pre- and post-class interviews, all four Human Resource managers I approached agreed to be interviewed. They included both the Director and Manager of the Training and Development Department, the Phoenix Sector Workforce Diversity Program Manager, and the Austin Workforce Diversity Manager.

Two externally contracted Diversity Instructors were also asked to participate in this research project. The instructor for "Valuing the Diverse Work Force" participated in an interview, but the instructor for "White Men" declined an interview. Although he was interested in the project, he said he would be publishing a book shortly and believed it would not be in his best interest to be interviewed.

In order to access the diversity training program's objectives and goals, I interviewed the relevant corporate and sector managers. In addition, I interviewed the diversity class instructor of "Valuing the Diverse Work Force." I then observed both classes in which informants participated. All class materials were analyzed for content and compared to the stated intentions of the class instructors and management personnel.

In addition, I collected data about the informants' perceptions of the diversity classes through pre- and post-class interviews. The pre-class interviews were scheduled with informants one week prior to their

scheduled class. The post-class interviews were scheduled for one week after the class.

Non-management informant interviews took place at the factory in various conference rooms or vacant offices. I conducted interviews with management personnel in their offices, while the interview with the class instructor occurred in my office at the training center. Interview questions were semi-structured and most questions were taken from a prepared interview guide of questions and topics (see Appendix B for Interview Questions: WFD Manager; Appendix C for Interview Questions: Training Department Management; Appendix D for Interview Questions: Diversity Class Instructors; Appendix E for Pre-class Interview Questions: Students; and Appendix F for Post-class Interview Questions: Students). Each one hour interview was tape recorded, and tapes were later transcribed. In addition, demographic information on each informant was recorded. It was therefore necessary to employ a coding system to maintain the confidentiality of the informants. This coded list was kept separate from the research data.

Both classes were conducted in training rooms located in the training building at the East Side facility of the company. During the participant observation of the classes, I attempted to maintain a balance between participation and observation. I took extensive notes during both classes. This detailed record included both objective observations and my subjective responses. In addition, I collected all class materials for subsequent analysis.

The analytical task was to examine the multiple data sources (recordings, class observations and class materials) in order to identify regularities and patterns in language and behaviors during interviews and

class participation. I did this by incorporating three concurrent flows of activity into the analysis: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification.

The first activity, data reduction, involved condensing the data. After each interview, the audio tape was transcribed using a Sanyo Memo Scribe. The transcription was then studied to identify similar phrases, patterns, and themes. After isolating these similarities, semi-structured questions were refined and taken out into the field during the next data collection. This process continued throughout the interviewing phase of the research. The data reduction activity sharpened, sorted, focused, discarded and organized the data in such a way that final conclusions could be drawn and verified after the data were examined for patterns. Upon completion of the interviews, I identified recurring themes.

In addition to examining the interview data, I analyzed class observation notes and materials from "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" to compare the instructors' previously stated theoretical and conceptual intentions with what occurred during the classes. My notes from class observations were also analyzed for patterns and themes, as were course materials.

The second analytic activity involved creating a data display. A matrix was created on an Excel spreadsheet. Recurring themes were assembled in this matrix. This process helped to organize information into an immediately accessible, compact form that revealed patterns in the data. Preliminary conclusions were drawn during this activity, while final conclusions were drawn during the third phase of the analysis.

During the third analytic activity, research conclusions were drawn and evaluated. This was done by developing generalizations based on the themes and patterns observed in the data. I developed final conclusions and verified those conclusions with colleagues in order to develop an intersubjective consensus.

In conclusion, this research has attempted to examine how diversity training conceptualizes differences among people and what the effects of that conceptualization are on the diversity training program. I chose to conduct a case study using ethnographic methods of participant observation and qualitative study so that I could compare the stated intentions of management and class instructors with what actually occurred in the classroom. Following are the results of this research.

Chapter 3: A View From the Top

Each year, as diversity continues to grow within the American workplace, organizations are under increasing pressure to respond in a constructive rather than a reactive manner. To be ready for the workforce of the future, this constructive response must begin now. While leading-edge organizations provide valuable examples of what is being done to facilitate the change from assimilation to valuing differences, no single organization has created a true culture of diversity as yet. Nonetheless, early successes and failures of various valuing diversity efforts suggest that a basic blueprint for creating the culture of diversity does now exist. By culture of diversity, we mean an institutional environment built on the values of fairness, diversity, mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation; where shared goals, rewards, performance standards, operating norms, and a common vision of the future guide the efforts of every employee and manager. This culture is the ultimate goal of organizations seriously committed to the philosophy of valuing diversity. (Loden & Rosener, 1991, p. 196)

Loden and Rosener present a clear perspective on diversity and suggest that there exists "a basic blueprint for creating the culture of diversity within organizations." But this assumed consensus warrants examination. We may fairly ask why such unanimity should exist in a world explicitly characterized by diversity. How, for example, do different groups understand and value diversity, if indeed they do? How do the necessarily abstract elements of any general perspective on diversity become translated into specific messages and activities? How is expertise concerning diversity incorporated into a corporation's larger policies?

This chapter takes a "view from the top" by presenting High Tech's diversity objectives as articulated in interviews and official documents. It discusses the objectives of key High Tech managers, Workforce Diversity program management, Austin Training and Development management, and

the diversity instructor for High Tech's "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" class.

Corporate Objectives and Implementation

In 1992 members of the Semiconductor Sector's Workforce Diversity Department wrote an article intended to promote and report on the progress of its three year "Wave of Change" diversity program. This article, published in High Tech's Semiconductor Products Sector newsletter, stated:

At High Tech, Workforce Diversity is more than a slogan. The "Wave of Change" permeates the air in the halls, the parking lot, the lunch room. The excitement is everywhere. Even the walls exhibit pictures about diversity, High Tech style! That's because Workforce Diversity has been very active implementing a program that goes beyond EEO, and Affirmative Action. They call it "Wave of Change." It all started with a vision that grew out of a concept which High Tech has adopted. It is the desire of upper management to become the Premier Employer by making a supreme effort to meet the needs of their employees.
(p. 12)

The article's reference to High Tech's Premier Employer initiative is where this story really begins. The company believed that building "the best" workforce would create Total Customer Satisfaction, the company's key initiative toward becoming the "the finest company in the world." This awareness had been reflected in corporate initiatives since 1989, when the company's new CEO created the Premier Employer initiative to determine what steps would be required to realize the company's vision.

Although the corporation had outlined the new initiative, there were still many questions to answer. How would the company ascend to Premier Employer status? How would it know when had achieved that status? How would it maintain that status? In an effort to answer these questions, a

corporate executive council was formed to articulate a clearer, expanded vision of High Tech as the Premier Employer.

Recognizing that there were other senior level efforts underway to improve technology and financial performance, a senior executive council was established to focus on this challenge. As a result of these senior executive efforts, the corporation defined the Premier Employer as "the company by which all others are measured" ("High Tech" document). High Tech could achieve this benchmark status by creating model levels of achievement in satisfying customers, working more closely with suppliers, retaining long term investors, earning the pride of the communities where it operates, and providing employees and their families with satisfying opportunities to fulfill their personal and career aspirations.

The council identified a number of key areas related to employment conditions that could be improved in order to become the Premier Employer. Individual programs and subsequent action plans were conceived and implemented. It was assumed that a full and timely execution of these plans would enable the company to attain its desired status. The areas of attention were leadership, quality, and diversity. In the first area, leadership, efforts would focus on the development of future leaders and managers by providing them with the skills and knowledge necessary to successfully manage a rapidly growing workforce. The second identified area, quality, concerned the need to identify and recruit a "world-class" workforce. Diversity was identified as the third key area because the corporation was concerned about Affirmative Action, the retention of minority employees, and current and future Equal Employment Opportunity trends.

In 1986, company statistics indicated that for every female employee hired, the company lost 2.1, and for every female engineer hired, 2.7 female engineers left the company (Workforce Diversity program manager personal communication). In addition, the corporation was concerned about future workforce trends. The company's current statistics and projected demographic trends served as an impetus to develop a corporate parity goal. The specific quantitative details of the corporate parity goal are confidential, but generally speaking, the company hoped to achieve full utilization of women and minorities in the manager job category by the end of 1996. This goal concerned not only the company's ability to hire and promote, but also its ability to retain qualified women and minority employees with respect to their availability in the workforce at large.

Very little was done at the corporate level to develop a formal program to achieve parity until 1989, when the Premier Employer initiative was created. At the same time, within the Semiconductor Products Sector, the Phoenix Equal Employment Opportunity Department took the lead for the entire corporation.

Semiconductor Products Sector (SPS) Workforce Diversity Program

As part of the SPS efforts to develop a diversity program that would meet the Premier Employer Initiative, a Phoenix-based task force was organized and its subsequent sector objectives were clearly articulated: "Evolve to a culture that is bias-free in which High Tech's values of trust, respecting differences and individual dignity are reflected in all that we say and do" ("High Tech" document). The Phoenix task force determined that in order to achieve their vision, they would have to "influence cultural and

systemic change to achieve workforce diversity as a critical component of our business success" ("High Tech" document).

In looking at the company's goals under the Premier Employer initiative, the task force determined that creating the organizational capability necessary to achieve the business success expected of the sector would require a long-term, large-scale organizational, cultural, and systemic change process. As part of that change process, the Equal Employment Opportunities Department changed its name, and Workforce Diversity (WFD) emerged in its place. The department wanted to make sure that the new name reflected the shift from a compliance and punishment focus to one of acknowledging and valuing differences. Changing the department's name was the first of several corporate efforts to establish the systems and processes necessary for the achievement of Premier Employer status. However, the task force concluded that before it could change the organizational culture, it needed to understand the current culture. Therefore, the task force members organized their efforts around an initial objective: to conduct an assessment of the current organizational culture at the sector's headquarters in Phoenix.

An internal analysis was conducted at SPS headquarters in Phoenix, and focus groups among more than 400 employees--grouped according to race, culture, gender, job function, and shift--provided the foundation for an emerging understanding of the organization's culture. Simultaneously, the task force conducted a benchmark study of 75 diversity programs in other companies. The internal analysis and benchmark study resulted in the identification of six goals for achieving the task force's vision. These goals were: (a) developing diversity as a critical business issue reflecting

sponsorship and leadership by senior managers; (b) creating a network and infrastructure capable of sustaining cultural diversity; (c) improving High Tech's external image in order to attract individuals from diverse backgrounds; (d) focusing on schools and the community as workforce suppliers; (e) making significant progress toward parity representations in management; and (f) leading a long-term, large-scale organizational cultural and systemic change process.

These goals provided the foundation for a diversity plan that was to be guided by four key approaches to diversity. The approaches were: (a) manage the diverse workforce, (b) learn to respect difference, (c) acknowledge diversity as a competitive advantage and (d) establish management accountability for diversity program goals. The Phoenix Workforce Diversity Program believed that addressing each of these approaches was necessary for leading a successful large scale organizational cultural and systemic change process effort.

Managing a diverse workforce requires an examination of the learning and leading role of the manager. This approach attempts to provide supervisors and managers with the awareness and skills necessary to lead an increasingly diverse workforce. In addition, it attempts to address such systemic changes as staffing, succession planning, training, and performance management. The approach also stresses strategies that integrate diversity concepts into business initiatives.

The second approach involves learning to respect difference; it focuses on change strategies that encourage full employee involvement in creating the emerging culture. The task force believed that employee networks, alternative work scheduling concepts, participation in community and

educational events, as well as internal diversity workshops would "shift" the culture.

The third approach concerns acknowledging diversity as a competitive advantage. The key focus of this approach is on linking diversity to organizational effectiveness processes and to the structure of work. Members of the task force believed that as this approach was integrated into work systems and processes, diversity would surface as a strength. During a pilot program, a 500 person wafer fabrication factory would attempt to change their work culture using a whole systems perspective, incorporating customer expectations into the design of an emerging culture. Organizational effectiveness, diversity, teams and individuals would be linked through appropriate work systems and structures. It was believed that this process would link diversity to work and productivity.

The fourth approach was identified as holding managers accountable for specific diversity program goals. This approach focused on increased emphasis on the sector's efforts to improve in the areas of parity and Affirmative Action, internal and external charge activity, and High Tech's management succession planning efforts. A key measurement would be the achievement of the corporate parity goal by 1996.

The intention of the Semiconductor Products Sector Phoenix Task Force in Phoenix was to develop an implementation strategy for each of these four objectives that would initiate cultural and systemic changes within the current organizational culture. They believed that this strategy would allow them to accomplish their vision and thereby develop a bias-free culture that values trust and respects difference in its employees.

Austin's Workforce Diversity Program

Because of the perceived strides made by the Phoenix Task Force, High Tech's Austin site followed suit in 1991, and, by changing their EEO/Affirmative Action Department to Workforce Diversity (WFD), began their efforts to implement a similar program. Senior Austin Human Resource management personnel determined that the program would need high visibility within the business in order to gain the support of management. Therefore, the Human Resource department asked each of Austin's Group General Managers to assign managers to a diversity task force similar to the Phoenix task force, with the hope that their involvement on this task force would promote greater visibility for the Workforce Diversity program.

The Austin task force developed its own mission and determined how that mission would be achieved. Its goal was to "Create an atmosphere in High Tech which embraces our diversity and incorporates diversity as a critical component of our business success" ("High Tech" document).

Each task force member was asked to interview three credible people in order to identify the critical diversity issues facing Austin SPS and to develop a strategy for each issue. Although the issues and strategies identified by these interviews were fairly consistent with those in Phoenix, Austin's strategic approach to those issues was quite different. While the Phoenix task force considered the overall cultural and systematic change process strategy to be the focus of their efforts, the Austin task force saw the culture change process as only one of five approaches. The other four approaches involved (a) marketing and communication, (b) family/lifestyle, (c) recruitment and

growth, and (d) training. Five task force subcommittees were established to focus efforts on each area of strategic focus. Each subcommittee worked independently and reported back in Workforce Diversity task force meetings. The Marketing and Communications Subcommittee's objectives were to develop an awareness and understanding of workforce diversity among employees and the management team in Austin, to conduct internal marketing of the Workforce Diversity Task Force and its efforts, and to influence and enhance the corporate image of diversity in their advertising. The Family and Lifestyle Subcommittee was challenged to make proposals to address family and lifestyle issues, to improve the health of Austin's High Tech employees through a holistic wellness program, and to increase focus on employee health and well-being. The Recruitment and Growth Subcommittee's objectives were to propose programs to address the recruitment, retention, and promotion of women and minorities. The Training Subcommittee would develop a diversity training curriculum for professional and nonprofessional employees in order to create an awareness of the diverse workforce in Austin.

The Cultural Change Process Subcommittee's responsibility was to develop a process by which Austin's current culture would be changed "so that diversity would be embraced" ("High Tech" document). As in Phoenix, the Cultural Change Process Subcommittee determined that they would first need to conduct an assessment of the current culture at the Austin sites. However, unlike in Phoenix, their proposals for such a study were not able to gain Human Resources and Senior Management support. Without that

support, Workforce Diversity could not secure financing for the assessment.

The Workforce Diversity manager commented,

We could not get Senior Management to walk the talk by supporting our efforts towards workforce diversity. We couldn't get them to take a leadership role that was visible and demonstrated to the workforce that they would lead our diversity efforts. We couldn't even get them to agree on the definition of diversity. (personal communication)

An assessment never occurred, and two years after establishment of the task force in 1991, it was quietly dismantled. Austin's Workforce Diversity manager attempted to explain why the task force was unable to accomplish its goals:

Where I think it [Austin task force] was set up for failure is that a task force should be short in its intervention and does a task and goes away. It was never fully funded to carry out its tasks, and although we had visible, some visible management support, the management team as a whole was not fully comfortable themselves with the whole issue of diversity. So consequently, I don't think we had the biggest gains we could have from the management team and the workforce. And I think more so than anything else, I think it's difficult to get 6,000-8,000 employees to fully embrace and understand something as nebulous as overpowering this diversity. But it [the task force] did have some successes. All those things I think were the factors that helped push, and sometimes impede diversity. I don't think we will ever have everybody singing off the same sheet of music or using a similar definition or responding to diversity within the norms of the culture or norms of the organization because I think that's always changing too. (personal communication)

Unlike in Phoenix, where the four approaches related to an overall strategy of creating a cultural and systematic change process, Austin had created a program in which a culture change process was only one aspect of a larger strategy. When that approach failed to receive management support and financing, the success of the program became dependent on progress in the other strategic areas of the Workforce Diversity program. One of the most

successful of these areas was the implementation of a diversity training curriculum.

The Workforce Diversity program relied heavily on training to drive the diversity program and institutionalize the "valuing diversity" concept within High Tech's current Austin culture. Whereas Phoenix believed that training was a useful mechanism that supported change efforts, Austin has relied on it to create change. This training strategy appears to be consistent with High Tech's past practices, as training has historically been used as a catalyst for change efforts; the company has traditionally used training to institutionalize new corporate initiatives.

Training Department

In addition to using training as a developmental tool for individual employees, the corporation has used it as the vehicle both for the development of its organizational culture and as a means for initiating the company's culture change efforts. For example, High Tech developed a mandatory, company-wide orientation class that all new employees attend on their second day of employment. The training materials articulate corporate goals:

for employees to form a personal partnership with High Tech and, by working together in teams to continuously improve and achieve Total Customer Satisfaction [the corporation's fundamental objective] and Six Sigma Quality [one of the corporation's key initiatives]. ("High Tech" document)

The corporation expects that High Tech employees will both make the customer their top priority and achieve Six Sigma quality through continuous improvement. Put simply, Six Sigma denotes a statistical measurement of quality: Six Sigma Quality is defined as a rate of defect less

than 3.4 parts per million. High Tech applies this principle to services as well as products throughout the company. In other words, High Tech is striving for absolute perfection. In their efforts to become absolutely perfect, the company requires that all of its employees continually enhance their individual competencies by engaging in life-long learning. High Tech has aggressively promoted its internal training program since the late 1970s, when the (now former) chief executive saw that developing the company's workforce was vital to its future success. The Director of Austin's High Tech University emphasized this focus on training: "Training is seen as the change agent within the corporation to get us to where we need to go with our human resources" ("High Tech" document). Therefore, whenever a new corporate initiative is developed in order to change the corporation's culture, it is introduced to the organization through training.

Further evidence of High Tech's commitment to employee training is a training policy implemented in 1990, in which each employee is required to have at least five days of training per year, which is equal to 2% of their annual work time. In order to provide each employee the opportunity to benefit from training, available training resources include High Tech's corporate facility in Chicago, regional training facilities in both Phoenix and Austin, local universities and colleges, workshops and seminars, vendor/supplier/customer training, and on-the-job training.

In 1993, Fortune Magazine reported that some of the best training in America was taking place at High Tech (Henkoff, 1993). The article stated that the corporation delivered 102,000 days of training to employees, suppliers, and customers in 1992. High Tech does not employ many professional

educators; instead, it relies on a cadre of outside consultants, including engineers, scientists, and former managers, to teach most of its courses. Fortune reported that High Tech, whose sales were a record \$13.3 billion in 1992, spent \$120 million on education. That sum was equivalent to 3.6% of payroll, more than double the 1.5% goal President Clinton advocated during his campaign. Since the appearance of the article in 1993, the company's sales have increased to \$22.3 billion in 1994, and over \$130 million has been spent on the education of the company's employees. Keeping in mind the fact that these numbers reflect only completed formal training programs, the scope of High Tech's commitment to training is impressive.

High Tech calculates that with every \$1 it spends on training, it delivers \$30 in productivity gains within three years. Between 1987 and 1992, High Tech cut costs by \$3.3 billion, not by the normal expedient of firing workers, but by training them to simplify processes and reduce waste. Sales per employee doubled in the same period, and profits increased by 47%. High Tech's training appears to have influenced the company's bottom line (Henkoff, 1993).

The objectives of the Training and Development Department at High Tech's Austin SPS site are consistent with corporate goals. The Department states that its charter is "to provide improved techniques and skill development opportunities to help ensure the success of our Austin-based clients" ("High Tech" document). Furthermore, the Department states in its vision statement, "We accomplish this by practicing aggressive and unrelenting customer service and by constantly researching, designing, teaching, upgrading and institutionalizing the best practices of process

consultation, organization development, training and education" ("High Tech" document).

Because High Tech has historically relied on training to institutionalize new corporate initiatives, Austin management naturally considered diversity to be a training issue. When the new Workforce Diversity program emerged with its charge to initiate a large-scale organizational cultural and systemic change process, the most likely tool for accomplishing this was a training curriculum. Therefore, the Workforce Diversity program, in partnership with the Training and Development Department, attempted to develop a diversity curriculum that would create the desired employee awareness and sensitivity to diversity. However, in interviews with Training and Development Department management, the director and the manager provided different explanations for the company's development of diversity classes.

The director of the Training and Development Department stated that he believed the company wanted to help employees understand the existence of differences among employees. He felt that because the company (a) was becoming more of a multinational company, (b) was aware of future demographic trends, and (c) had experienced growing dissatisfaction regarding Affirmative Action policies, it wanted to send a message that traditional ways are not always acceptable and that diversity has value. He stated that the Training and Development Department would attempt to accomplish this objective by developing the skills and knowledge needed to deal with cultural differences. He believed that these skills included an awareness and understanding of cross-cultural communication and a basic

understanding of what behaviors would be culturally appropriate when interacting with people with different customs.

The Training and Development manager reiterated the director's belief that the company felt it was important for its employees to learn about each other's cultures and to understand how to work well with each other. He also felt that the company wanted its employees to grasp some of the values of the people's differences and to understand that "it's OK" for people to be different. He agreed with the director that the training curriculum should provide the awareness of how to work with people's differences. However, in contrast to the director, the manager also pointed to another reason behind the creation of a diversity curriculum: "It's been a faddish thing more than anything else." He continued by saying,

There are also certain perhaps legal implications to bringing things in such as being in the middle of a lawsuit or being charged with something or another. And so by having a whole Workforce Diversity Department, the logical solution was to bring in Workforce Diversity Training. And so we did. (personal communication)

This Workforce Diversity curriculum was developed by the Workforce Diversity manager, rather than by members of the Training Department. The curriculum has included classes in the prevention of sexual harassment, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and cultural diversity. The original diversity curriculum included two courses also taught in Phoenix--"White Men, Women, and Minorities in the Workplace: Culture and Power" ("White Men") and "Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior"--as well as "Valuing the Diverse Workforce," a course created by Austin's Workforce Diversity and designed by an outside instructional consulting group.

Workforce Diversity Instructor Objectives

The present study examined each of the classes in the Austin Workforce Diversity training curriculum: "White Men," "Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior," and "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." For each of the three classes, interviews with instructors, pre- and post-class interviews with class participants, and participant observation during each diversity class were the intended data collection methods.

Although I observed and participated in all three classes, a comprehensive study was only possible for "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." While pre- and post-class interviews with participants occurred for "White Men," the instructor did not show up for a scheduled interview and later explained that he was in the process of publishing a book and was not comfortable with participating in this research.

Comprehensive study of "Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior" was impossible because of a change in the diversity curriculum. Before the instructor and students for the class could be interviewed, the Senior Human Resource Manager instructed the Training Department to remove the class from the diversity curriculum because of the manner in which the instructor depicted Corporate America in general and High Tech more specifically. The instructor had spent the first half of the class discussing how corporations have historically "changed the rules" around employment candidate qualifications, making it continually more difficult for minorities to be hired into corporate jobs. He also criticized High Tech's diversity efforts by suggesting that they lacked substance. Since all further

sessions of the class were canceled, no interviews were possible with the instructor or with class participants.

Although interviews with the instructor were not possible for "White Men" and "Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior," the instructor's objectives for each class, as communicated in High Tech training documents, are discussed in the following section. The instructor's objectives for "Valuing the Diverse Workforce," as reported in an interview with the instructor, are also included below. In addition, the results of the participant interviews for "White Men" and "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" will be discussed in Chapter 4, "Looking From Below."

"Valuing the Diverse Workforce."

The instructor for "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" was a psychologist from a local university's student counseling services program. In an interview, he explained his understanding of High Tech's objectives for the course. He recounted a meeting with Austin's Workforce Diversity manager and the Senior Manager of Human resources, in which the Workforce Diversity program's objective, as reflected in the course, was explained to him: "getting people to at least begin verbalizing what cultural programming had occurred to them and how it might interplay on a day to day basis for individual relationships within a work group." The diversity manager wanted the class participants "to walk away from the class understanding that you should avoid raw judgment calls on people based on their own cultural programming." In this meeting, the instructor was asked to design an eight hour class based on his understanding of the company's position on diversity.

The instructor explained the extent of that understanding in the interview for the present study:

It was never communicated to me why High Tech developed a Workforce Diversity program. I've never really been clear about what the motivation is for High Tech in terms of addressing diversity issues. When I met with the head person in Austin and overseas, he said that corporate headquarters was feeling that diversity was an important issue for them to address. I didn't hear him articulate a company understanding of how diversity relates to their business practices, in terms of do they seem to understand it being part of their competitive advantage. I only heard that diversity was something that High Tech needed to do. The other part of that was that although he saw diversity as an important issue, he felt that other skill areas were more important than diversity. When he ranked that on a scale of one to ten, he said diversity was kind of a five or something that needed to be addressed—that really other skills were the most critical things to be done.

The instructor designed the class, based on his admittedly limited understanding of why High Tech had decided to have a diversity program and diversity training. He believed that a training class should include three bases: an awareness base, a knowledge base, and a skill base. Because "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" was considered an introductory diversity class, only two of those three bases were incorporated into the design: awareness and knowledge. The instructor said that he first wanted to increase participants' awareness of cultural issues:

Culture is so intangible for people. I am trying to give them some handles. We explain that culture is a shared set of beliefs, values, assumptions, customs, that are shared by a group of people and passed on from one generation to the next. So, culture is something shared. It's got to be within a social system. It's all the dynamics that go with that social system. Another part of culture is that it is something that defines our perception of reality to a certain degree. And the other is that . . . so saying to a certain degree you can't have culture by yourself. You have to be with other people to have a sense of culture. And in

that shared sense you have a shared perspective of how the world works.

In addition, the class would include discussion regarding how people can bring their individual assets to the workplace and make a contribution:

We have had good discussions around how diversity is a way of looking at how the system, the business of High Tech, is tapping into and allowing to include and capitalize on all the contributions that people make in creating an environment where their differences really stimulate them and develop a greater capacity for what their worth is.

The instructor also wanted to provide a knowledge base for understanding how culture impacts individuals and organizations:

We want people to be able to understand the concepts around diversity. A lot of the issues we have gut feelings about. They can have kind of a cognitive knowledge base to kind of pull and separate the issues out.

For example, the course was designed to introduce basic actions which promote productive relationships among diverse peoples. In addition, the Workforce Diversity program management wanted to replace an exclusionary conception of diversity with a more inclusive one. The instructor concluded the interview by remarking, "That's a lot to do in a day, so the skills will come later."

The instructor believed that the following class objectives would accomplish the awareness and knowledge base goals: (a) define culture and its effects on attitudes, perceptions and behavior; (b) develop an awareness of one's own cultural identity and memberships; (c) identify the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion; (d) foster an awareness of culture as a factor in workplace misunderstandings; and (e) identify basic actions which promote productive relationships among diverse employees. The instructor believed that through these objectives, he could successfully create awareness and

knowledge: "What all this is about, is trying to help people to identify with one another and just trying to help them bridge those gaps that they made for different reasons."

On January 28, 1994, the instructor conducted a session of "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" for High Tech. An account of the implementation of the instructor's objectives as he facilitated an eight hour class and the perspectives of the students of this class will be discussed in Chapter 4, "Looking From Below."

"White Men."

"White Men" is described in the 1996 Training and Development Course Catalog: "This course addresses the dynamics of workplace interactions among minorities, women, and white males. Its objective is to gain an understanding and some useful techniques of the power dynamics used in the workplace" (p. 179).

"White Men" was the first diversity class brought into the Training Department as part of the new Workforce Diversity curriculum. High Tech professional employees were originally identified as the target audience for this class. However, the class is open to nonprofessional employees, and the class usually consists of both groups. Historically, this class has been extremely popular: at the end of each year, many High Tech employees are still waiting to take the class. For instance, at the end of 1994, approximately 200 employees remained on the Training Department's course request list. Part of this popularity is due to the presentation style of its instructor.

The instructor is a 62 year old "White male" who holds PhDs in organizational psychology and clinical psychology. His class has been

designed to examine the White male's role in Corporate America and how that role and the power he has enjoyed have been threatened by changing workforce demographics.

The eight-hour class is entirely lecture-based. He attempts to make his points through stories and jokes. "The doctor" is extremely animated, and it is not uncommon to hear loud laughter that builds throughout the day. He has often been described as "a character," a comedian, humorous, enjoyable, and extremely knowledgeable.

"Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior."

Added to the Workforce diversity curriculum in 1993 and developed by a Black male clinical/industrial psychologist working in Organizational Development, "Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior" was described in the 1993 training catalogue as a course that "examines European, African and Asian values, epistemology and logic with the intent of promoting understanding at the intra-personal, inter-personal, group, organizational, inter-organizational, and societal levels" (p. 84).

The goals of the course were to combine current management technology and knowledge of the philosophical aspects of cultural difference into a science of cross-cultural management for a diverse workforce. The immediate objective of the course was "to provide a supportive learning environment for peers to work together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and understanding, seeking ways to bring to fruition the goals and objectives of their business" (1993 Training Catalog, p. 84). In addition, the personal objectives were to "familiarize the executive with his/her social-psychodynamic patterns of initial ethnic acculturation which could detract

from and/or preclude effectiveness and commitment in the decision making process."

The class was primarily designed for "executives who formulated company policy and those individuals who were obligated to meet company goals and objectives to receive their merit increases" (confidential instructor document). The executive would be guided through a series of experiences which were designed to (a) demonstrate unconscious cultural bias that governs the decision making process, (b) analyze socialization as a reinforcement of values which effect behavior, (c) explore basic attitudes that foster feelings of mistrust between self and "others," and (d) make a personal commitment to be a change agent for the agency. An assumption guiding the class was that in order to become a change agent, one must (a) establish the uniqueness of one's own identity, (b) analyze the mechanisms of the system that need to be changed, and (c) set one's goals and objectives for that change.

The eight hour class was designed to look historically at the U.S. corporation and the effects of the values, behaviors and attitudes on minority employees. Pilot sessions of this class had been run both in Phoenix and Austin in 1992; based on the evaluations from both sessions, "Diversity: Insights Into Patterns of Behavior" was added to the Austin curriculum.

Ten eight-hour classes were scheduled between February and November 1993, of which five were held. Evaluations were conducted after each class with favorable results. However, the remaining five scheduled classes were canceled after the Senior Manager of Human Resources attended the November 11, 1993 session and was dissatisfied with the course's content and the instructor's presentation style. He felt that the instructor conveyed

an extremely negative message regarding the corporate world in general and, more specifically, did not focus on High Tech's accomplishments within Workforce Diversity. The Director of Training and Developing was directed to "kill the class" and the five remaining scheduled classes and twelve 1994 classes were canceled. The course was dropped from the Workforce Diversity curriculum, leaving only "White Men" and "Valuing the Diverse Workforce."

Conclusion

In conclusion, the goals of enhancing sensitivity to diversity were implemented through existing corporate technologies (e.g. Training) and in accordance with other corporate goals and programs (e.g. Premier Employer). Translating the general challenge to enhance diversity into actual courses was problematic. The courses varied in such aspects as knowledge vs. skills, audiences, and expected outcomes. They depended heavily on what was available from the local reservoir of practitioners. Clarity could not be assumed, and when conflict arose, corporate goals were supreme, as was demonstrated in the cancellation of "Diversity: Insights into Patterns of Behavior." Therefore, something more complicated than a consensus on diversity is going on here. There is clear evidence that the courses have a manifest/official function of diversity enhancement, but there is also a latent function, or hidden agenda. The corporation will be supported through other messages: employees don't just learn diversity, they learn High Tech, too.

Chapter 4: Looking From Below

While Chapter 3 looked at High Tech's diversity program from the corporate perspective, this chapter will examine the Workforce Diversity program by "looking from below": it will examine two of these classes from the perspectives of the employees who enrolled in the diversity classes. This examination will include a discussion of the general themes and patterns that were extracted from both pre- and post-class interviews as well as the classes themselves.

The chapter is organized in four sections. The first describes the class enrollment process. The second section discusses the pre-class interviews with employees enrolled in the diversity classes and addresses their impressions prior to the class. The third section identifies patterns extrapolated from observation made in class and materials distributed in class. The final section discusses the results of interviews conducted with enrolled employees after the classes.

Class Enrollment

Enrollment in the diversity classes must be placed in the larger context of training in High Tech. All employees at High Tech are required to take at least 40 hours of training each year. Training is available at the corporation's High Tech University in the Chicago, the sector headquarters in Phoenix, the Southwestern Region of High Tech University in Austin, or at one of the two local High Tech training centers in Austin. Training hours can be accumulated during self-paced independent study programs, professional conferences and seminars, or classroom participation. Employees can select classes on many topics from the High Tech curriculum catalog. Curriculum

areas include Engineering, Environmental Health and Safety, Leadership/Management, Manufacturing Training, Quality, Sales and Marketing, Software, and Professional Development. Several diversity classes are part of the Professional Development curriculum. As with all of High Tech's classes, employees must enroll in diversity classes before they attend them.

How and why employees enrolled.

During pre-class interviews and during one of the classes, employees commented that they enrolled either because they chose to take the class or because they were told to take the class (see Table 4-1).

Five of the 16 employees who participated in this study commented that they had enrolled themselves in one of the two classes. Four of those five employees (2S101, 4S101, 5S101, and 3S200) chose to attend the class because they wanted to take the class. Two of them (2S101 and 4S101) were interested in the topic of diversity and wanted to learn more for themselves. One of these employees remarked:

I requested to take the class because I want to see more and more about the diverse workforce here in High Tech and in general everywhere. I work with different races, different cultures. I wanted to see what they [class instructors] has to say about it. (4S101)

Another noted, "I want to try to get to know other people. To try to understand them. See where other people are from." However, one employee was more curious than anything and just thought it might be interesting. He commented:

The class sounded interesting. I've been working here a long time. I didn't know there was anything like this. I saw the class in a catalog. I

was reading what the descriptions were and I thought this kind of sounds neat. Let's take it and see what is going on. (3S200)

Table 4-1
Reasons For Class Enrollment

Diversity Class ^a	Employee No. ^b	Employee Position ^c	Chose Class		Had to Take Class	
			Interest	Limited choices	Told by Mgr.	Told Mand.
VDWF	1S101	NP			x	
	2S101	NP	x			
	3S101	NP				x
	4S101	NP	x			
	5S101	NP	x			
	6S101	NP		x		
	7S101	NP			x	
	NI1	NP			x	
	NI2	NP			x	
	NI3	NP			x	
	NI4	NP			x	
	1S200	NP				x
	2S200	P				x
	3S200	NP	x			
WM	5S200 ^d	NP			x	
	6S200	NP				x

Note.

^aVDWF = "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." WM = "White Men."

^b101 = course number for VDWF. 200 = course number for WM. NI = not interviewed.

^cNP = nonprofessional employee. P = professional employee.

^dEmployee 4S200 not interviewed after enrolled in study.

One employee wanted to enroll so that she could take back what she learned to others. She told me:

I picked this class as my class. But I picked it just because of things I've been seeing going on in the area with the girls having to take problems to personnel and with this man not handling . . . not getting along with

people because of his color. I just hoped that maybe it would enlighten me and I could take it back and share it with these people that are just not getting along very well or bringing bad things up. (5S101)

The fifth employee who had self-enrolled in a diversity class did so for a rather different reason. He confided:

Well, first of all I signed up for this class but I really don't know what it is about. Well, you see, we have to take 40 hours a year. And all the other ones [classes] were way over my head . . . classes like management and lab, and there weren't very many to choose from, and from the title it sounded interesting. Now, me and a trainer took a course last year on technical writing. We thought the class was about how to write. Well that's not what it was about at all. I mean it was about something way over our head. There were engineering people and up in the class writing programs and it was just way over both of our heads. So, some of the classes that we signed up for were titles with little captions [course descriptions]. . . . This class sounds like it is about a workforce--you know, problems. I don't know what it's about. It says it's a workforce. OK, because I'm a lead person in here and I've had a lot of trouble with how to approach people--how to deal with things here. But, the three of us last week were trying to figure out what to take this year and so many of them [classes] don't deal with the production people. You know we might have a High School education, but a lot of it is management or whatever and we're really running out of classes. As long as I've been here we've had these classes. I just thought it sounded interesting. That's the only reason I put my name down on it. And if I just knew . . . I don't know what I'm getting into. I'm just going. (6S101)

Eleven employees remarked that they had been told they had to take the class. Seven of the eleven (1S101, 7S101, NI1, NI2, NI3, NI4, 5S200) were told by either their manager, supervisor or group leader that they would be taking the class and were enrolled in it automatically, although many of them would have preferred to take other classes. One such employee remarked:

I was told we had to by my boss, my area supervisor. I told her I wanted to take a computer class and a couple of other classes. I'm a very slow learner. I have to really work with it and they not going to train you in here. You need to take a class. I was going to ACC [Austin Community

College], but I had certain people tell me not to do that because High Tech has the same classes. So, I was going to take my money and go to ACC so I could learn the basics. This year my supervisor was real good about explaining the courses in the book. Like the computer class. But I want to make sure it is not too far over my head and it was going to benefit my job here. But my supervisor said I should also take this class. (5S200)

Although most of these employees were not interested in taking a diversity class, one employee stated that she needed to take the class as part of the requirements for becoming a group leader. She stated, "I am taking this class because it is on my training road map and recommended, so I have to take it" (3S101).

In contrast, there were two employees who, in addition to not being interested in taking a diversity class, did not know they were enrolled until they received a class notification letter from the Training Department or were contacted by this researcher and asked to participate in this study. One of these employees commented:

I was told I had to. When you called me that was the first I had heard. So I really. . .I'm sure my manager picked classes for me. I didn't choose any classes this year. They picked them for me. After I talked to you yesterday, my group leader came in and she say, "Oh, you have to go up to a class." And I said, "Yeah, I've already talked to the lady." They just gave it to me. I didn't know anything about it. I had no idea. (1S101)

And finally, four of the 11 employees who did not choose the class remarked that they enrolled in one of the two classes because they were told the classes were mandatory and they had to enroll and attend (3S101, 1S200, 2S200, 6S200). Several employees stated that they enrolled simply because the class was mandatory. The only professional employee who participated in this study commented:

Our manager, our operations manager, sent out a memo stating that four or five classes were going to be considered mandatory. . .that everybody in the department would have to take them at some point. And I had taken all of them or most of them. I can't remember for sure if this was on there or not. I think it was. So when I sat down to do the IDP [Individual Development Plan] this year, I was looking through it and I said, "Oh, I think that's on the list and so I need to take it." (2S200)

Another stated: "My manager's manager's manager said it is mandatory.

Everybody in my organization must have "Customer Satisfaction," Six Sigma," "Preventing Sexual Harassment," and this diversity class. And so I am taking it" (6S200). However, one employee was not as accepting and remarked:

It's mandatory. I guess for everybody in High Tech to take this class. And that's why I'm taking it. Otherwise I would have taken another class. It comes up automatically. You have to take it. There's like certain classes that are mandatory that you have to take. Otherwise, I wouldn't waste eight hours of my. . .I mean to me it's a waste. You know there's probably another class I could have taken --computer skills--or some kind of DOT [Hazardous Materials] class or something. (1S200)

Employee position and class selection.

There appears to be an association between an employee's position within the company and the diversity class he or she takes. Although both classes have open enrollment, these classes have in the past been targeted to particular employee populations within the company. The 1992 Training Course Catalog defined the targeted audience for "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" as "Non Supervisors/Nonexempt personnel," and it identified "Managers and Supervisors" as the targeted audience for "White Men, Women, and Minorities in the Workplace: Culture and Power" ("White Men"). In 1993, the catalog revised these distinctions and opened the

enrollment in both classes to "All Employees." Although the current stated target audience for both classes is more inclusive, there appears to be an association between the employee's position within the company and the diversity class that person takes (see Table 4-2).

Table 4-2
Class Demographics

Diversity Class ^a	Enrolled	Employee Position ^b		
		P	NP	UN
VDWF	11	0	11	0
WM	27	14	5	8

Note.

^aVDWF = "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." WM = "White Men."

^b P = professional employee. NP = nonprofessional employee. UN = unknown.

All employees enrolled in "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" were nonprofessional employees. There appears to be a higher number of professional employees enrolled in "White Men." Twenty-seven employees attended this class: 14 were professionals, 5 were nonprofessionals, and the positions of 8 employees were not known.

To summarize, it appears that nonprofessional employees took the class as part of their larger training requirements, not to address specific needs they experienced. The decision to take a diversity class, or to select from several diversity classes, was not always theirs. Despite High Tech's stated respect for the individual, nonprofessional employees were not given the

opportunity to choose classes for themselves. Therefore, larger organizational schisms are reproduced in the enrollment for diversity classes.

Pre-class Interviews

This section describes the impressions and expectations of 12 employees prior to attending their diversity class.

Participation in study.

There appeared to be an association between an employee's position within the company--professional or nonprofessional--and the employee's participation in this study. Thirteen of 14 employees who enrolled in "White Men" and were known to be professional chose not to participate in interviews. Only one professional employee, an engineer, agreed to pre- and post-class interviews (2S200). Seven of the 11 nonprofessional employees who enrolled in "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" agreed to participate in interviews. In addition, all five nonprofessionals enrolled in "White Men" agreed to participate (see Table 4-3).

Table 4-3
Employee Participation in Study

Class ^a	Enrolled	Participation requested ^b			Employee Response					
					Agreed		Declined		No Response	
		P	NP	UN	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
VDWF	11	0	11	0	0	7	0	0	0	4
WM	27	14	5	8	1	5	2	0	11	0

Note.

^aVDWF = "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." WM = "White Men."

^bP = professional employee. NP = nonprofessional employee. UN = unknown.

Before each diversity class, I contacted by phone each enrolled employee. Each employee was called and either spoken to directly or a detailed message was left explaining the project and requesting their participation in the study. Eleven employees had enrolled in "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." All of these employees were classified as nonprofessionals. Seven employees agreed to participate and four did not respond to the phone message.

Twenty-seven employees enrolled in "White Men." Fourteen were professional employees, five were nonprofessional, and the status of eight employees was not determined. Again, all enrolled employees were called. Although some employees were directly contacted, the majority of the employees were not available to receive the call. Detailed phone messages were left. All five nonprofessional enrolled employees agreed to participate in pre- and post-class interviews. Eleven professional enrollees did not return the phone call. Three did: two managers and one engineer. The two managers said that they could not participate. One manager said that he had decided to take vacation the week of the class and would not be in the class. The second manager told me that he did not have time to participate in interviews. He said there was a lot going on in his department and he was very busy. The engineer agreed to both interviews.

In summary, professionals chose not to participate in this study, whereas nonprofessionals did. Although nonprofessionals participated, they may have felt that they had to, given my own status as a professional within the company. Professionals, on the other hand, may not have been as compelled by my own professional status to participate. This contrast again

suggests an organizational division between nonprofessional and professional employees that may impact the effectiveness of diversity classes.

Diversity viewed negatively.

The subject of diversity is not viewed positively by the interviewed employees. The Workforce Diversity program and the classes are intended to address perceived problems between diverse groups of people within the workforce. Most interviewed employees believe that a diversity program has been initiated because the company is concerned that employees are not getting along with one another. They feel that the corporation has somehow determined that the reason people are not getting along is related to the fact that the workforce is very diverse. One nonprofessional High Tech employee of fourteen years stated:

Well, I've been here for almost 14 years, and I know years ago there were employees that talked about how people were being treated, so I guess the topic of diversity is about getting at how people are feeling about the workforce. I guess the diversity program is going to make better how people get along with each other. I guess the company figures there is a lot of trouble going on down here in the manufacturing areas between the Black and Whites and Spanish, and they have to do something. (1S101)

Most interviewed employees agreed. They believe that the company's actions have been based on the assumption that most workforce problems are due to misunderstandings between diverse members of the workforce. The interviewed employees view the diversity classes as outgrowths of this assumption. A nonprofessional employee commented:

I think the whole diversity thing is supposed to be about how to get along or understand. . . . They think you have to be able to work with people of different minorities and to be able to get ahead and make something of your job and your success and their success. Without working together as one they believe nobody will have anything. They

think we have a lot of things to fix and diversity classes are suppose to be helping us with that. (5S101)

Several nonprofessional employees suggested that the company has even identified the diverse groups of employees that other members of the workforce have problems with. One employee suggested that the title of the diversity class tells employees where the problems are:

Well, just what it says basically in the title. The minorities and women are wanting to get ahead, and men are thinking they are not getting anywhere these days because of women's rights and minorities. And the women and minorities think that they are still behind, just because they are who they are and yet everybody wants the same thing out of life. I mean everybody wants to be successful. They want a house and a car and they want to be the Jones. In order to be successful, you need to be able to hold down a job and think of yourself as successful, you know what I mean? But maybe this is causing too many problems, and the company decided they have to do something about it. (1S200)

During the pre-class interviews, several employees suggested that the diversity program was the company's response to dealing with the problems that come with the demographic changes and the transition employees must make between "what was and what is to be." One nonprofessional employee saw diversity as a way of moving the workforce forward from an old, troubled work environment:

Diversity is supposed to be about how we can work together better in the workforce. . .the men, the women and the minority people. Sometimes we say things about them and we do things, and that's just the way the culture is and we've been that way for ever and ever, and it's going to be real hard to change. It's taking a little bit of time to get everybody into the groove. It's a problem because they seem to be promoting men around here a lot faster than women, and men want to be so demanding on women. (1S200)

The professional employee suggested that the changes and the resulting problems were due to attempts by the corporation to provide

competitive opportunities for the workforce. He believes that the current largest diversity problem involves getting rid of the "Good Ol' Boy Network" and becoming an new organization that is not dominated by this group:

High Tech has this diversity program because it's going to be a difficult transition from ten years ago. We've had diversity, but then the management levels and the engineering professional level has definitely been White male dominated. And that is changing as a consequence of keeping all the workforce more competitive. I'm sure there's clear recognition that there's talent out there other than the White male environment, so it's probably just to help people deal with the problems associated with the transition from the old "Good Ol' Boy Network" type thing. (2S200)

He continued by adding:

And if there are diversity problems anywhere, here is where they are. And in trying to get away from the problem area, it requires a big change in attitudes. The transition is difficult because the company, in essence and maybe without realizing it, must change what makes up the company. . . White Males. I don't think they understand that yet. Perhaps this "White Men" class is the company's way of addressing this. High Tech always deals with things with training. You can usually tell what the problems in the company are by what new training comes out. (2S200)

Diversity training was discussed extensively during pre-class interviews. Most employees believe that the corporation has responded to diversity problems by implementing diversity classes and then making people go to them. Many employees commented that these are corporate attempts to teach employees how to behave and get along better with one another, "whether we need it or not." One nonprofessional employee stated:

The class has been put together because the company believes there is a lack of understanding in the workplace. People see things differently, hear things differently. There is an accent and language barrier. You also have to learn how to get along and deal with varied people in the workforce on a daily basis. We have diversity classes probably to make us appreciate each other more. We have to learn all that we have to

contribute and share with one another and to practice tolerance instead of just preaching it. I'm sure that gets put into an action mode instead of just staying as a nice idea. (6S200)

Although most employees viewed High Tech's diversity efforts negatively, one nonprofessional employee had a more optimistic outlook on the program. He felt that the diversity training could benefit both him and his coworkers:

High Tech has all races of people--female, male, different races--and maybe they started this diversity class to understand how people are different and how to get along with other people, so they can understand and have a better environment for people to work in, so everybody would get along. And so, they gave this class to people who would take it and help understand why people do certain things. I guess just to help everybody along in the same environment, since everybody is different and from different cultures. (2S101)

He added:

Well, that's just the way cultures are, you know. Different states. I believe they each have special talents, special gifts. I think High Tech tries to bring that together to please people. I mean they see, like, Hispanics and Orientals you know, you know, dependable people and they work hard so they try to bring that into the workforce and you know they have creative minds. That's basically what I think of it. They do classes to try to get to know each other's ethnic backgrounds and try to bring people together. To understand other people, you know, ethnics and how they work. It makes it much easier to work with them and understand how they feel. It just makes a better work environment for all of us. (2S101)

This employee concurred with the "official" view that the company is motivated to help its workforce. He truly seemed to appreciate High Tech's efforts to develop a workforce that appreciates, gets along with, understands, and respects one another.

However, at the other end of the continuum, the professional employee was extremely cynical about the company's motives. He believed

that the company's actions contradict its stated objectives; therefore, he did not put a lot of credence in the corporation's message regarding constant respect for the individual and respect for diversity within the organization.

They talk about valuing diversity and respecting people. The constant respect for people is one of their true beliefs of the corporation. But there seems to be a conflict here between their stated key belief and the drug testing policy. The company has a drug testing policy that is saying that everyone is guilty until proven innocent. And that doesn't seem like respect. And the company's counter-argument is that we are trying to provide a drug free place, and that every employee has a right to expect a drug free work place. On another note, High Tech talks about diversity and valuing diversity, but actually my father-in-law has taken this same course ["White Men"] at his old business and here at High Tech and said that it is virtually the same class, except High Tech left out the portion of it that deals with sexual preference [heterosexual or homosexual]. I find that rather interesting. I won't argue with their right to do so, but it's clear that High Tech's concept of diversity is not intended to include all diversity. It is certain that some diversity will be promoted and other diversity will be implicitly ignored or whatever. Let's face it, the only reason we have a diversity program is to avoid law suits that might involve different people's civil rights. (2S200)

The message here seems clear. Most of the employees who were interviewed as part of this study believe that the concept of diversity carries a negative connotation. They believe that the corporation views diversity as a problem brought upon them by a troubled, diverse workforce that cannot get along with one another. Interviewed employees do not see the corporation's perception grounded in their daily lives. In fact, many employees mentioned that contrary to what the company believes to be true, things are not that bad. Although there may occasionally be employee disagreements, these are usually based on individual, not group, characteristics: they may not be "diversity" based, according to the interviewed employees.

Employees believe that overall, people work hard and well together toward a common goal. One of the nonprofessional employees said that he was taking the class not because there were problems, but because he just wanted to meet other people. He commented:

I've been here six years and I've never seen any problems. People pretty much get along together. Yeah, they try to work together. They work hard and try to put out good product. I've never seen anybody. . . I am going to take this class to try to get to know other people. I want to see where other people are from. . . other departments. The class will probably give me a clearer view of what I haven't seen before as far as, like I said, other people that I haven't seen. Give me a wider picture of things so I can understand how to relate to them on a day to day basis. It'll help me once I've found out how everybody else is like. We all work together even though we are on different shifts. (2S101)

He added that even though there are a lot of people in his group from different cultures, he believes that his group works well together, and he appreciated the fact that there was diversity. In fact, he stated that he saw this diversity as a real asset:

Yeah, because it's nice to know that there is different cultures and different things, and you get to enjoy everybody else's food and background. That's my feeling. That's the way I feel. If you have people in the same culture, they pretty much think the same, and do the same thing. But if you have various cultures, it's good to spread that knowledge and different ideas. You get ideas and all the gifts and knowledge that they have to make good product. (2S101)

Another nonprofessional employee echoed these ideas. He also believed that everyone worked together in his group.

Actually, we are all here to do one thing. I mean, we're all here to serve one purpose. You know, and that's to make money for the company. It doesn't matter if you are Black, White or Yellow. We each have a specific job that needs to be done, and we each have a talent or something that we view or separates us from everyone else. But yet we still all need to be able to work together as one. Even though someone

else might be more educated than myself or I might be more educated than this one here and that's why I'm at where I am. (1S200)

And finally, one woman put it very simply:

That's one thing about this little department here that we are in. We all do work together and we do get our work out. We have our little sisters and brothers ups and downs, but in the end we still work together. (5S200)

Although most interviewed employees felt that there was a degree of harmony within their work groups, they still felt there were some problems worth discussing. In fact, many of them admitted to some work-related problems. As one nonprofessional employee put it, "No, I don't have any diversity problem. Any problems we have are work problems that come from people other than us" (5S101). When I asked the employee what she meant, she told me that a lot of the work-related problems she and her coworkers deal with are the result of interactions with managers, supervisors or group leaders. In fact, when I asked her to identify the diversity at High Tech, she commented:

The difference in levels of professional, like some production operators all the way to engineers. Like, you know, different levels of professional versus production. I mean, this is the thing that separates people from each other. (5S101)

Another nonprofessional employee responded similarly. He stated:

When you ask me about what the diversity is, are you talking about production and management? You have leadership, management, operator, you know, there's a lot of different. . . . Well, how about like management, supervision, production. I call that, we put that in separate categories. Is that what you mean? (6S101)

There was an overwhelming amount of discussion during pre-class interviews regarding conflicts between nonprofessional employees and their

managers, supervisors or group leaders. One nonprofessional employee told me about the ongoing problems with her supervisor:

Yeah, sometimes people aren't treated fairly, but I'm sure that if we come to personnel and talk about it, it will get worked out. But, I kept giving this person [her supervisor] a lot of chances, and she and I had a talk, so I don't know how things will be now after she get back. It's the little petty things to me wasn't professional. It was more or less, like, to me, under cover because by her being a supervisor or something she had a way of doing people certain ways that. . .she would maybe hide behind or what, but I've experienced things like that about her being a supervisor or a manager or something over me. (1S101)

Another nonprofessional employee complained:

The group leader is a major, major, major, major, major, major, major problem in our area. My group leader takes long breaks, long lunches, and goes into other modules herself. That's probably one thing that is causing that resentment in those two Black girls because our group leader tells us one thing and does another. It's do as I say not as I do. And it gets me angry too, but I can't do nothing. I mean I'm sure I can go up to my supervisor and talk about it with him, but I don't know what's really best to do. I just don't want any repercussions from her if she knows that it's me complaining. But all of my coworkers. . .it's very difficult to work with our group leader. She once told me that the reason why she is so strict. . .the reason why she is so demanding and wants to always be in control is because she grew up in a military life style. He father was a military. So she grew up very strict. She says that's why she is the way she is today. But I feel that's no way to treat . . . she doesn't treat us like people. She treats us like kids. Say it's like 15 to 12 and almost time for us to leave, and all our work is done and everything is cleaned up and we're in another module just standing. It may be four of us just standing waiting for 12:00 to come along and she'll come to us and point her finger like. . .come here, you need to be in your module. You need to stay over here. She makes us feel like. . . We're not horse playing. We're not being loud, you know. (4S101)

Another nonprofessional employee told a story of one of her first experiences with her supervisor. Although it did not involve a confrontation with her supervisor, it created a problem that might not otherwise have occurred. She stated:

When I first started, I was told by a supervisor to stay away from certain women because they were gay. It's just not fair. It's none of my business. I shouldn't have been told that, you know. She [her supervisor] has gotten talked to. It wasn't the first time she has done that. So, there was no problem. I was just warned from the very beginning to stay away from them. I guess because they were different from what the supervisor was. The supervisor you know was heterosexual and I'm assuming that's what she thought was against her morals, and she knew I had a boyfriend and everything and she warned me to stay away from these girls because these girls were gay. She was just was kind of ugly about it. It turns out that I have become really good friends with one of them and her family, and you know, it's just sad that she was prejudiced against them like that for no reason when they are really nice women in the area. (4S101)

During one pre-class interview, a nonprofessional employee who has worked at High Tech for 16 years communicated his frustration with the engineers he works with.

I have to work side by side with a lot of engineers, and I don't know if this is what you want, but a lot of times they think they can just call on the phone and change something on the phone with a program, and you can't do that. You know, it's got to be written, it's got to be signed. We have a lot of friction there. They say things are OK when they ship the lot out the door, and I see that the lot is not ready to go out the door and then they get sent out the next day, but us being the off-shift we can not move some through if we are not sure. It's got to meet our spec. too. I mean, we have guidelines to go by. We can't just move anything at least because they call and say ship it. I think that's mostly my confrontation with work. The engineers. And sometimes supervision gets in the way. Sometimes management wants to change things, but yet we run the floor in a smooth way, and when they want to come through with a lot of changes and stress, that's not the better way. We need to keep it as is. . . a smoother way of doing things. If they won't listen to the way we want to do it. . . . This is the way we been doing it and if we change it, it will cause this, this, and this. If we change it to this, it's going to cause this. It's this kind of friction that I have a lot of with Engineering. But we do have to go by everything here. Things has got to be signed to go out. You can not just. . . just because we say engineer doesn't give you the right we will move this or we will do that. Everything has got to be signed and there is a procedure for them that's easy to follow. (6S101)

This same employee also suggested that besides conflicts between professional and nonprofessional employees, the only problems he encounters are "everyday" work problems:

Most of our problems come during pass-ons. That's a shift change. A pass-on. What's going on after this day. A lot of people complaining about why wasn't this done before. They had plenty of time to set the program and set the system up. We get a lot of that. We have that quite a bit. Why wasn't this set up first. You know they had time or we have a lot of quality errors that people try to put on the next person. It is tedious and so it's kind of a back and forth thing. Well, you did it. Well, I didn't have time. You know, that kind of thing. Our product has to be quality, you know. The quality has to be as perfect out the door and a lot of people don't want to fix their problem that they caused. They do have quite a lot to do. It's understandable but they just don't. . . I don't see any reasons in pointing fingers. The job has got to be done, and if you got time to do it, do it. But we have a lot of problems with the operators who will argue about or they will come up to me and say, "Well that so-and-so left this lot for me to do and I don't have time." (6S101)

Although most of the work-related problems appeared to be centered around the interaction between nonprofessional employees and supervisors or other professional employees, there was one nonprofessional employee who identified a race-related problem. However, she suggested that it was a problem because of Equal Employment Opportunity legislation. She remarked:

I do know specifically that there are. . . you do have to have. . . so many black individuals. I know one specific case where I was working nights where a supervisor had to hire this certain Black person because he was Black and that was one of the criteria coming straight down from Personnel. And I think that is total bull. You know, I don't care. EEO is wrong. You should be hired for your skills, not because of who you are. . . and, um, your color or what you think you deserve. It actually causes a lot of racial problems. I think that is the biggest thing. (1S200)

The employee went on to say:

There were a lot of people that, this is at the operator level that I'm saying, downstairs one of them, a Black person, got promoted. I mean, they all complained and griped about it. But it didn't go any higher than that. You know what I'm saying? It just stayed before level supervision--a shift administrator type person--and everybody ran crazy in talking about it. Yeah, it was ugly for awhile, and then they got used to it, sat back and said, OK, that's fine. But people had been mad not because the person was Black but because he got promoted only because he was Black. (1S200)

And finally, one nonprofessional employee summed things up by noting:

Problems are really just work problems. It's not just because you're from Vietnam or Timbaktu. I don't see that on the floor [manufacturing floor]. I really don't. It is a work problem. It's something that they don't want to do. They don't ever call them names like that "China man" or never say anything like that. . .never anything like that before. So it's just work related is what it is. Yeah, it's just work-related situations. (6S101)

Most employees view the corporations diversity efforts negatively.

However, they view it that way because they believe that the corporation views diversity negatively as well. Many of them described their work environments positively. Although they recognize the diversity within it, they do not attribute work-related problems to that diversity. However, many of them acknowledge that most of the "diversity"-related problems they encounter involve their supervisor or other professional personnel, such as group leaders and engineers.

Although employees do think about "diversity," the issues they see are not the same as those perceived by management. Whereas management perceives that diversity problems exist between races and minorities, employees clearly defined the diversity problems as those between professional and nonprofessional employees. The biggest "diversity" issue they see is the arrogance of some employees in professional/occupational

categories. Again, this is evidence of an organizational separation between professional and nonprofessional employees. Secondly, many employees criticized the "other side" of the company's previous approach to diversity-- hiring and promotion--which they see as unfair. Although this "other side" represents an older, Affirmative Action/EEO approach to diversity issues, such approaches continue to have negative results: they are not favorably viewed by employees and have failed to encourage respect for diversity. Therefore, some employees interpret the diversity classes in light of that negative experience. Finally, employees feel that at least during work hours, they respect others, do their job and do not see racism within the company, even if their remarks in the interviews are not entirely free of racism.

Perceived value of diversity class.

There appeared to be an association between how employees were enrolled in the classes and the pre-class perceptions of the value of the class. All employees who personally selected and enrolled in either class, whether they were professional or nonprofessional, assumed the class would be valuable (see Table 4-4). Those who did not choose the class were less likely to consider the class valuable.

In the pre-class interview, one nonprofessional employee who chose to enroll in a diversity class anticipated:

It will probably give me a clearer view of what I haven't seen before. It will give me a wider picture of things that I understand about and that I can relate to on a day to day basis. It'll help me once I've found out how everybody else is like. (2S101)

Table 4-4
Value of Class

Class ^a	Employee	Reason for Enrollment			Value?		
		Chose	Limited Choice	Mgr. Enrolled	Told Mandatory	Yes	No
VDWF	1S101			x		x	
	2S101	x				x	
	3S101				x	x	
	4S101	x				x	
	5S101	x				x	
	6S101		x			x	
	7S101			x			x
	NI1			x			x
	NI2			x			x
	NI3			x			x
	NI4			x			x
W M	1S200				x		x
	2S200				x		x
	3S200	x				x	
	5S200				x		x
	6S200				x		x

Note.

^aVDWF = "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." WM = "White Men."

However, prior to taking the class, five of six employees who had been enrolled by either a manager or supervisor did not believe that the class would be worthwhile. And four of the six employees who enrolled in the class merely because they understood it to be mandatory were not enthusiastic about what they would walk away with after the class. One nonprofessional employee commented:

You know, I don't personally feel that I need to spend eight hours in a classroom with a whole bunch of other people and someone instructing me, you know telling me, well, you know, you're White and you're Black and you're Yellow, and we should all live harmoniously together. Well, all that's a known fact. I don't know. I personally see it as something I could just spend eight hours doing

something else. You know what I'm saying? There are probably other people who could use it. I get along with anybody and I have no problem with people from different backgrounds, so it's just a waste of eight hours for me. You know, it might not be for someone else. Someone may need to. . .but I'd take the eight hours of something else if I could. But I'm only taking it because I have to. I've pretty much gotten out of it before. Actually, I was scheduled for this class two different times, and each time something came up and I didn't have to go. This is like the third time they've got me in three years. (1S200)

The professional employee expressed similar feelings: he felt insulted that he had to go to the class because the company assumed that he did not already know about and understand diversity. He stated prior to his class:

The instructors will probably attempt to teach the students some things that they will assume that the student doesn't know, when in fact maybe he does. I am aware and I understand and am more aware than other people. I get along with everybody. We have a bunch of different nationalities and we all work together. I don't want to take this class. I get along with everybody. Most of the time they are steering attitudes towards how they want you to feel, I already feel that way! (2S200)

A nonprofessional woman also stressed her understanding of diversity before the class, although she had a slightly different attitude toward classes in general:

There's a lot of High Tech classes that are about attitude and I already feel, "Oh goody, teamwork." "Oh goody, diversity." And they flip my switch and I get manic. It's like I get ridiculous. I understand that people that are in a phase of "I don't really care," or have emotional ties to High Tech and can be swayed by a lot of the classes like Customer Satisfaction. You know, classes that teach us to see each other as our customer. They need the classes to understand that we're all working together toward a common goal and must rely on each other and help each other. I came here that way, and I turn into probably a fanatic in the classes, so in my case I think I am getting brainwashed. I wish there was another kinder word for it. Because that has so many negative connotations to it. (6S200)

To summarize, three themes emerged during pre-class interviews. First, there appeared to be a correlation between the employee's position within the company, professional or nonprofessional, and whether or not the employee chose to participate in this study. Second, diversity was viewed negatively, and diversity classes were seen as the means to solve workplace problems. Nonprofessional employees perceived most of the "diversity" problems to be between themselves and their managers or supervisors. Third, there is evidence of a pattern between the method of enrollment in the classes and a employee's pre-class perception of the value of the class.

Class Participant Observations

This section will contrast High Tech's management perspectives and intentions with what actually occurred during two diversity classes: "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" and "White Men." Three patterns emerged in one or both of the courses. First, the instructor's actions often contradicted his rhetoric and the company's stated intentions. Second, valuing "sameness" was emphasized, contradicting the company's conceptual framework of "valuing diversity or difference." Third, the absence of professionals in "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" led the nonprofessionals to conclude that they alone were responsible for learning about valuing diversity.

Contradictions.

The first theme that emerged related to contradictions within course materials. During a pre-class interview and class discussion, the instructor of "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" appeared to be able to intellectualize the concepts relating to the topic of cultural diversity. In many instances, he logically articulated concepts and provided examples of those concepts.

However, after he had moved on to another topic, a comment, example or exercise sometimes contradicted a point made previously.

For instance, during his discussion of perception, he attempted to make very clear to the employees, through lecture and exercises, that assumptions are often based on visual cues that are inaccurate. During this discussion, he presented a perception model that included the four steps involved in creating a perceived reality: raw data, cues and hints, filters and maps, assumptions, and perceived reality. The model showed pictorially how an individual can create a perceived reality by filtering and making assumptions about raw data. He then had the class participate in several exercises in which they had opportunities to experience perception based on this model.

One of the exercises required the employees to join one of three sibling groups that they identified with: oldest, middle, youngest. The employees were then instructed to talk about (a) what it was like to be the oldest, middle or youngest child, (b) what was positive and negative about being in their birth order and (c) whether there had been any lasting effects with their parents and siblings. Employees formed groups and began to discuss these questions. After a period of time, the instructor asked the group of middle children and the group of oldest children to comment on what they thought it was like to be the youngest child. The youngest sibling group was then asked to comment on whether these perceptions were accurate and, if not, how they would have described themselves. The instructor recorded the comments on a flip chart.

This process was replicated with the oldest group and the middle group. After each group had an opportunity to discuss how they perceived

other groups, and those groups had a chance to comment on those perceptions, the instructor told the class the purpose of the exercise: to demonstrate what it is like to be judged by another group that bases their perceptions on their own past experiences. The instructor commented:

Based on our filters and maps, we make assumptions about what we are actually observing. Through assumptions, we tend to fill in any missing information and create our perception of the raw data. In this stereotyping, there is a little nugget of truth, but people stop looking for the uniqueness and narrow their vision. In other words, the reality may be the same, but one's perception may be different based on one's position within the family.

At this point the instructor read Gordon Allport's definition of stereotype from The Nature of Prejudice (1958): an "exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify or rationalize our conduct in relation to that category." After doing so, he warned the class to be careful about stereotyping groups. He added, "We need to be careful with the many dimensions of culture and how they effect our perceptions of how we create our own reality."

Another exercise asked employees to select the employee in the class whom they thought was most likely to have grown up on a farm, least likely to have grown up on a farm, most likely to be devoutly religious, and least likely to be devoutly religious. After the employees selected their candidates, a discussion followed as to why these individuals had been selected. The reasons for the selections included: "He looks honest and seems to be devoted to his kids"; "He dresses casually"; "He seems to be a nice guy"; and "She is from a newer generation and probably is not religious. Besides, she told me she has a pierced belly button."

At this point, the instructor concluded his discussion of perception

by explaining the difference between primary or external cues (obvious visual cues such as physical attributes, ethnicity and gender) and secondary or internal cues (children, education, religion). He provided the same definitions for primary and secondary cues that he provided during his pre-class interview.

The preceding exercises and subsequent discussions were conducted in an effort to demonstrate the influence that several factors have on how people perceive one another. They appeared to be engaging and productive. However, at the end of the day, when the instructor concluded the class with an exercise intended to punctuate the day's learning, his method of leading the exercise seemed to contradict his warnings about inaccurate perception.

The instructor chose an exercise called "Cultural Walk." He began by asking, "If you are or identify with being a White or European American, please walk to the other side of the room." Three female employees and two males got up and walked across the class room. They were then asked by the instructor, "What do you never want to hear again about your group?" One female responded, "That we all have prejudices deep down inside of us." One of the males commented, "Whites are also discriminated against and we are not superior." The group was then asked by the instructor, "What do you want others outside your group to appreciate about your group?" One employee stated, "That we are a diverse group." The instructor asked a third question, "What do you need most from others outside your group?" One of the women responded, "Patience," and another commented, "Don't judge us by a few." The instructor asked them to go back to the other side of the room.

The instructor continued the exercise by asking, "If you are Chicano, Chicana, Hispanic, Latino or Latina, please walk to the other side of the room." Four employees did so: two women and two men. The instructor again asked, "What do you never want to hear again about your group?" One of the male employees stated, "That we are lazy and don't contribute to the system." The instructor asked the second question, "What do you want others outside your group to appreciate about your group?" An employee stated, "That we have our own culture." Again the instructor asked, "What do you need most from others outside your group?" One of the women responded quickly, "Respect," and one of the males added, "We want people to appreciate that we have a very diversified culture within the Hispanic culture." This group was then asked to return to the other side of the room.

Again, the instructor asked the class, "If you are or identify with being Afro-American, Black or Caribbean, please walk to the other side of the room." Two employees, one female and one male, did so. When they were asked the first question, "What do you never want to hear again about your group?", the male employee answered, "Blacks are doomed to fail, not smart, not equal, all criminals, drug addicts, and poor." The female responded to the instructor's second question by stating, "We want to be appreciated for who we are and the contributions we have made to this country." And finally, both agreed that what they needed most from the group was "respect and understanding."

The instructor continued the exercise by asking the same questions of employees that identified with being men, women, over 45 (when no one represented this group, he asked for those over 40), and members of divorced

families. Each time, various members of the class walked over to the other side of room, responded to the same three questions, and then walked back.

The instructor concluded by asking for reactions to the Cultural Walk exercise. One male employee commented, "When you called White/European American, I started to walk, but I'm Italian and so I sat back down." The rest of the class responded that they had enjoyed the exercise.

After the class, I asked the instructor for the list of the identity group categories he had selected from for the exercise and was given a hand written list of the groups he had called out during the exercise. When I attempted to clarify the request, asking for "the entire list," I was told that list had over 30 categories. When I asked the instructor what criteria he had used to select the categories he had called out during the exercise, he replied, "I looked around the room and, for example, saw no Asian-Pacific Islanders so I didn't call that category out."

This method of selection appears to contradict the instructor's earlier comment to the class that rather than defining another's identity by primary or external cues (obvious visual cues such as physical attributes, ethnicity and gender), they should instead rely more on the secondary or internal cues. In addition, during the pre-class interview, the instructor had commented on the difference between primary and secondary cues:

Say perhaps one dimension of culture is where you grew up. If I grew up in East Texas and somebody else grew up in the panhandle of Texas, their cultures are different. You may never know that. Or you might be able to experience a difference of how that is. For one, like for me, I grew up on steak and potatoes. I grew up in the panhandle. Other people grew up in East Texas. They grew up on sweet potatoes and ham. Now when we sit down to have a meal, I'm not real big on sweet potatoes and ham. You know it's like--how about a burger and fries? You know? And the issue is. . .if you want to motivate me, if you want

to understand who I am, it's going to have less to do with the fact that say my skin is white or brown and more for the fact that I grew up in the panhandle of Texas. Because there you are getting the essence of me. And if you want to manage me, then don't look at the fact that I'm male and White. What you need to look at is that I have certain values that come from my upbringing. Another major thing is that . . .this is a life event. . .a random event. . . . My father developed MS [multiple sclerosis] when I was eight, and so I probably wouldn't be a psychologist if that hadn't happened to me. Now if you want to treat me as a White Male, somewhat conservative, that's an external picture people have of me. . .you are going to miss me by miles. And you are not going to miss me if you understand internal. And so in terms of making bridges, we are helping people move past those primary dimensions of cultural difference and help them get into the internal issues. What we are trying to do in this class is trying to help people understand other people's identity formation. And what's important for them. If you want to motivate people, you have to find out what really motivates them, not what you think motivates them.

After all of this discussion regarding primary and secondary cues, the instructor had relied on primary cues to categorize the individuals in his class for the purpose of this final exercise. Even the employee who chose not to walk as "White or European American" because he identified with being Italian noticed the instructor's reliance on primary visual clues. He commented to me after the class, "I guess I didn't look Italian enough for him to call that group."

Valuing sameness vs. difference.

The second theme that became apparent was whether the instructor framed the class around valuing "diversity" or "sameness." The corporation, sector and Austin Workforce Diversity program have all consistently emphasized the company's need to value the differences in the diverse workforce that constitutes High Tech. They have defined mission statements, identified goals, and developed programs to help them achieve their mission. As part of the diversity program, the company has worked with an outside

consultant to design a customized diversity class for High Tech employees. In addition, it has contracted with one consultant for over five years to bring his own class into High Tech.

The instructor of "White Men" has framed diversity differently than the corporation may realize. In his conception of diversity, it is more appropriate to value "sameness." At least at the surface level, this approach contradicts the corporation's message regarding diversity.

On January 11, 1995, 27 High Tech employees attended "White Men." During the class, the instructor discussed the corporation as a culture, the effects of the changing power structure on the White male, and cultural diversity programs. The instructor acknowledged that although cultural diversity is an important concept, workforce diversity programs tend to focus on differences and, in doing so, have actually separated people. He believes people's "sameness" should be emphasized:

People say difference is what is the problem. Why do we focus on differences? When we keep focusing on differences, we say we don't fit. When we focus on differences we separate. Differences are important, but by themselves they separate. This is the piece missing in diversity training. We need to talk about sameness. What we have in common. I deal with gender because there are a lot of patterns of sameness. We can't just focus on style, we need to focus on similarities. We are not going to focus on style. Focusing solely on difference is going to separate us. Sameness presents harmony and homogeneity, whereas difference presents conflict and heterogeneity.

Therefore, unlike the management of the Workforce Diversity program, the instructor teaches that rather than focusing on difference, the corporation should focus more on the similarities among its employees. This message and the intentions of the instructor contradict those of Workforce Diversity program, in which difference is valued as the basis for a

harmonious organization. This disparity is further evidence that the management's expressed intentions do not translate in any direct, clear way into the diversity curriculum.

Where's management?

The third theme regarded the perception of nonprofessionals that High Tech has developed diversity classes that only nonprofessionals are attending. They see themselves as responsible for developing skills and knowledge of how to create a more harmonious workplace, and, implicitly, they feel that they are blamed for the diversity "problem." Many employees, although interested in the subject matter, appear to resent that perceived blame and are upset that management does not attend diversity classes. They interpret the absence of professional employees as support for their belief that the classes have been developed only for nonprofessionals because they are the ones who "need it."

The afternoon session of the "Valuing Diversity in the Workforce" class may have contributed to that perception. During the session, the instructor shifted from the morning's focus on awareness to creating a knowledge base for business application. He did so by introducing four resources: a video on "Supervising Differences," a list of "Supervisory Skills for a Diverse Workforce," a list of basic actions which can promote productive relationships among diverse employees, and a list of tips for working with differences.

The video, "Supervising Differences," addressed cultural awareness and workplace misunderstandings illustrated through a series of scenarios between production workers and their supervisors. Each scenario presented a

situation in which a supervisor and production worker(s) attempted to work through a diversity issue. In each case, the scene escalated to conflict between the two groups. Discussion followed the video. When the instructor asked employees if they could relate to any of the scenarios, one female nonprofessional employee commented that her supervisor had told her that "It is against High Tech policy to speak Spanish at work." She didn't feel that there should be such a policy: "Even though sometimes we do speak Spanish when we want to talk about our supervisor without him knowing what we are saying, we still have a right to speak our native language whenever we want to." When asked by the instructor whether she had talked to personnel about this she retorted, "Personnel is a joke. Personnel is the biggest joke. Personnel backs Management." Another High Tech nonprofessional employee remarked,

Supervisors are on ego trips. They think they are God's gift and can do anything they want to. They boss us around all the time. That's why some of us are here and we didn't sign up for the class. It's because our supervisors think we need this class, so they sign us up for it whether we want to come or not.

This comment initiated a lengthy discussion regarding supervisors in the workplace. A nonprofessional employee stated:

Our supervisors are the ones that need to attend this class. Where are they? I don't see any of them in here with us. They are the ones that need to learn about valuing diversity.

At that point the instructor responded by commenting, "We have created stereotypes of supervisors, just as supervisors have against us." After this response, the instructor began a discussion regarding a list of "Supervisory Skills for a Diverse Workforce." He then introduced a list of skills for supervisors.

The list of Supervisory Skills included: (a) open up membership to diverse employees, (b) share the organizational rules, (c) identify stereotypes, (d) examine assumptions about others, (e) acknowledge real cultural differences, and (f) coach all employees for success. The list might have been better received had there been supervisors in the classroom. However, there were not. The nonprofessionals were angered by their absence and asked the instructor why he was telling them this. One employee remarked:

My manager should be hearing this. Why are you telling us? We aren't managers or supervisors. We told you that at the beginning of the class. Now you give us this list. You should tell our supervisors. Why are we the only ones having to hear it? Don't they think they need it too?

The instructor had no response. He listened intently and then moved on.

The instructor moved from supervisory skills to identifying the basic actions which can promote productive relationships among diverse employees. The action plan he proposed suggested that supervisors should (a) understand that his/her role is to work through others; (b) identify his/her own cultural values and those that define the culture of the organization; (c) study the cultural patterns of the workforce and how they affect productivity; (d) accept the fact that everyone has perceptions which are confused with an absolute reality; and ours is not the only reality; (e) give membership to diverse people; (f) share the rules by communicating directly and openly about job requirements; and (g) hold people accountable for valuing diversity, managing differences and reward people for their efforts. Accordingly, all employees should (a) control assumptions -- both about people and about job requirements, (b) maintain standards but remember that treating people fairly requires sensitivity to cultural differences, and (c) pay attention to the process,

and ask, "What's going on here?" Although the instructor had presented a plan that not only included actions not only for supervisors but for all employees, the class again commented about their supervisors. One employee stated:

I guess this makes some sense, but are we the only ones that are supposed to try to do it? How can it make a dent if no one else does it too? I mean, my supervisor doesn't do this stuff. She sends me here because I guess she thinks I'm the one with the problem. It's like I am being punished.

At this point the instructor said that sometimes supervisors attended his class, but most of the time they went to another class, "White Men." Several employees responded to this comment. One remarked back excitedly, "Why don't they all go to this class? Why do they have their own class?" The instructor said that he thought it was a slightly different kind of class and told the employees to check with Training and Development to see if they could go if they wanted to.

The instructor concluded this section by providing the class with some tips for working with differences. One tip suggested that one must communicate respect by showing sincere interest, encouragement, and positive regard for one's employees. A second tip reminded the employees to avoid judgments and moralistic, value-laden statements. A third tip suggested that a supervisor personalize his or her knowledge and perceptions, in other words, own his or her own biases and values rather than forcing them on others. The fourth tip suggested that employees use empathy and try to understand the other person's perspective. The fifth tip proposed that one should be reciprocal and foster a true dialogue, taking turns talking. A sixth tip stated that employees should seek creativity and flexibility and not

expect everyone to act as they do. And lastly, employees were advised to take their share of the work, since working through differences takes effort from all parties. The class had no response.

All of the concluding tips presented by the instructor to the class for working with differences are devoid of concepts related to "diversity." They are merely variations of the human relations school of management, an irony which would further confirm the nonprofessional employees' conclusion that diversity classes are just as important for management as they are for themselves. Nonprofessional employees expressed annoyance that they are the only employees required to develop the skills and knowledge necessary to create a more harmonious work environment for High Tech's diverse workforce. Because nonprofessional employees concluded that their supervisors do not attend the diversity classes, supervisors seemed to them to be exempt from this responsibility.

Post-class Interviews

This section documents the results of the analysis of post-class interviews with nine employees who attended one of two diversity classes. During the analysis, three patterns became apparent: (a) there appeared to be an association between how an employee defined valuing diversity during post-class interviews and the diversity model used in the class they attended; (b) the employees' perceived value of the class changed after taking the class; and (c) employees perceived the absence of management during the class as indicative of the company's perception of diversity as a problem among certain employees who are "punished" by taking the class.

Defining diversity.

Each diversity class used a particular model to frame the presentation of diversity. "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" applied the model that the Workforce Diversity program incorporated into the original class design. That model proposed that High Tech's diverse workforce should be valued for its employees' differences. The instructor for "White Men" framed his class content around a model that suggests that although the workforce is diverse, employees are really very similar and that sameness should be valued above difference.

As part of this analysis, a comparison of pre-class and post-class interviews was conducted. The researcher reviewed employee comments about what valuing diversity meant to them. During this analysis, a pattern emerged (see Table 4-5). Eleven out of 12 employees stated in pre-class interviews that they valued the differences diverse employees brought into the workforce, and one employee stated that although she realized there were many diverse employees at High Tech, she saw everyone more as the same.

After employees had attended one of the two diversity classes, 8 of the original 12 employees participated in post-class interviews. Of those eight, four employees (2S101, 4S101, 5S101, and 6S200) stated that they still valued the differences of the diverse employees at High Tech. However, four employees (1S101, 1S200, 2S200, and 3S200) now emphasized the valuing of similarities or sameness within the diverse workforce. Three of those four employees had attended "White Men," where the instructor stressed sameness.

Table 4-5

Valuing Diversity vs. Valuing Sameness in the Workforce

Diversity Class ^a	Employee No.	Conception of Diversity	
		Pre-class	Post-class
VDWF	1S101	Sameness	Sameness (mgrs.)
	2S101	Difference	Difference
	3S101	Difference	?
	4S101	Difference	Difference
	5S101	Difference	Difference
	6S101	Difference	no interview
	7S101	Difference	no interview
W M	1S200	Difference	Sameness
	2S200	Difference	Sameness
	3S200	Difference	Sameness
	5S200	Difference	no interview
	6S200	Difference	Difference

Note.

^aVDWF = "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." WM = "White Men."

One "White Men" class participant (6S200) stated in both pre- and post-class interviews that difference should be valued, and one "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" participant (1S101) stated in both interviews that sameness should be valued above difference. Three employees who attended "White Men" (1S200, 2S200, and 3S200) changed their original response from valuing difference to valuing sameness.

For instance, employee 2S200 commented during his pre-class interview:

There is a diversity at the individual level. In my terms that would include everything, personalities, gender, ethnic background and skill level certainly. People are coming from different directions and much of their own personal--cultural and family and everything--background will bias them as they come into the workplace and interact. They are coming with different traditions, perceptions and everything else and,

uh, High Tech and Workforce Diversity would like us to recognize these differences and value the contributions different people can make to the company.

After he had attended "White Men," he was asked what the class had been about. He stated: "I guess I thought the purpose of the class was just to bring in a mixed audience and try to explain some of the shared and similar factors in our background and our culture." Employee 3S200 also shifted from valuing diversity to valuing sameness after the class. She remarked during her pre-class interview:

High Tech has developed a cultural diversity training program because there are so many different cultures working here now and they've got to do that to help everybody out as a whole. Because, like for the Japanese, we don't know too much about them and we have Japanese people working here who would help you in your department. We need to know what their ideas are and what's going on and respect what they know and who they are.

After this employee had taken the "White Men" class, she said during her post-class interview:

The instructor told us about how the Americans are. . .how the Europeans are, how the Hispanics are, how the Blacks are. . . . He kind of made everybody feel kind of at home and that no one group is more special than another group. That we are all equal in one way.

Although three employees who participated in pre-class interviews chose not to participate in post-class interviews, and one employee did not comment at length regarding this topic in the post-class interview, there still appears to be an association between employee response and the class they attended.

Value of class: before and after.

A second theme during post-class interviews was apparent. The employees' perceived value of the class changed after taking the class. A

comparative analysis of the perceived value of the class before and after taking a diversity class shifted with three employees (see Table 4-6).

Seven of 16 employees stated, prior to taking the class, that they anticipated that the class would be valuable (1S101, 2S101, 3S101, 4S101, 5S101, 6S101, 3S200). Of those seven, two did not participate in post class interviews (3S101, 6S101). However, the other five stated during post class interviews that the class had been valuable.

Nine employees were not optimistic that the class would be valuable to them (7S101, NI1, NI2, NI3, NI4, 1S200, 2S200, 5S200, 6S200). One of those nine did not participate in a post-class interview (7S101). Two employees, after taking the class, confirmed their pre-class feeling that the class was not valuable (1S200 and 5S200). However, seven employees changed their pre-class opinion and found the class valuable in the post-class interview.

Table 4-6
Pre- and Post-class Perceptions of Value of Class

Employee	How Class Selected		Class Valuable?	
	Chose	Told/Mand.	Pre-class	Post-class
1S101		x	yes	yes
2S101	x		yes	yes
3S101		x	yes	no interview
4S101	x		yes	yes
5S101	x		yes	yes
6S101	x		yes	no interview
7S101		x	no	no interview
NI1		x	no	yes
NI2		x	no	yes
NI3		x	no	yes
NI4		x	no	yes
1S200		x	no	no
2S200		x	no	yes
3S200	x		yes	yes
5S200		x	no	no
6S200		x	no	yes

Punishment.

The last theme extracted from post-class interviews is that employees who did not choose to enroll in the "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" class believe that nonprofessional employees were being punished by the company. They believe this because while they were told that they had to attend the class, their supervisors did not participate in the class. One nonprofessional employee remarked:

I don't think I did nothing wrong. I get along pretty good with the people in my group. But then I wonder. . . . Why did my supervisor say I have to take this class? At first I thought it was just something we all take. But when the teacher asked us how many are supervisors . . . nobody was. Maybe my boss thinks I need to know these things because I didn't do things right. (1S101)

Another nonprofessional employee felt similarly:

I feel like my manager thinks I should know the things we learned in the class. That's OK, but maybe she enrolled me because she has seen me not act right on the floor with the other operators. We can all learn new things but then why didn't she come to the class too? I wonder why she wasn't there right along with us all. (3S200)

In addition, employees believe that it is management that needs the class. One nonprofessional employee remarked:

I would like management to take this class. They are the ones that need it. They treat you like a kid. Maybe this class would change their attitudes about certain things. Can the management take these [classes]? (1S101)

Although some employees enjoyed the class and found it to be valuable to them, they also asked why the class had only nonprofessional employees in attendance. A nonprofessional employee stated:

I enjoyed the class, but I think it should be required for a lot more people though. Management included. Because management doesn't handle things very well. There is a lot of diversity and it seems like our management. . . if something happens and if it gets to management, they try to blow it off and get rid of it and make everybody happy and just get over it instead of talking things out and fixing it. They just try to push it over to the side and that's why it keeps coming back up. I doubt seriously management has been to these classes. This should be required for them. (5S101)

It became apparent during post-class interviews that employees still seemed to be concerned over who participated in the class and who didn't. Although many of them enjoyed the class, even most of those who did not choose to take the class, they focused on the apparent lack of substance in High Tech's diversity programs.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has attempted to examine the diversity program and its classes at High Tech, through the perspectives of the

employees who attended diversity classes. Enrollment occurs in one of two ways and for one of four reasons. There is an association between an employee's position within the company and the diversity class in which they enroll, and a relationship between employee position and participation in this study. Diversity is viewed negatively. There is an association between how an employee was enrolled in a class and that employee's perceived value of the class. In addition, there is a relationship between the class enrolled in and a shift in how value was perceived prior to and after the class. In some cases the instructor's actions during the class contradicted his rhetoric. Finally, there appears to be an association between a diversity class and the model of diversity used; namely, whether valuing "sameness" or valuing "difference" is stressed. Employees believe they are responsible for improving relationships with the diverse workforce, and in some cases feel they are in diversity classes for punitive reasons.

Chapter 5: Summary and Implications

In previous chapters, a research problem was identified, literature discussing the problem was reviewed, a methodology was described, and findings of the research were reported. This final chapter provides a summary and discusses the implications of the study. The summary reviews research methods and results. The second section discusses the implications of the research findings for High Tech employees, the Workforce Diversity and Training and Development Departments, the corporation as a whole, and beyond.

Summary

This thesis is a case study of one corporation's response to a perceived problem of diversity in its workforce. High Tech has acknowledged that its workforce will continue to be increasingly diverse, and the company is concerned about the impact of that diversity on its business. High Tech has approached workforce diversity as a problem in need of management. Recent efforts to cope with diversity have gone beyond Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action approaches and have included the implementation of changes in organizational systems and processes, as well as diversity training aimed at effecting behavioral and attitudinal changes in individual employees. This thesis has examined how corporate efforts to manage diversity depend upon a world view that is not shared by all members of the corporation. While High Tech's Workforce Diversity program presents itself as a neutral, inclusive process that provides employees with skills for working in a diverse environment, this study has examined how the program actually affects those employees who participate

in it. This case study suggests that programs that aim to foster sensitivity to cultural differences among people may also promote a more exclusive, traditional corporate culture.

In order to measure the effects of High Tech's diversity training program against its stated goals, this study first examined the development and implementation of the Austin Workforce Diversity training program. High Tech's corporate objectives and previous uses of training in the company provided a context for Austin's Workforce Diversity training curriculum. Corporate documents and interviews with Workforce Diversity management, Training Department management, and diversity class instructors provided data for this portion of the study. The ethnographic methods of interviewing and participant observation provided data on the effects of the training classes on employees. Thus, this study aimed to outline High Tech's objectives for addressing a perceived diversity problem, to examine the implementation of a program designed to meet those objectives, and to determine the effects of that program on individual employees. This research hoped to assess the diversity program's effectiveness in achieving its stated objectives, as well as the broader lessons and consequences for participants in the training program.

The data demonstrate High Tech's dramatic commitment of both human and monetary resources to a diversity program aimed at managing perceived diversity problems within the organization. High Tech's Premier Employer Initiative represents a company-wide commitment to employees, while the creation of task forces, committees, and Workforce Diversity Departments in Phoenix and Austin has focused efforts on enhancing

sensitivity to diversity; this goal is in accordance with the corporate initiative. In Austin, a holistic wellness program has attempted to promote a healthy lifestyle for employees and their families. Marketing and communication plans have been designed to promote an image of diversity in the company's advertising. Additional programs have aimed at improving the recruitment, retention, and promotion of women and minorities. In addition, a Workforce Diversity training curriculum has been developed to create an awareness of and sensitivity to the diverse workforce. High Tech has contracted with external consultants to develop and facilitate diversity classes, at significant expense to High Tech.

While the efforts of Austin's Workforce Diversity have been extensive, they were initiated without a needs assessment, undoubtedly a basic and necessary step in program design. Without Human Resources and Senior Management support, the Workforce Diversity program could not secure financing for such an assessment. With the corporate Premier Employer Initiative as a guiding rationale and the Semiconductor Products Sector's Phoenix Workforce Diversity program as a model, Austin's Workforce Diversity program management saw no alternative but to proceed with their mission, relying on their own perceptions of Austin's current work environment and its diversity-related problems.

In accordance with High Tech's traditional reliance on training as a means of institutionalizing corporate initiatives and developing skills, the Austin Workforce Diversity program identified training as a primary means of addressing "diversity" problems. This study has shown how Austin's Workforce Diversity and High Tech's Training and Development

Department worked together to develop a curriculum that they hoped would create an awareness of and sensitivity to diversity.

Yet, as the data show, translating the general challenge to enhance diversity into actual classes was problematic. High Tech relied on standard operating procedures in addressing the new challenges posed by a diverse workforce. While training usually focuses on both knowledge and skills, the classes in the new diversity curriculum focused more on awareness and knowledge than on practical skills. The classes varied in expected audiences and outcomes, and High Tech had to depend heavily on the local reservoir of available training practitioners. Two of the diversity classes, "White Men" and "Diversity: Insights into Patterns of Behavior," were designed by the contracted instructors and presented to High Tech employees in their original form. Although "Valuing the Diverse Workforce" was jointly designed by the instructor and the Workforce Diversity manager, the design was based solely on the Workforce Diversity manager's perceptions of the salient diversity issues at High Tech.

Although Workforce Diversity officially aims to enhance sensitivity to the value of diversity and difference within the workplace, this research has made clear that both corporate and Workforce Diversity management and participating employees see "diversity" as a problem for which training is the solution. Interviews with employees show that despite internal marketing efforts to promote the value of diversity, employees view the issue of diversity negatively and consider diversity classes to be a form of punishment.

While corporate and Workforce Diversity management have included general personnel issues, such as employee wellness, along with cultural differences within the category of diversity, employees who participated in this study identified a different set of concerns as they talked in interviews about diversity at High Tech. While they recognized the increasing demographic changes in the workforce, they consistently identified the most formidable diversity-related problems as those divisions and conflicts between nonprofessional employees and management. They emphasized conflicts between occupational categories, rather than racial/ethnic groups, as the most pressing concern in the workplace.

This research has shown that diversity training cannot be analyzed in isolation from the general corporate culture. Since the employees who participated in this study were predominantly nonprofessionals, their emphasis on conflicts with professional employees might be seen as a biased or limited perspective. However, their willingness to participate in this study, in contrast to professional employees' lack of interest, time, or sense of obligation, may only underscore the two-class system at High Tech, in which professionals are treated differently than nonprofessionals. The company's distinction between professionals and nonprofessionals is itself an acknowledgment of this division. A brief overview of High Tech's culture may thus help to identify the broader concerns that the nonprofessional employees stressed in their interviews for this study.

Although the company has made efforts to provide all employees with similar equipment, opportunities, and privileges, these efforts vary, depending on the employee's position within the company.

Although the company claims to value the individual employee, the nonprofessional employees in this study believe that professionals are valued more. This perception seems to be confirmed in many areas of the company, even at the seemingly trivial level of T-shirts. All High Tech employees receive company logo T-shirts: professionals are given expensive shirts, with long sleeves, collars, and embroidered logos, while nonprofessionals receive short-sleeved, rounded-neck shirts with printed logos.

The same division applies to work-related equipment and furnishings. Although both professional and nonprofessional employees can be assigned company pagers, professionals receive better quality pagers, with long range, digital message capability, and some can even receive news reports. A nonprofessional employee once told me, "You must be someone important, because you have a good pager." Professionals are provided with cellular phones, late-model computers, and, in many cases, portable computers. Nonprofessionals also have computers; however, they usually receive the professionals' older models when systems are upgraded. Likewise, professionals have offices, many of which include mahogany desks and framed art, while nonprofessionals work in small cubicles and often share this space with another employee. The size of the cubicle is based on the grade level of the employee. Therefore, one's status within the company is easily identified by other employees.

All employees can park their vehicles on site; however, managers park in reserved, covered spaces on the bottom floor of the garage, close to the building entrances. Covered parking spaces are quite coveted on High Tech's Austin site because of extreme weather conditions and their effects on

automobiles and people. Again, employee status is apparent even in the act of entering the building.

Divisions in status are also evident in employee privileges. Professionals receive unlimited sick leave, whereas nonprofessionals are given a specific number of sick days per year. Nonprofessionals must report sick time and vacation time to their superiors, and these hours are closely recorded and tracked for payroll purposes. Professionals, on the other hand, track their own vacation time.

Professionals have the freedom to select their own training, which often takes place at professional conferences and seminars outside of Austin and Texas. For instance, team development is a popular training activity. Managers often participate in several days of team development conducted in exotic locations such as Belize, Canada, or France. Nonprofessional employees work on their team development skills during a two day class held at a local, on-site training center.

Parity goals have been established for professional minority employees within certain job grades. Nonprofessionals are not targeted for parity goals. Although Affirmative Action numbers are tracked for all new employees, parity goals are limited to professional employees.

Professional employees have developed the Workforce Diversity program. They have defined the vision, mission and model of diversity for their efforts to manage an increasingly diverse workforce. Nonprofessionals are expected to participate in the program, and while nonprofessionals are required to participate in diversity classes, professionals are not. Supervisors and managers enrolled the nonprofessional employees involved in this study

in the classes and stated that the classes were mandatory, when, in fact, they are not.

Although the corporation has attempted to send a message to the workforce that everyone is to be treated equally, it differentiates between the professional and nonprofessional populations. Nonprofessional employees are aware of the distinctions made between them and their managers and may also realize that they are powerless to do anything about it. This division is replicated even in efforts to manage diversity, since the Workforce Diversity program separates employees into two classes: the professional "Doers" and the nonprofessional "Receivers," who are the audience for those efforts.

Examining efforts to manage diversity in light of the broader corporate culture reveals a second lesson about disparities between stated intentions and results. High Tech's Workforce Diversity training program was inserted into a corporate context of interdependent objectives and programs that necessarily influence, and sometimes even conflict with each other. While the Workforce Diversity efforts reflect High Tech's official commitment to acknowledging and valuing difference among its employees, diversity training programs exist within a broader context of training in relation to organizational and corporate culture. High Tech relies upon training to indoctrinate new employees into an established corporate culture, as well as to institutionalize new aspects of that homogenous culture among all employees. These training programs represent a corporate effort to mold employees by promoting conformity to pre-established corporate goals. In this context, diversity training can be seen as only one more opportunity to

promulgate a uniform High Tech culture of "valuing diversity," as defined by High Tech. Implementing a corporate commitment to "diversity" has thus relied upon a strategy generally used to promote conformity to corporate norms.

Implications

This study has shown that diversity programs aimed at fostering sensitivity to differences among people may have an additional effect: the promulgation of corporate values. The following sections discuss the implications of this study for High Tech employees and the Workforce Diversity and Training and Development Departments, as well as the corporation as a whole and American society in general.

Employees.

The implications for High Tech employees, especially those who participate in diversity classes, are clear. While the company presents diversity positively, claiming that "diversity is an asset," many employees are cynical about these efforts. Employees attend diversity classes that have been designed to instill an awareness of and sensitivity to diversity. Instructors present the company view that diversity should be valued. But when professional employees do not attend classes with them, nonprofessional employees perceive that they alone have been targeted for these lessons. While they are being told that everyone should value diversity, nonprofessional employees feel that the company holds them responsible for "fixing" the diversity "problem." Therefore, employees have become cynical about the company, the Workforce Diversity program, and its valuing diversity concept. In addition, rather than bringing diverse segments of the

company together, the Workforce Diversity program has only increased the organizational tension between management and nonprofessional employees.

Workforce Diversity and Training and Development Departments.

This research also has implications for the Workforce Diversity and the Training and Development Departments. The success of the Workforce Diversity program must be measured by the elimination of perceived workforce problems. However, the solutions to those perceived problems have been designed and implemented without an appropriate needs assessment of the problems. Beyond the consequent difficulty of measuring the program's success, it is possible that High Tech's current workforce environment could be negatively effected by those efforts if they do not appropriately address the actual problems.

The Training and Development Department's effectiveness is also measured by the results of the diversity training program. Although the Training and Development Department currently uses only a Level One Evaluation instrument (written evaluations filled out by each employee immediately after each class), the department is planning to add Level Two and Three Evaluation tools. The Level Two Evaluation tool will measure instructor effectiveness through student tests. Level Three Evaluations will determine whether the employee applies knowledge from the class to the work environment. These evaluations will attempt to provide a measurement of the effectiveness of the diversity classes, as well as the Training and Development Department. If classes are designed and implemented without a prior needs assessment, the instructional design may

be inappropriate, and the success of the instruction may be effected. The Training and Development Department, which is responsible for providing training to all High Tech employees, will ultimately be held accountable for these results.

The corporation.

Implications for the corporation as a whole are also evident in the research results. The corporation has unwittingly bred cynicism by focusing on what many employees see as the "wrong" diversity. Although the corporation may have had only good intentions in implementing the Workforce Diversity program, that program seems not to have met its stated intentions of fostering sensitivity and understanding. The corporation has focused on racial and ethnic diversity among employees, whereas the nonprofessional employees see the important diversity as that between themselves and management. It becomes apparent, therefore, that what really matters, at least to the employees interviewed for this study, is not racial/ethnic diversity but instead economic class, and how it is reflected in the corporation. This confusion of class with ethnicity and race is common in this country. People often think they are talking about ethnic or cultural differences when, in actuality, they are talking about class.

Bochner (1982) has stated that "the perception of difference in others, whether based on beliefs, language and behavior, or appearance, impels each person to categorize himself and others as "we" and "they" (p. 7). This categorization becomes the basis for stereotyping and discrimination. People may come to valorize one mental representation of a group while denigrating another, and their consequent behavior may be in accordance with these

perceptions. High Tech may be doing just this by continuing to differentiate between professionals and nonprofessionals while directing change efforts at racial/ethnic diversity. Professionals and nonprofessionals have categorized and stereotyped each other: nonprofessionals are stereotyped as being ignorant and needing help, and they believe that they are discriminated against in the very process of being told to value one another. The impact of this class system on the success of the corporate vision of being the Premier Employer may be in jeopardy, as the company further divides itself into "We" and "They," the "Doers" and the "Receivers," management and the proverbial others--nonprofessionals.

Beyond High Tech.

The implications of this research for the wider, increasingly diverse society also need to be addressed. High Tech is recognized among other Fortune 100 companies as being one of the best in training employees. Other industry leaders frequently study High Tech's training organization as a benchmark for their own companies. High Tech's diversity training curriculum has been audited and replicated by many corporations. These diversity classes are the products of a cultural diversity program that has defined the company's diversity-related problems without a needs assessment; the data in this study suggest a wide disparity between management and employee perceptions of the most crucial "diversity" problems at High Tech. By examining the effects of the diversity classes on participating employees, this research has suggested that the diversity program, while well-intentioned, has widened the gap between management and nonprofessional employees. Although High Tech is an industry leader,

its workforce is not unique, and what has occurred at its Austin site could easily happen elsewhere.

In light of the anticipated demographic changes in American society in the coming decades, workforce diversity will only increase. This case study of one company's efforts to manage diversity has suggested that corporate diversity programs can have unintended, contradictory consequences. At High Tech, the unintended consequences of attempting to manage an increasingly diverse workforce have included the promulgation of traditional corporate values and the exacerbation of class distinctions between employees.

References

- Albert, R. (1986). Conceptual framework for the development and evaluation of cross-cultural orientation programs. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 197-213.
- Agar, M. (1980). The Professional Stranger. An Informal Introduction to Ethnography. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Agar, M. (1982). Toward an ethnographic language. American Anthropologist, 84, 779-795.
- Altman, J. (1974). Observational study of behavior: Sampling methods. Behaviour, 49, 227-267.
- Allport, G. (1958). The nature of prejudice. New York: Anchor Books.
- Arvey, R. & Faley, R. (1988). Fairness in selecting employees. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Althen, G. (Ed.). (1981). Learning across cultures: Intercultural communication and international education exchange. Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- Babbie, E. (1983). The practice of social research (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Batchelder, D. & Warner, E. (1977). Beyond experience: The experiential approach to cross-cultural education. Brattleboro, VT: The Experiment Press.
- Becker, H., & Geer, B. (1960). Participant observation: The analysis of qualitative field data. In R. N. Adams & J. J. Preiss (Eds.), Human organization research (pp. 267-289). Homewood, IL: Dorsey (for the Society for Applied Anthropology).
- Bennett, J. (1986). Modes of cross-cultural training: Conceptualizing cross-cultural training as education. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 117-134.
- Bennett, M. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. International Journal of Intecultural Relations, 10, 179-196.
- Bernard, R. (1994). Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bochner, S. (1982). Culture in contact. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Bogdan, R. (1972). Participant observation in organizational settings. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Bolgar, H. (1965). The case study method. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.), The handbook of clinical psychology (pp. 27-43). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brein, M., & David, K. (1971). Intercultural communications and the adjustment of the sojourner. Psychological Bulletin, 76, 215-230.
- Brislin, R. (1981). Cross-cultural encounters. New York: Pergamon.
- Brislin, R. (1986). A culture general assimilator: Preparation for various types of sojourns. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 215-234.
- Brislin, R., Landis, D., & Brandt, M. (1983). Conceptualizations of intercultural behavior and training. In D. Landis & R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (Vol. 1, pp. 1-35). New York: Pergamon.
- Brislin, R., & Pedersen, P. (1976). Cross-cultural orientation programs. New York: Gardner Press.
- Campbell, D. (1975). Degrees of freedom and the case study. Comparative Political Studies, 8, 178-193.
- Casse, P. (1979). Training for the cross-cultural mind. Washington, DC: Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.
- Caudron, S. (1993, April). Training can damage diversity efforts. Personnel Journal, 51-61.
- Commerce Clearing House Editorial Staff. (1989). 1989 Guidebook To Fair Employment Practices. Chicago: Commerce Clearing House.
- Church, A. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 540-572.
- David, K. (1972). Intercultural adjustment and applications of reinforcement theory to problems of "culture shock." Trends, 4, 1-64.
- Deane, B. (1993). Straight talk: Outcomes of cross-cultural training. Cultural Diversity at Work, 5 (5), 6-7.

DeCrow, R. (1969). Cross-cultural interaction skills: A digest of recent training literature. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EDRS ED 029 159).

Deutscher, I. (1973). What we say, what we do. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

De Vos, G., & Romanucci-Ross, L. (Eds.). (1975). Ethnic identity: Cultural continuities and change. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Downs, J. (1969). Fables, fancies and failures in cross-cultural training. Trends, 2 (3). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 034 935).

Downs, J. (1970). Understanding culture: Guidelines and techniques for training. Hilo, HI: Center for Cross-Cultural Training & Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 088788).

Downs, J. (1978). Intercultural training for government employees and military personnel for overseas assignment. In D. Hoopes, P. Pedersen, & G. Renwick (Eds.), Overview of intercultural education, training and research: Vol. 2. Training and Education (pp. 102-117). Washington, DC: Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.

Eckstein, H. (1975). Case study and theory in political science. In F. I. Greenstein & N. W. Polsby (Eds.), Strategies of inquiry (pp. 91-122). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Elashmawi, F., & Harris, P. (1993). Multicultural management: New skills for global success. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Elliot, David (1992, August 30). Texas 2026: Future will alter state's familiar face. The Austin American Statesman, pp. A1, A10.

Ethier, K., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67 (2), 243-251.

Etzione, A. (1969). The semi-professions and their organizations. New York: Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers Free Press.

Fetterman, D. (1989). Ethnography step by step. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Forsberg, M. (1993, May). Cultural training improves relations with Asian clients. Personnel Journal, 79-89.

Foster, R., & Danielian, J. (1966). An analysis of human relations training and its implications for overseas performance (Technical Report No. 66-15). Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Foster, G., Scudder, T., Colson, E., & Kemper, R. (Eds.). (1979). Long-term field research in social anthropology. New York: Academic Press.

Gans, H. (1968). The participant observer as a human being: Observations on the personal aspects of fieldwork. In H. S. Becker, B. Greer, D. Reisman, & R. Weiss (Eds.), Institutions and the person (pp. 40-52). Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Gardenswartz, L. & Rowe, A. (1993). Managing diversity. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.

Geber, B. (1990). Managing Diversity. Training, 27, 23-30.

George, A. (1979). Case studies and theory development: The method of structured, focused comparison. In P.G. Lauren (Ed.), Diplomacy: New approaches in history, theory, and policy (pp. 87-99). New York: Free Press.

Giovannini, M., & Rosansky, L. (1990). Anthropology and management consulting: Forging a new alliance. NAPA Bulletin, 9, 1-48.

Gordon, J. (1992, January). Rethinking diversity. Training Magazine 23-30.

Gudykunst, W., Hammer, M., & Wiseman, R. (1977). An analysis of an integrated approach to cross-cultural training. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 99-110.

Gudykunst, W., & Hammer, M. (1983). Basic teaching design: Approaches to intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (Vol. 1, pp. 118-154) New York: Pergamon.

Hall, E. (1973). The Silent Language. New York: Doubleday.

Hammer, M., Gudykunst, W., & Wiseman, R. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2, 99-110.

Harris, P., & Moran, R. (1991). Managing cultural differences. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Harrison, R., & Hopkins, R. (1966). The design of cross-cultural training with examples from the Peace Corps (Report No. 2). Washington, DC.: National Training Labs Institute for Applied Behavioral Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 011103).

Harrison, R., & Hopkins, R. (1967). The design of cross-cultural training: An alternative to the university model. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3 (4), 431-460.

Henkoff, R. (1993, March 22). Companies that train best. Fortune Magazine 28-33.

Hoehn, A. (1986). The need for innovative approaches for training in intercultural interaction (Technical Report No. 9-68). Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Hoopes, D., & Pusch, M. (Eds.). (1981). Multicultural education: A cross-cultural training approach. Chicago, IL: Intercultural Network.

Hoopes, D., & Althen, G. (1975). Culture and communication in intercultural relations. In D. Hoopes (Ed.), Readings in Intercultural Communication (pp. 15-27). Pittsburgh: Intercultural Communication Network and SIETAR.

Hoopes, D., & Pusch, M. (1981). Teaching strategies: The methods and techniques of cross-cultural training. In M. Pusch (Ed.), Multicultural education: A cross-cultural training approach (pp. 104-204). Chicago, IL: Intercultural Network.

Howell, W. (1979). Theoretical directions in intercultural communication. In M. K. Asante, E. Newmark, & C. Blake (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural communication (pp. 53-62). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hughes, G. (1983). Intercultural education in elementary and secondary schools. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (Vol. 3, pp. 26-35). New York: Pergamon Press.

Hughes-Wiener, G. (1986). The "learning how to learn" approach to cross-cultural-orientation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 485-505.

Ingram, R. (1993, April). Training 101. Training & Development 15-22.

Jackson, J. (1970). Professions and professionalization. New York: Herder & Herder.

Jackson, A. (1992). Is it diversity or affirmative action? Managing Diversity, Sample Issue (pp. 2). Fredonia, NY: Jamestown Area Labor Management Committee.

Jahoda, G. (1970). A cross-cultural perspective in psychology. Advancement of Science, 27, 1-14.

Johnston, W., & Packer, A. (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the twenty-first century. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Jorgensen, D. (1989). Participant observation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Keefe, S. (1992). Ethnic identity: The domain of perceptions of an attachment to ethnic groups and cultures. Human Organization, 51 (1), 35-43.

Kennedy, M. (1979, November 3). Generalizing from single case studies. Evaluation Quarterly, 661-678.

Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). Variations in value orientation. New York: Row, Peterson.

Kohls, R. (1987). Four traditional approaches to developing cross-cultural preparedness in adults: Education, training, orientation, and briefing. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 89-106.

Kohls, R., & Brussow, H. (1995). Training know-how for cross cultural and diversity trainers. Duncanville, TX: Adult Learning Systems.

Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kraemer, A. (1973). Development of a cultural self-awareness approach to instruction in intercultural communication (Technical Report No. 73-17). Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Landis, D., & Brislin, R. (eds.). (1983). Handbook of intercultural training: Vol. 2. Issues in training methodology. New York: Pergamon.

Langness, L. (1980). The study of culture. Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp Publishers.

Larson, M. (1977). The rise of professionalism. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Le Compte, M., & Preissle, J. (with Tesch, R.). (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in education research (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Levin-Epstein, M. (1987). Primer of Equal Employment Opportunity. Washington DC: The Bureau of National Affairs.

Llewellyn, K. (1948). Case method. In E. Seligman and A. Johnson (Eds.), Encyclopedia of the social sciences (pp. 179-191). New York: Macmillan.

Loden, M., & Rosener, J. (1991). Workforce America: Managing employee diversity as a vital resource. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin Professional Publishing.

Lucas, W. (1974). The case survey method. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Malinowski, B. (1922). Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London: Routledge.

Martin, J. (1986). Training issues in cross-cultural orientation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 103-116.

McCaffery, J. (1986). Independent effectiveness: A reconsideration of cross-cultural orientation and training. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 159-178.

Mead, M. (1970). Culture and commitment. Garden City, NY: Natural History Press and Doubleday & Company.

Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Nadler, L. (1980). Corporate human resources. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Nadler, L. (Ed.). (1984). The handbook of human resource development. New York: John Wiley.

Nadler, L., Nadler, Z., & Fetteroll, E. (Eds.). (1986). The trainer's resources. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture. Social Problems, 41 (1), 152-176.

Nixon, J. (1985). A teacher's guide to multicultural education. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Newmark, E. (1979). The evaluation of the effectiveness of an intercultural training program for a study abroad project. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Paige, M. (1986). Trainer competencies: The missing conceptual link in orientation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 135-158.

Perry, R. (1992, March 4). Why do multiculturalists ignore anthropologists? The Chronicle of Higher Education A52.

Porter, R., & Samovar, L. (1985). Intercultural communication: A reader. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Pusch, M. (Ed.). (1981). Multicultural education: A cross-cultural training approach. Chicago, IL: Intercultural Network.

Pusch, M., Seelye, N., & Wasilewski, J. (1981). Training for multicultural education competencies. In M. Pusch (Ed.), Multicultural education: A cross cultural training approach (pp. 85-103). Chicago, IL: Intercultural Network.

Renwick, G. (1981). Evaluation: Some practical guidelines. In M. Pusch (Ed.), Multicultural education: A cross cultural training approach (pp. 205-255). Chicago, IL: Intercultural Network.

Roethlisberger, F., & Dickson, W. (1939). Management and the worker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rorty, A. (1994). The cultures of multiculturalism: The hidden politics of cultural identification. Political Theory, 22 (1), 152-166.

Royce, A. (1982). Ethnic identity: Strategies of diversity. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ruben, B. (1977). Human communication and cross-cultural effectiveness. International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 4, 95-105.

Sarbaugh, L. (1979). Intercultural communication. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden.

Schneller, R. (1989). Intercultural and intrapersonal processes and factors of misunderstanding: Implications for multicultural training. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13, 465-484.

Schwartzman, H. (1993). Ethnography in organizations: Qualitative research methods (Vol. 27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Shizuru, L., Landis, D., & Brislin, R. (1983). Specific methodology and approaches, organization context, and theory development in cross-cultural training. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training: Vol. 2. Issues in training methodology (pp. 1-18). New York: Pergamon.

Singer, M. (1987). Intercultural communication: A perceptual approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Spradley, J. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spradley, J. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stephenson, J., & Greer, L. (1981). Ethnographers in their own cultures: Two Appalachian cases. Human Organization, 30, 333-343.

Stewart, E. (1966). The simulation of cultural difference. Journal of Communication, 16, 291-304.

Stewart, E. (1977). American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective. Washington, DC: Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.

Stolovitch, H., & Lane, M. (1989, July). Multicultural training: Designing for affective results. Performance & Instruction, 10-15.

Strauss, H. (1992). The Mi-culture of the Mount Hagen people. Ethnology Monographs Number 13. Pittsburgh, PA: University Of Pittsburgh, Department of Anthropology.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sturtevant, W. (1959). A technique for ethnographic note-taking. American Anthropologist, 61, 677-678.

Swierczek, F. (1988, November). Culture and training: How do they play? Training & Development Journal, 74-80.

Triandis, H. (1977). Theoretical framework for evaluation of cross-cultural training effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 19-45.

U.S. Census Bureau (1995). The American Almanac 1995-1996 Statistical abstract of the United States. Austin, TX: Reference Press.

Wasilewski, J., & Seelye, N. (1981). Curriculum in multicultural education. In M. Pusch (Ed.), Multicultural education: A cross cultural training approach (pp. 62-79). Chicago, IL: Intercultural Network.

Wax, R. (1971). Doing fieldwork: Warnings and advice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weeks, W., Pedersen, P., & Brislin, R. (Eds.). (1977). A manual of structured experiences for cross-cultural learning. Washington, DC: Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.

Wight, A. (1970). Experiential cross-cultural training. Estes Park, CO: Center for Research & Education.

Wurzel, J. (Ed.). (1988). Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Yin, R. (1983). The case study method: An annotated bibliography. Washington, DC: COSMOS Corporation.

Yin, R. (1991). Case study research: Design and methods. Applied Social Research Methods Series (Volume 5). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin R., Bateman, P., & Moore, G. (1983). Case studies and organizational innovation: Strengthening the connection. Washington, DC: COSMOS Corporation.

Appendix A: Employee Demographics

Employee ^a	Interviews		Gender		Age	Race ^b	Position ^c		Years Employed
	Pre-class	Post-class	M	F			P	NP	
1S101	x	x		x	40s	Bl		x	14
2S101	x	x	x		20s	Cauc		x	6
3S101	x			x	50s	Cauc		x	13
4S101	x	x		x	20s	Cauc		x	
5S101	x	x		x	20s	Cauc		x	1
6S101	x		x		30s	Cauc		x	18
7S101	x			x	30s	Cauc		x	16
1S200	x	x		x	28	Cauc		x	10
2S200	x	x	x		30s	Cauc	x		7
3S200	x	x		x	40s	Cauc		x	18
4S200	canc								
5S200	x			x	50s	Cauc		x	16
6S200	x	x		x	48	Cauc		x	13
1F101			x		30s	Cauc			
TM			x		30s	Cauc			7
DMA				x	30s	Hisp			14
DMS				x	30s	Cauc			
HM			x		47	Cauc			6

Note.

^a101 = course number for "Valuing the Diverse Workforce." 200 = course number for "White Men." S = student. F = instructor.

^bBl = Black. Cauc = Caucasian. Hisp = Hispanic.

^cP = professional. NP = nonprofessional

Appendix B: Interview Questions, Workforce Diversity Managers

Interviewee

Date

1. Why did this company develop a workforce diversity program/training?
What is the history of the WFD program? What is the vision, mission, goals?
2. What was the process for developing this specific work force diversity program/curriculum?
3. What is the "diversity" at this company (in Austin)?
4. Can you give me examples of diversity-related problems that you have heard about or witnessed first hand?
5. What are the goals of the classes as you understand them?
6. After taking a workforce diversity class, what skills would you hope to see the students take back into their work environment?
7. What is working and isn't working within the current curriculum?
8. Identify categories of differences you are trying to "bridge" (asked if the "bridge" metaphor is used).
9. What is your understanding of the term "manage diversity"? Is it different than "valuing diversity" and if so, how?
10. How are you attempting to "manage diversity" within this company?
11. How do you define "culture"?
12. What would you like the students of the diversity classes to take away from the class? What would they do differently when back at work? What sort of difference do you think taking a diversity class makes in a person? Is the student going to be transformed into a different person?

Appendix C: Interview Questions, Training Managers

Interviewee

Date

1. Why did this company develop a workforce diversity training curriculum?
2. What is the "diversity" at this company (in Austin)?
3. Can you give me examples of diversity-related problems that you have witnessed first hand?
4. What was the process for developing this specific work force diversity curriculum?
5. What are the goals of the classes as you understand them?
6. After taking a workforce diversity class, what skills would you hope to see the students take back into their work environment?
7. How are the classes evaluated?
8. What is working and isn't working within the current curriculum?
9. Identify categories of differences you are trying to "bridge" (asked if the "bridge" metaphor is used).
10. What is your understanding of the term "manage diversity" ?
11. How do you define "culture"?
12. Do you identify with any ethnic group? If so, where did that identity come from and when?

Appendix D: Interview Questions, Class Facilitators

Interviewee

Date

1. What is your understanding as to why this company has developed a cultural diversity training program?
2. What is the "diversity" at Motorola in Austin?
3. Have you heard about any diversity-related problems first hand?
4. How are you attempting to "manage diversity" within this company through your class?
5. What is the goal and what are the objectives to reaching that goal in this class?
6. How do you define "culture"?
7. How do you define "ethnicity"?
8. How do you define ethnic identity?
9. How do you define corporate culture?
10. What are the identify categories of differences you are trying to "bridge" (asked if the "bridge" metaphor is used).
11. What do you want your students to get from this class - walk away with?
12. Do you identity with a particular ethnic group(s) and if so what is it/what are they?
13. What is it in that ethnic group that you identify with?

Appendix E: Pre-class Interview Questions, Class Participants

Interviewee

Date

1. Why do you think this company has developed a cultural diversity training program?
2. What is the "diversity" at Motorola?
3. What diversity-related problems (if any) have you heard about first hand?
4. Why are you going to take this class?
5. What is your understanding of what the class is about?
6. What do you hope to get out of the class?
7. How do you define "culture"?
8. Do you identify with any particular ethnic group(s) and if so, what is it/are they?

Appendix F: Post-class Interview Questions, Class Participants

Interviewee

Date

1. What did you think about the class?
2. What was the class all about?
3. What were some of the key points of the class? (What about "culture" and "identity"?)
4. How do you think what you learned in class could change/has changed your life? What do you view differently (if anything) since the class?
5. What is the "diversity" at Motorola?
6. How is culture defined?
7. How does culture affect us?
8. Do you identify with any particular ethnic group(s) and if so what is it/are they?