

Public Disclosure Authorized
Public Disclosure Authorized
Public Disclosure Authorized

ENHANCING INCLUSION

AT THE WORLD BANK GROUP:

DIAGNOSIS & SOLUTIONS

MARY LOU EGAN • MARC BENDICK, JR. • JOHN J. MILLER



ENHANCING
INCLUSION
AT THE WORLD BANK GROUP:
DIAGNOSIS
& SOLUTIONS

MARY LOU EGAN • MARC BENDICK, JR. • JOHN J. MILLER

DECEMBER 2003

CONTENTS

PREFACE	vii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	11
Psychological mechanisms that tend to create systemic barriers	11
Earlier studies consistent with systemic barriers	16
Implications of this conceptual framework for empirical analysis	20
3. DEVELOPING INCLUSION METRICS	23
The Bank Group's current metrics measure diversity, not inclusion	23
The 16 metrics	24
4. EVIDENCE OF SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO INCLUSION	39
Statistical analyses	39
Illustrations of processes underlying these statistical patterns	42
Current rate of change	45
5. NEW EVIDENCE SUGGESTS A NEW DIVERSITY STRATEGY	49
Inclusion differs from traditional diversity efforts	50
First benefit: Eliminating individual and group inequities	50
Second benefit: Enhancing client engagement skills	51
Third benefit: Enhancing efficiency and effectiveness	51
Fourth benefit: Supporting Bank Group's organizational structure	53
Fifth benefit: Positioning Bank Group as the industry leader	54
APPENDIXES	57
A. Excerpts from the Terms of Reference for This Study	57
B. Advisory Committees, Focus Groups, and Interviews	59
C. Topics Related to Systemic Barriers Examined in 16 Bank Group Studies/Reports, 1992–2002	61
D. Regression Analysis Cited in Chapter 4	79
ACRONYMS	84
FREQUENTLY USED HUMAN RESOURCES TERMS AND NOTES TO THE READER	85
GLOSSARY	86
REFERENCES	89

BOXES

1.1	Bank Group's evolving diversity focus, 1991–2003	8
2.1	Examples of how Bank supervisors may assess the performance of male and female employees differently	18
4.1	Four examples of HR practices that are not fully transparent and job related	43

TABLES

E.1	Out-group effects on careers within the Bank Group, 2002 (%)	3
1.1	Emergence of the inclusion approach in Bank Group thinking about diversity, described by the Senior Adviser on Gender Equity in 2000	9
1.2	Bank Group's principal measures of staff diversity	9
2.1	Inclusion issues examined for 3 groups of employees in 16 World Bank Group diversity studies, 1992–2002	17
2.2	Earnings and grades for three groups compared to equally qualified Part I males, IBRD professional employees, 1997	17
2.3	Gender differences in selected responses to the 2002 Staff Survey	19
3.1	Sixteen inclusion metrics defined by the proportion of GF+ staff with non-modal characteristics, June 2002	26
3.2	Nationality (based on current passport), GF+ staff, June 2002	27
3.3	Overlap between nationality (based on current passport) and cultural perspectives (based on other data), GF+ staff, June 2002, for the five nationalities with the most GF+ staff	28
3.4	Native languages reported by GF+ staff, June 2002	29
3.5	Undergraduate degrees held by GF+ staff, June 2002, by country of degree-granting university	30
3.6	Family status of GF+ staff, June 2002	31
3.7	Age of GF+ staff, June 2002	32
3.8	Graduate degrees held by GF+ staff, June 2002, by field of study	33
3.9	Universities accounting for a large proportion of graduate degrees held by GF+ staff, June 2002	34
3.10	Graduate degrees held by GF+ staff, June 2002, by country of degree-granting university	35
3.11	Years of work experience of GF+ staff, June 2002	36
3.12	Work experience outside the Bank Group by sector of employment, GF+ staff, June 2002	37
3.13	Breadth of experience within the Bank Group, GF+ staff, June 2002	37
3.14	Prevalence of individuals with multiple non-modal characteristics, GF+ staff, June 2002	38
4.1	Regression-based estimates of the effect on four employment outcomes of out-group characteristics	41
4.2	Regional assignments of staff in operational VPUs, GF+ staff, June 2002	42
4.3	Prevalence of out-group characteristics among Young Professionals 2002–02 and two comparison groups	44
4.4	Bank Group average metrics, GF+ staff, comparing 1996 to 2002	47
5.1	US business leaders' views of how diversity affects the “bottom line” (%)	52
5.2	Characteristics of transnational organizations	54
5.3	Three approaches to managing diversity in work groups	55

B.1	Selected characteristics of staff members who provided information for this study through interviews, focus groups, advisory committees, or other means	60
D.1	Multiple regression analysis cited in chapter 4	79
D.2	Correlations among selected explanatory variables utilized in regression analysis	82
D.3	Top 10 ranked programs worldwide in 2 fields of graduate study	83



PREFACE

In simple terms, the objective of this study is to help us think about whether the Bank would be better served by shifting the focus of our diversity work from “What do they look like, where do they come from, and will they ‘fit’?” to “What is it like to work here, what determines who can ‘succeed’ here, and are we a competent global employer?” The first set of questions places the onus for change and adaptation almost entirely on staff. The latter set places the onus where it belongs: on the employer, that is, the World Bank Group and its management, which has primary responsibility for the organizational culture and dynamics that determine employment outcomes for staff. Recalling our stated diversity goal, “to be an institution able to attract, excite and nurture diverse and committed staff with exceptional skills who know how to listen and learn,” we seek through this study to understand ourselves better as a global employer of choice.

Reflecting on trends and patterns within the Bank, we began this search for understanding with this hypothesis: there is a gravitational pull working across the organization that tends to sort staff by groupings through a process of subtle barriers and small inequities. This hypothesis is controversial, but it reflected the recognition — now trite among diversity practitioners in the United States and elsewhere — that numbers are just outcomes with

important stories behind them. What are the stories behind our diversity numbers at the Bank? How could we access these stories and verify them? What would we do with what we found? By testing this controversial hypothesis, this study represents our attempt to rigorously answer these questions.

Focusing on the diversity of staff, by any benchmark or standard, for over a decade the World Bank Group has handled well the challenge of “balancing representation and difference.” The Bank is a trend-setter in this as in other fields of human capital management and has made tremendous commitments and investments within and beyond the United Nations family. This history of success in a difficult human resources area is perhaps what has emboldened our institution to raise the stakes yet again, to self-interrogate and seek to refine its practices and policies even further.

During the work on diversity across the Bank Group over the last decade, certain patterns emerged indicating which groups were better able to navigate the system than others and which tended to “settle” at the margins, as opposed to thriving at the center of the organization. However, we could not explain with any precision what was generating and sustaining these patterns; nor were we entirely clear about their impact on staff and staffing.

Other important lacunae remain. What distinguishes us as an employer in the perceptions and experiences of a global mix of very able candidates and staff? What is required to successfully integrate diverse staff into an increasingly decentralized global organization? How can we maximize the value of our diversity as a resource to enhance the quality of our problem-solving and innovation, and our client engagement and responsiveness? These and other questions challenge us as we grapple with envisioning the next generation of diversity work at the Bank.

By the end of 2001, there was concern that the diversity work — always very numbers-driven and hovering between myth and fact — had hit a plateau, as hiring slowed down following the Human Resources Reform and downsizing. Among

other objectives, this study was commissioned to provide measurement tools to enable us to monitor our future progress and — even more significantly — deepen our own self-analysis.

Our consultants distinguish in this report between “traditional” approaches to diversity — which are about employees and their dimensions of difference — and “inclusion” — which is about us, the employer, and our obligation to create an enabling environment for all. The authors pose the question of whether shifting emphasis from one approach to the other might move us beyond the plateau. They challenge us to position the organization to attract and retain diverse staff by ensuring that all groups — regardless of characteristics such as gender, age, race, source of degree, or any other diversity dimension — have fair chances for favorable performance and career outcomes. They encourage us to ask ourselves difficult questions: Has the problem been staff, where they come from, and what they look like? Or, is the real issue that the Bank itself is a particular kind of “space” with deeply entrenched attitudes, policies, and processes that tend to generate differentiation among staff — albeit unconsciously — on the basis of where they come from and what they look like?

The consultants, Egan, Bendick, and Miller, have completed the study. It is substantial enough to engage our attention and reaction for some time to come, as well as to provide valuable resources for reflection and self-appraisal. We have begun this reflection with a detailed presentation to senior management. The present abridged publication distills the key concepts necessary for advancing the Bank-wide dialogue. The study also has provided us with an innovative set of inclusion metrics that will enable us to nuance our traditional demographics-based approach to managing diversity. In addition, we can use them to monitor where each unit in the organization falls along a spectrum from “non-inclusive” to “inclusive.”

We have responded with delight to some of the findings and with dismay to others in almost equal measure. However, what is clear is that the journey toward full inclusion across the World Bank Group has begun well...and is a work in progress! The

central message — strikingly similar to that suggested by a number of prior studies — is that, for the bearers of our diversity, inclusion at the Bank is mediated through, and compromised by, systemic barriers such as misapplied policies, stereotyping, subtle in-group bias, habits, and perceptions. One consistent recommendation across this and the previous studies calls for a shift from “fixing” staff to fixing the conditions of their employment. Falling under this recommendation are identifying and removing barriers to full inclusion through universal diversity awareness raising, education, and training; and redesigning and repairing

systems that persistently reproduce disparate employment outcomes.

Why should we care about next steps in diversity? What is the business case for all this probing, measuring, and monitoring? One of our Vice Presidents said recently: “We are not likely to treat our clients better than we treat one another.” It is on this note of wisdom that I invite you to read and reflect upon the following report, with a view to taking our work on diversity to the next — and best — level of our collective endeavor toward full inclusion across the World Bank Group.

Julie Oyegun
Director

World Bank Group, Office of Diversity Programs



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*Traditional diversity focuses on the characteristics of the staff.
Inclusion focuses on the culture and practices of their organization.*

Diversity within the World Bank Group often is equated with counting the number of staff by race, gender, and nationality. Under this approach, the Bank Group has made important progress in terms of the presence and treatment of demographic groups within its staff. For example, the representation of women among GH+ headquarters employees more than tripled over the last decade: from 7.3% in FY1992 to 23.4% in FY2003. Furthermore, in the vast majority of interviews conducted during this study, grades GF and higher (GF+) field staff of all backgrounds described the Bank Group as better in terms of diversity than in former years.

This study was commissioned to support Bank Group strategic planning about how to expand this progress. In recent years, state-of-the-art thinking on diversity increasingly has recognized that a “diversity = numbers” approach carries organizations only so far toward workplace equity. Traditional diversity efforts tend to emphasize policies — such as the Bank Group’s 2005 targets for women, Part II, and SSA/CR (Sub-Saharan Africa and Caribbean Region nationals) staff — which seek to change staff demographics directly. Under the “inclusion” approach, state-of-the-art diversity practices have moved beyond these emphases to focus on the *inclusiveness* of the organizational culture

and Human Resources (HR) management practices that generate those demographic patterns. The present study was initiated to provide empirical information concerning whether the inclusion approach is relevant to the Bank Group.

Specifically, this study was commissioned by the Office of Diversity Programs to test the hypothesis that the Bank Group's organizational culture and HR management practices are distorted by *systemic barriers to inclusion*. If they are, then these systemic barriers must be eliminated if the organization is to continue to move toward its stated diversity goals: zero tolerance for discrimination, attracting and nurturing a diverse staff, and mobilizing all human differences as strategic assets in poverty reduction.

In this study's test of this hypothesis:

- *Barriers* may be any aspect of Bank Group operations — such as attitudes, perceptions, policies, or practices — that cause some staff to be treated differently from their equally qualified peers.
- Barriers reduce *inclusion* if they cause staff who differ from the Bank Group's typical employees to have very different employment outcomes than would have been predicted from their qualifications and interests.
- Barriers are *systemic* if they operate widely across the organization — distorting multiple policies and practices or affecting employment outcomes for many different groups.

DEEPENING THE CONCEPT OF DIVERSITY (CHAPTER 2)

Decades of empirical research have documented the effects on workplaces of often unconscious but powerful social and psychological processes such as stereotyping, in-group bias, and limited social networks. In some workplaces, an inclusive corporate culture, senior management commitment to inclusion, and good human resource management practices hold these processes in check. In other workplaces, weaknesses in these checking mecha-

nisms allow the processes to generate less favorable employment outcomes for *out-groups* (staff differing from the organization's typical employee) than for *in-groups* (staff conforming to the typical employee). In sophisticated workplaces, these differences often consist primarily of “micro-inequities” — small differences that often are awkward for employees to challenge as they arise. However, persistent accumulation of small differences can generate very different careers for equally qualified individuals.

Unconscious bias needs to be actively controlled, even in the most sophisticated workplaces.

This study is based on this conceptual framework: it compares employment outcomes for *equally qualified* Bank Group staff with and without out-group characteristics. Differences in these outcomes measure the extent to which social and psychological processes create systemic barriers to inclusion in the Bank Group today.

DEVELOPING INCLUSION METRICS (CHAPTER 3)

Data on individual staff members currently available in the HR Query database permit development of 16 metrics representing a broad range of out-group characteristics. Each metric is created by identifying the statistical mode among GF+ staff on a visible or invisible characteristic (the in-group) and then counting the proportion of staff members not possessing this modal characteristic (the out-group). Thus, the count of women among employees is a metric because the Bank Group's modal gender (65.4% of the GF+ staff) is male. A second metric counts staff members who have no graduate degree from 20 “core” universities because these universities account for 50% of all graduate degrees held by GF+ staff.

The 16 metrics defined through this procedure comprise:

- 3 covering demographic characteristics for which the Bank Group has explicit employment targets: Part II passport, Black race, and female gender
- 2 addressing additional demographic characteristics: age and marital/family status
- 2 using native languages and undergraduate universities to proxy staff members' cultural perspectives
- 3 representing staff members' graduate education in terms of university and field of study
- 2 measuring staff members' employment experience outside the Bank Group
- 3 reflecting staff members' experience within the Bank Group
- 1 representing staff who differ from the mode on multiple characteristics.

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS (CHAPTER 4)

These metrics then are applied in a statistical analysis of 4,711 headquarters-appointed staff at grade GF+ in June 2002. The metrics are used in estimating multiple regression equations that include staff members' status on the 16 metrics as explanatory

variables along with "human capital" variables representing employees' education, experience, and other job-related qualifications. In this model, systemic barriers to inclusion would be indicated by statistically significant differences in career outcomes associated with the out-group metrics.

This analysis confirms that out-group characteristics, both visible and invisible, significantly affect staff members' employment outcomes. Holding individuals' job-related qualifications constant, simulations based on these estimates measure this effect.

The statistical analysis also documents adverse employment outcomes for the demographic groups targeted in the Bank Group's employment goals for 2005. For example, salaries average 5.1% lower for women, 3.2% lower for Blacks, and 2.5% lower for holders of Part II passports than would be expected based on their qualifications. However, the primary purpose of this analysis is not to measure adverse effects on these specific groups. Instead, it is to *measure the extent to which the organization is not inclusive of out-groups in general*. These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that the Bank Group's organizational culture and HR management practices are distorted by systemic barriers to inclusion (table E.1).¹

According to the research discussed in chapter 2, the root causes of such differences in career outcomes are anti-inclusion social and psychological processes

Table E.1 Out-group effects on careers within the Bank Group, 2002 (%)

If staff members differ from the modal GF+ employee on...	...the effect on their annual salary would be...	...the effect on the likelihood they are managers would be...	...the effect on their rate of inter-VPU mobility would be ...
...7 personal or cultural characteristics	-14.5	-40.4	-79.0
...8 educational or experience characteristics	-9.7	-26.8	-89.6
...all 15 characteristics plus their interactions	-23.0	-54.8	-92.0

inadequately constrained by a workplace's organizational culture and HR management practices. This study illustrates the operation of these processes within the Bank Group with more than 100 examples of staff members' experiences collected through 2 study advisory committees, 43 staff interviews, and 2 focus groups. Similar patterns had also been identified, with varying degrees of empirical rigor, in 16 earlier Bank Group diversity studies. Of course, many aspects of Bank Group human resource management appear well designed, operate in an equitable manner, and are trusted by Bank Group staff. However, these illustrations make clear that others are not.

THESE FINDINGS SUGGEST AN INCLUSION APPROACH TO DIVERSITY (CHAPTER 5)

In seeking to further advance staff diversity over the next several years, the Bank Group might simply continue the “traditional” approach to diversity that has marked its efforts over the past decade. The hallmarks of the traditional approach are concentration on a limited number of demographic groups (women, Part II, Blacks) and *numerical targets* for employment of persons from these groups. While such direct efforts to increase the presence of targeted groups may correct some past inequities, this approach largely sidesteps, rather than addresses, the *systemic barriers* preventing the organization from being automatically inclusive.

Traditional diversity approaches have generated one decade of progress. An inclusion strategy might do the same for the next decade.

The most fundamental reason to embrace an inclusion strategy is that research on diversity concludes that the traditional approach, by itself, will never permanently eliminate the inequities in hiring, compensation, and advancement for which the Bank Group has declared zero tolerance. Non-systemic initiatives — such as targeted hiring from a particular

out-group or salary adjustments for under-paid individuals — may reduce these imbalances temporarily, but they do not prevent the problems from recurring. They also do not prevent the same problems from adversely affecting other, non-targeted out-groups. Nor do they not create morale-enhancing trust among staff of all backgrounds that they are being treated fairly.

The strategy of enhancing diversity by addressing systemic barriers to inclusion also would promote four additional Bank Group goals:

1. *Enhancing client engagement skills.* The Bank Group increasingly seeks to conduct its development work through partnerships with a variety of external stakeholders. The same staff skills and corporate culture that would make the organization internally inclusive would enhance its ability to cooperate with clients and partner organizations.
2. *“We can never treat our clients better than we treat one another.”*
2. *Mobilizing differences as strategic assets in poverty reduction.* Research offers only limited support for the claim that simply improving staff diversity counts automatically will improve workplace efficiency, flexibility, or creativity. In fact, recent studies emphasize that when workforces are diverse but diversity is not actively managed, adverse consequences may arise for individuals, work-teams, and the organization. Without efforts to address systemic barriers to inclusion in the organization's culture, staff diversity is likely to be a source of continuing friction rather than an asset.
3. *Supporting the Bank Group's organizational systems.* The Bank Group employs several complex management systems to promote organizational learning and efficient staff use, most prominently: a matrix structure, succession planning, and decentralization to country offices. If these systems were designed and managed to control

systemic barriers, they would tend to support these goals. As they currently operate, they often appear to have the opposite effect.

4. *Positioning the Bank Group as an industry leader.* Many of the Bank Group's peer organizations have not focused on eliminating systemic barriers to inclusion. If the Bank Group pursues an inclusion strategy, it would generate state-of-the-art techniques and demonstrate leadership for other organizations.

Notes

- 1 Table E.1 describes a notional, not actual, scenario.



1. INTRODUCTION

In medicine, “prescription without diagnosis” is malpractice. This statement is also true when “doctoring” organizations.

— HR Magazine, 2002

Throughout the decade during which the World Bank Group has engaged in diversity work, it has pursued a constantly evolving agenda (box 1.1). Empirical analysis has been central in identifying and shaping each new direction. For example, in 1998 a study identifying constraints on women’s advancement helped to structure the organization’s gender effort.² In 1997, a study of racial concerns within one Bank Group unit facilitated creation of the Racial Equality program.³

This study follows in that tradition. State-of-the-art research on diversity outside the Bank Group increasingly reflects an approach referred to in this study as inclusion. The emergence of such thinking within the Bank Group was noted as early as 2000 by the Bank Group’s Senior Adviser on Gender Equality (table 1.1).⁴ The present study was commissioned to provide empirical information to assist the Bank Group as it considers the applicability of inclusion in its future diversity efforts.

The “traditional” approach to diversity, which dominated Bank Group efforts for the majority of its first decade of diversity work, is most visibly associated with employment counts of gender, race, and nationality groups (table 1.2). Under this approach, the Bank Group has made important progress in terms of the presence and treatment of demographic

Box 1.1 Bank Group's evolving diversity focus, 1992–2003

Pre-Strategic Compact. The first formal initiative on gender began in 1992 with appointment of a Senior Adviser on Gender, formal targets for women's representation, creation of networks of Vice Presidential Unit (VPU) Gender Equality Coordinators and Anti-Harassment Advisers, and VPU gender action plans.*

Strategic Compact. The [1998] HR Reform took a more comprehensive approach. Targets for nationality, gender, and race were set. In 1998 the Racial Equality program was launched, marked by a zero tolerance policy for racial discrimination, appointment of a Senior Adviser, and creation of mentoring and Junior Professionals programs for Sub-Saharan African and Caribbean nationals. New emphasis was placed on managerial accountability through Diversity Agreements between the Vice Presidents and the President. The varied aspects of diversity were brought under Director-level leadership in July 2001.

HR Agenda. The HR Agenda in 2001 and Strategic Staffing Paper in 2003 made mainstreaming diversity, enhancing managerial competence, and increasing accountability priorities alongside increasing representation of targeted groups. Attention to different aspects of diversity expanded to disabilities and other areas such as education, language, and prior professional experience. To reflect decentralization, beginning in FY04, the Bank removed the distinction between HQ- and non-HQ-appointed staff in measuring the diversity of GF+ staff.

*Sources: Adapted from World Bank (2002d, 2) and World Bank (2003d, 10).

groups within its staff. For example, the representation of women among GH+ headquarters employees more than tripled from 7.3% in FY1992 to 23.3% in FY2003. Moreover, in the vast majority of interviews conducted during this study, GF+ staff of all backgrounds described the Bank Group as better in terms of diversity than in former years.⁵

As subsequent chapters of this study will clarify, the inclusion approach represents a continuation of the Bank Group's commitment to staff diversity and equitable treatment. However, it represents a shift in the strategy for achieving further progress. In recent years, state-of-the-art thinking on diversity increasingly has recognized that a "diversity = numbers" approach carries organizations only so far toward workplace equity. Traditional diversity efforts tend to emphasize policies — such as the Bank Group's 2005 targets for women, Part II, and SSA/CR staff — which seek to change staff demographics directly. Under the "inclusion" approach, state-of-the-art diversity practices have moved beyond that emphasis to focus on the inclusiveness of the organizational culture and HR management practices which generate these outcomes. The present study was initiated to provide

empirical information concerning whether the inclusion approach is relevant to the Bank Group.

The inclusion approach differs from "traditional" approaches to diversity management in three fundamental ways:

1. **SYSTEMIC VERSUS GROUP-SPECIFIC PROBLEMS.** Traditional diversity management addresses problems of gender, race, and nationality largely separately, as though they are fundamentally different. The inclusion approach emphasizes social and psychological processes that affect all individuals who differ from the organization's "typical" employee in any way, visible or invisible.
2. **PROGRAM FOCUS.** Traditional diversity management treats employment outcomes for specific demographic groups, such as employment counts, as important stand-alone objectives. The inclusion approach tends to consider such employment outcomes to be the results of underlying organizational processes and practices, on which it focuses directly.

Table 1.1 Emergence of the inclusion approach in Bank Group thinking about diversity, described by the Senior Adviser on Gender Equity in 2000

Emerging Theme in Bank Group Diversity Thinking	Chapters in the Current Study Addressing This Theme
"The dialogue [has] shifted from deficiencies in groups that did not fit into the culture, to deficiencies in the culture itself." (pp. 6–7).*	1,2,5
"We have faced the reality that unconscious biases exist, manifested not only in attitudes but in performance appraisals, salary, and grades." (p. 1).	2,4
"We have broadened our focus from 'women's issues' to...inclusion—valuing differences of all kinds, including gender, race, nationality, sexual orientation, culture, and disabilities." (p. 2)	1,3,5
"We have moved from an emphasis on equity (fairness issues such as equal pay) to a balance between equity and efficiency (i.e., the business case)" (p. 2)	6
"We are changing the numbers, but we need to pick up the pace of change in the coming years." (p. 3)	1,4
"If an organizational culture creates strong pressure on staff to think and act alike, and encourages managers to hire people like them, then changes in numbers have a limited impact." (p. 6)	2,5
"We need to concentrate on fully integrating gender and diversity into basic business processes." (p. 10)	5
"Our needs may change in terms of where a diversity office is placed in the institution." (p. 12)	5

*Note: Pederson (2000). Page numbers in table 1.1 refer to pages in that report.

Table 1.2 Bank Group's principal measures of staff diversity

	FY2003		FY2005
	HQ and CO Appointments (%)	HQ Appointments (%)	Targets for HQ Appointments (%)
Part II Staff, GF+	47.4	39.2	40.0
Women, GF-GG	39.4	40.9	45.0
Women, GH+	23.3	23.3	30.0
SSA/CR, GF+	10.4	8.0	10.0

Source: Annual Review of Human Resources FY2003, 3.

3. WHO MUST CHANGE? Many initiatives undertaken within traditional workforce diversity management assist diverse employees to operate within an organization's existing corporate culture. The inclusion approach does not reject this approach entirely. However, it emphasizes ways in which the organizational culture may need to change to encompass diverse employees without requiring these employees to assimilate so extensively.

The present study was commissioned to provide empirical analysis corresponding to these three new conceptual assumptions. Specifically, it was assigned to test the hypothesis that the Bank Group's organizational policies and practices incorporate systemic barriers to inclusion.⁶ In this study, these terms are defined as follows⁷:

- *Barriers* may be any aspect of an organization's ways of operating — for example, attitudes, symbols, beliefs, arrangements, perceptions, policies, procedures, or practices — that cause some staff to be treated differently from their equally qualified peers.
- Barriers are *systemic* if they operate widely across the organization — distorting multiple policies and practices, influencing the behavior or attitudes of more than a small number of staff, and/or affecting employment outcomes for many different groups.
- Barriers adversely affect *inclusion* if they cause staff who differ from the organization's typical employees to have very different employment outcomes than would be predicted from their qualifications and interests.

Chapter 2 sets forth a conceptual framework for identifying systemic barriers to inclusion, and chapter 3 operationalizes that framework through 16 metrics to be used in empirical analyses.

The core of this analysis is multiple regression models of employment outcomes for 4,711 headquarters-appointed staff at grade GF or higher in June 2002. Both Bank-Group-wide analyses (chapter 4)

empirically demonstrate that metrics representing many different diversity characteristics substantially affect staff members' employment outcomes — the pattern that the conceptual framework in chapter 2 led us to expect as a consequence of systemic barriers to inclusion. Two study advisory committees, 43 individual interviews, 2 focus groups, and 16 previous Bank Group studies (appendixes B and C) reinforce the plausibility of this interpretation by providing more than 100 Bank Group illustrations of the operation of these barriers. Chapter 5 sets forth a strategy for Bank Group efforts to address systemic barriers to inclusion.

The entire study emphasizes the differences between traditional diversity efforts and the inclusion approach. The goal in emphasizing this contrast is not to imply that, until now, the Bank Group has been mistaken in emphasizing traditional approaches to diversity. The progress that the Bank Group has achieved over the past decade suggests quite the contrary. Instead, the goal is to sharpen the discussion of what to do in the future to continue past success. This study is intended to assist the Bank Group in looking with fresh eyes at whether assumptions, decisions, and practices that may have served the organization well until now will continue to do so in the future.

Notes

- 2 Catalyst (1998).
- 3 Dewey Ballantine (1997).
- 4 In the same spirit, World Bank (2002d, 1) describes diversity as the Office of Diversity Programs currently conceptualizes it, using language typical of the inclusion approach. It describes the Bank Group as "focused on process and behavior change leading to long-term and deep organizational culture change...."
- 5 Findings from these interviews are presented in chap. 4.
- 6 The Terms of Reference (TOR) directed us "... through diagnosis, to identify persistent systemic barriers that constrain full inclusion of all staff..." (appendix A, "Objective.").
- 7 A glossary is provided at the end of this study.



2. A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Minimizing bias need not be a utopian project. Social research conducted across many decades has taught us much about what generates and sustains workplace inequalities.

— Dr. William Bielby, President
American Sociological Association

This chapter begins the analysis of systemic barriers to inclusion by setting forth a conceptual framework to guide the study.

PSYCHOLOGICAL MECHANISMS THAT TEND TO CREATE SYSTEMIC BARRIERS

How can systemic barriers to inclusion arise within a workplace? Can they be present in an organization, such as the Bank Group, in which blatant sexism or racism is infrequently expressed and the staff includes a large number of visibly different individuals?

Answers to these questions are provided by rigorous empirical research, added to continuously since the 1920s, in the disciplines of psychology, sociology, and cognitive science. This body of knowledge, especially on the topics of social identity and social categorization,⁸ provides a conceptual basis for state-of-the-art approaches to workforce diversity management.

A central finding of this research is that *powerful, unconscious psychological and social processes that can result in differences in treatment of groups or individuals are present even in workplaces in which the organization and its employees are free of conscious bias against identifiable groups*. Three principal psychological and

social processes underlie this conclusion: *stereotyping*, *in-group bias*, and *limited social networks*.

STEREOTYPING

A stereotype is a set of beliefs held by an individual about the characteristics of a group of people. Stereotyping is the process by which an individual employs a stereotyped belief in the evaluation of, or behavior toward, a member of the stereotyped group.⁹ Stereotyping is a way of thinking in which a person clusters people into categories to summarize and organize information, creating “shortcuts” so that decisions can be reached with minimum effort.

One form of stereotyping that can create obvious barriers to inclusion is *prejudice* — unjustified negative attitudes toward a group and its members.¹⁰ But all individuals, including those free of prejudice, tend to use stereotypes as a convenient way of thinking; therefore, the judgments of all individuals potentially are susceptible to stereotypes’ distorting effects.

These distortions arise whenever evaluations of an individual are influenced by generalizations about that person’s group rather than based solely on assessment of that individual.¹¹ It might seem that such circumstances easily are avoided by ensuring that decisionmakers concentrate on the facts about individuals rather than their groups. However, in workplaces, human resource management decisions often are made without considering individuals’ data either explicitly or systematically. This situation may arise, for example, when supervisors feel that they already know the employees whom they are assessing, or supervisors are under time pressure.

Moreover, even when individuals’ facts are examined, stereotypes tend to influence the way these facts are perceived, remembered, and interpreted — often without the decisionmaker’s being conscious of their influence.¹² Thus, social psychological research has demonstrated that:

- Individuals tend to seek out information confirming stereotypes at a greater rate than information contradicting them.¹³

- Especially when under time pressure, individuals notice and remember information that confirms stereotypes more than information that contradicts them.¹⁴
- When information is ambiguous, individuals fit information to confirm stereotypic expectations.¹⁵
- When recalling objective facts about an individual, memory errors tend to confirm stereotypes.¹⁶
- When an individual encounters information inconsistent with a stereotype, the stereotype tends to be maintained. For example, information contradicting the stereotype may be attributed to temporary circumstances, such as luck or unusual effort.¹⁷ Or the disconfirming cases may be split off into a new category about which a different stereotype is formed.¹⁸
- Even when individuals explicitly are informed about the invalidity of stereotypes, their propensity to rely on the stereotype is not eliminated, and their reliance on individual information is not increased.¹⁹
- Individuals may bolster their stereotype-based judgments by assuming that individual information went into the judgment, even when it did not. The illusion of having received individual information tends to make evaluators more confident in their judgments and the judgments themselves more extreme.²⁰
- Distinctive people often are perceived as causing whatever happens within a group. For example, a woman in an otherwise male group tends to be perceived as more prominent and influential and to have her good and bad qualities exaggerated in others’ judgments.²¹
- Individuals’ judgments are particularly prone to distortion by stereotypes when criteria for decisionmaking are arbitrary and subjective — for example, in high-level jobs, for which employees’ qualifications and contributions are less likely to be measured systematically.²²

These distorting processes tend to operate so automatically, swiftly, subtly, and unconsciously that the decisionmakers often feel that they have been objective and unbiased in their decisions. Thus, systemic barriers to inclusion may be created by stereotyping even when decisionmakers, such as supervisors, perceive that they have not.

IN-GROUP BIAS

Like stereotyping, in-group bias results from a process of categorization. In this case, however, the categories are simply “us” — whatever group “we” belong to — versus “them” — anyone not belonging to “our” group. Social psychological research has demonstrated repeatedly a tendency to perceive and treat members of other groups less favorably than members of our own group.²³ This effect can arise even when the basis for distinguishing one group from the other is inconsequential or arbitrary. For example, group bias has been demonstrated in groups whose common identity was simply that experimenters had told them they all preferred the same abstract artist rather than a different one.²⁴

Like stereotypes, in-group bias can distort judgments in the workplace unconsciously. Out-group members tend to be seen as homogeneous and undifferentiated, thereby reinforcing the tendency to use stereotypical group information in place of individual information.²⁵ In addition, social psychological research has established that:

- Members of one’s own group tend to be granted the benefit of the doubt in circumstances in which members of other groups are not.²⁶
- The same behavior may be given a different interpretation depending on whether the person is a member of the evaluator’s in-group. For example, negative behavior by out-group members tends to be attributed to their fundamental disposition, while negative behavior by in-group members is attributed to circumstances. (“They failed because they’re incompetent; we failed because our effort was spent on a higher priority.”) Similarly, positive behavior by out-group members is more likely to be discounted as a special

case — due to luck or some special advantage, or reflecting extra effort.²⁷

- Individuals remember members of their own group more than members of groups to which they do not belong.²⁸ Individuals not belonging to a group also tend to see members of that group as physically resembling each other, so that members of the group are more likely to be confused with one another.
- Evaluators tend to judge members of groups to which they do not belong more extremely than members of their own group; good performers are seen as better, and poor performers are seen as worse, than they would be if they shared group membership with the evaluator. This effect has been demonstrated to operate whether the group difference was based on gender, race, or age.²⁹

In situations of strong social relationships — for example, in families, close personal networks, or mutually supporting communities — in-group bias is sometimes deliberate. Favorable treatment may be used to reinforce a sense of association from which both parties derive psychological support.³⁰ Favorable treatment may be granted in anticipation of reciprocation. However, through the psychological processes just described, the same outcomes tend to arise even when there is no intention to favor one group or have antipathy toward the other group.³¹ Thus, as with stereotyping, the forces may operate without decisionmakers’ being aware of their influence, and the decisionmakers’ perceptions that they have been objective and fair offer little useful evidence concerning whether all persons were treated equally.

LIMITED SOCIAL NETWORKS

Systemic barriers to inclusion also can arise from patterns of interaction within and outside the workplace.

Networks are defined as bonds of affiliation among individuals that serve as both a “glue” that provides order and meaning to social life and a “lubricant” to get things done.³² Outside the workplace, members

of different groups tend to have access to different networks — for example, because they affiliate with different religions, live in different neighborhoods, graduated from different universities, or share different avocational interests. Within the workplace, similar differences in access can be created by organizational circumstances, such as in what organizational unit individuals work or what rank they hold; and by interaction patterns, such as which coworkers informally socialize.

One way that differential access to networks affects individuals' careers is by reinforcing in-group bias. When group members interact mostly with one another, their in-group feelings become intensified.³³ Concurrently, interactions that provide little contact across groups may lead to exaggerated stereotypes of persons with whom there has been little contact. The degree of interpersonal contact also affects how influential stereotypes are, in that getting to know an individual tends to reduce the influence of group membership and increase the impact of individual information.³⁴

Access to social networks can affect careers significantly by informally providing career-relevant information, such as job vacancies that are not publicly advertised.³⁵ Social networks also often facilitate the sharing of other information that promotes success in the workplace. For example, informal exposure to what goes on in a workplace can assist a job candidate to appear more knowledgeable and better prepared in job interviews. Informal advice and mentoring may help a job candidate develop vocabulary, appearance, or personal style that make employment decisionmakers more comfortable. This information also may help job candidates perceive themselves as better prepared and therefore be more poised and confident in interviews. For example, in a study of white interviewers of job applicants, interviewers sat farther from black job candidates, terminated the interview 25% sooner, and made 50% more speech errors than with white job applicants. When white interviewers deliberately duplicated such behavior with white interviewees, objective observers rated the interviewees as more nervous and less effective than whites whose interviewers did not behave in this manner.³⁶

MICRO-INEQUITIES GENERATE DIFFERENT CAREER PATHS

In many workplaces, differences in treatment arising through the mechanisms just described are not dramatic in magnitude and therefore are sometimes referred to as micro-inequities. For example, average salary increases for members of one group might differ from that for members of other groups by only a few hundred dollars; wording in performance evaluations for members of the groups might differ only in degree of enthusiasm; or individuals in one group might sometimes be included in informal socializing but less frequently than others.

These differences are difficult to challenge individually as they arise because to do so might seem like quibbling, not being a “team player,” or needlessly distracting from the organization’s “real work.” However, the small size of individual micro-inequities is belied by their cumulative effect. As individuals' careers develop over years and decades, the ways the individuals are perceived and treated and what opportunities are open to them at each moment tend to be shaped by the track record they have accumulated prior to that moment. Thus, each micro-inequity has both an immediate effect and a “ratcheting” effect as decisionmakers react to an employee’s past record and the effects of past judgments.³⁷

This cumulative effect is readily illustrated in terms of salaries. Suppose that two employees are hired at \$100,000 per year, and that, subsequently, they receive annual raises, one of 5% and the other of 4.5%. In the first year, that difference amounts to only \$500. However, if this pattern is repeated each year over 20 years, the gap in earnings will grow to 9.1% or \$24,000 per year, and the cumulative earnings deficit for the disfavored employee will total nearly \$200,000.³⁸

The same cumulative effect can operate through career “tracking.” In many workplaces, early in their careers, some employees become differentiated from their peers as having unusual promotion potential. Their designation may be formal (for example, through selection for a “fast track” management development program) or embodied in informal

perceptions and widely held assumptions. However they arise, differences in career advancement tend to become self-fulfilling prophecies. The “fast track” label itself tends to grant favored individuals more access to work assignments offering skill development, experience, or visibility. If employees not bearing this label receive work assignments lacking the same “grooming” benefits, then these employees will not be as qualified for promotion when a vacancy subsequently is announced. Thus, an unbiased promotion selection process may still produce a biased result because the bias affected access to preparatory opportunities months or years earlier.

A similar pattern of cumulative effects has been described for the process of stereotyping under the label of “schemas.”³⁹ A schema is a set of stereotypes about differences among groups that tend to reinforce one another to create increasing divergence in careers over time. Examining why men and women are found at markedly different rates on the faculties of prestigious universities, one author summarizes the process as follows⁴⁰:

Gender schemas affect our expectations of men and women, our evaluations of their work, and their performance as professionals. Both men and women hold the same schemas and begin acquiring them in early childhood. Their most important consequence for professional work is that men are persistently overrated, while women are consistently underrated....Clear marks of prestige, from having a degree from an elite university to sitting at the head of the table, are interpreted differently, depending on whether the person is a man or a woman... Whatever emphasizes a man's gender gives him a small advantage, a plus mark. Whatever accentuates a woman's gender results in a small loss for her, a minus mark....If everyone understood that success comes from creating and consolidating small gains, then no-one would counsel women to ignore being ignored....The well-meaning advice often given to women — not to make a mountain out of a molehill —...fails to recognize that mountains are molehills piled one on top of the other.

When such processes create even small differences in individuals' career outcomes, administrative processes tend to amplify these differences into large differences in group outcomes organization-wide. For example, consider a workplace with eight levels in its hierarchy, a system of “promotion from-within,” and equal numbers of men and women employees at the lowest level. If the promotional process at each level has a bias in favor of men amounting to only 1% of the variation in promotion rates, then the male representation at the top level in the organization will be 65%.⁴¹ Thus, micro-inequities operating on individuals can translate directly into broad patterns such as “glass ceilings” in the representation of women and minorities at higher levels of management.

PERCEPTIONS ARE NOT RELIABLE MEASURES OF SYSTEMIC BARRIERS

A final lesson from psychology research is that perceptions of the parties involved in employment decisions are not reliable indicators of the presence of systemic barriers to inclusion.

This conclusion could be reached by common sense alone: by definition, the parties have a self-interest in whether employment processes are seen as fair. Supervisors making evaluative decisions can advance their careers by being seen as impartial; employees favored by decisions can cite the positive judgments as proof of their merits; and employees not favored by decisions can minimize the harm to their reputations by discrediting the decision processes.

However, even for individuals trying to make disinterested observations on employment processes in their workplaces, psychological research cautions that their perceptions are not to be trusted. In particular, among individuals who are favored by judgments, there is an unconscious tendency to overestimate the extent to which all decision-processes are just and that people get what they deserve. This pattern reflects the reassurance that such perceptions offer to successful people that they have gotten what they deserve, a way to feel pride in achievement, and a way to resist taking responsibility for the misfortunes of others.⁴²

Perhaps more surprising is that the judgments of the people adversely affected by decisions are not necessarily biased in the expected direction. In most workplaces, employees have limited information about employment decisions and the basis for these decisions; for example, in many organizations, employees do not know the salaries of their peers. In situations of incomplete information, research suggests, individuals are likely to underestimate the likelihood that they have been disadvantaged by bias. For example, although most women employees in the United States are aware that sex discrimination leads to a lower salary for the average woman than for an equally qualified male, the majority of women feel that their own salary is fair and that discrimination is something faced by other women.⁴³ The same pattern of denial of personal disadvantage while being aware of discrimination against one's group has been demonstrated among Blacks, unemployed people, and lesbians.⁴⁴

EARLIER STUDIES CONSISTENT WITH SYSTEMIC BARRIERS

Although the present study is a particularly broad-ranging examination of systemic barriers to inclusion Bank Group-wide, it was preceded by a number of studies touching on these issues in narrower contexts. If the processes just described are creating systemic barriers within the Bank Group, it would be surprising if no indications of these processes had surfaced in these earlier studies. As part of structuring our empirical analysis, we reviewed the findings of these earlier efforts.

This review began with a content analysis of 16 diversity-related studies completed during the last 9 years. The studies addressed a range of diversity concerns; involved a variety of race, gender, and nationality groups; examined different parts of the organization in different periods; and employed a variety of research methodologies (appendix C). However, when these studies are examined side by side, they demonstrate that multiple demographic groups recurrently have raised similar issues (table 2.1). Of the 21 diversity topics listed in the table,

only 3 topics (14%) were of concern for only 1 of the 3 demographic groups examined in the table, whereas the remaining 86% of issues were of concern to either 2 or 3 groups.

By itself, the fact that an issue was examined in a study does not prove that a group suffered inequities. However, it does signal that the issue was considered relevant to that group, either because members of the group complained or others were concerned on their behalf. This similarity of issues raised for multiple groups is consistent with our conceptual framework's analysis of such issues in terms of generic psychological and social processes, rather than prejudice against specific race, gender, or nationality groups.

One of the 16 studies, by Filmer, King, and van de Walle of DEC, is particularly worthy of attention because it analyzed two key human resource management outcomes — salaries and promotions — for two key demographic dimensions — gender and nationality — in a highly rigorous fashion.⁴⁵ Using a human capital multiple regression analysis of IBRD professional staff members in 1997, the study first eliminated the effects of differences in education and experience expected to create differences in career outcomes. It then estimated that, compared to equally qualified male holders of Part I passports, three other groups all experienced less favorable employment outcomes (table 2.2). Furthermore, a second analysis in this DEC study focusing specifically on members of the Young Professional (YP) Program showed a pattern of cumulatively increasing disparities in salaries and grades over individuals' careers.

The Filmer, King and Van de Walle study concludes⁴⁶:

We have identified two ways in which [discrimination] could arise. In its attempt to reduce labor costs, the Bank may be taking advantage of the fact that the four groups face different reservation wages. The other explanation puts more onus on individual managers and their preferences for discrimination coupled with imperfect information....Our results suggest that bias from both these sources is present.

Table 2.1 Inclusion issues examined for 3 groups of employees in 16 World Bank Group diversity studies, 1992–2002

The Study Examined Allegations of Unequal Treatment or Outcomes in...	Demographic Group Studied		
	Under-Represented		
	Women	Nationalities	Blacks
Recruitment*	x	x	x
Progress toward Diversity Goals	x	x	x
Entry Salaries	x	x	x
Mobility among Assignments	x	x	x
Access to Developmental Assignments	x	x	x
Stereotypes Affecting Assignments	x	x	x
Inclusion in Social Networks	x	x	x
Compensation	x	x	x
Culture and Atmosphere	x	x	x
Inflexible Culture	x	x	x
Rates of Separation	x	x	x
Unclear Policies on Discrimination	x	x	x
Inadequate Accountability for Diversity	x	x	x
Assessment of Hiring Qualifications	x	x	
Raises	x	x	
Hiring		x	x
Promotions	x		x
Performance Evaluations	x		x
Fringe Benefits	x		
Lack of Representation among Managers			x
Reasons for Separation			x

*Note: Based on appendix C.

Table 2.2 Earnings and grades for three groups compared to equally qualified Part I males, IBRD professional employees, 1997

	Part II Males	Part I Females	Part II Females
Salary at initial hire (%)	-6.9	-8.7	-14.6
Current salary (%)	-3.9	-5.6	-10.6
Grade at initial hire	-0.36	-0.70	-1.24
Current grade	-0.20	-0.22	-0.54

*Note: Filmer, King, and van de Walle (2003, tables 2–5); grades are in units of grade numbers.

Box 2.1 Examples of how Bank supervisors may assess the performance of male and female employees differently

The consulting firm Catalyst performed a content analysis of written performance appraisals for a stratified random sample of 137 IBRD professional and managerial staff in 1995–96.* The sample was restricted to high performers, and the reviews were universally favorable. However, “Reading [the appraisals] at face value, one would not only be inclined to select men over women in promotions, one would almost have to.” (Catalyst 1997)

The overall impression that the evaluations gave was that the women were good, and the best of them very good, while the men were great, and the best of them superb. For example, the first lines of the women’s reviews typically used conservative language to portray solid performance (“She has had a very productive year.”), while those for men were effusive (“He has had another remarkably productive year.”).

Women’s reviews focused on performance in their current role (“She has proven to be an exemplary team player in the Department, whose advice and counsel I value.”), while men’s reviews focused on positioning for future advancement (“I value his strategic and professional leadership, as well as strong client orientation, resourcefulness, and creativity. He should be proposed for...a director level assignment.”) Statements about career paths and future assignments appeared regularly for men but seldom for women.

Reviewers praised men and women for different reasons. Women were most commonly cited for activities related to their own work group (“Her most important attribute is her devotion to getting the best out of her group.”), while men were praised for external relationships (“He has successfully expanded his activities to achieve high visibility with external partners, through extensive networking.”). Equally, reviewers criticized men and women for different weaknesses. Women often were warned not to be too forceful (“She should make an effort to be less intimidating.”) and advised to maintain a balanced life (“[She should] work at a pace that is physically and mentally sustainable...if she is to remain productive and healthy.”). These issues were seldom raised for men.

When men were criticized, the criticism tended to be phrased to explain or diminish the problem (“Usually one of his strengths, this year I sensed that one staff member in particular could have benefited from a little more guidance....These are minor points, and I comment on them only in comparison to the excellent job he has done in the past....”). Mitigating language was not commonly provided for women.

*Note: Townsend (1997). Unfortunately, this study was not conducted in a “blind” manner. That is, when researchers were comparing evaluations for individual staff members, they were aware of the gender of the person being evaluated. Therefore, caution should be exercised in concluding that the study independently proves that men and women staff members are evaluated differently. “Blind” re-analysis of the same data (Cox and Tulan 1997) reached conclusions that were somewhat more nuanced but predominantly consistent with the prior study.

Another of the 16 studies is worthy of particular attention because it concerns a key human resource management process within the Bank Group, annual performance evaluations. The study provides illustrations of subtle but pervasive differences in the focus, style, and content of performance evaluations for comparable male and female employees (box 2.1.) In doing so, it cited examples consistent with the processes discussed earlier in this chapter,

especially stereotypes’ biasing effects on evaluative judgments and the creation of micro-inequities.

A final noteworthy analysis prior to the present study is provided by the Bank Group’s Staff Survey for 2000. In it, systemic barriers to inclusion might be suggested by adverse answers to questions about inclusion itself or to questions about management practices, in which out-groups tend to be

Table 2.3 Gender differences in selected responses to the 2002 Staff Survey

Question's Relevance to Inclusion	Survey Question	% Agreeing	
		Male	Female
Directly addresses diversity/inclusion*	Q 13. My work group has a climate in which diverse perspectives are valued.	72	67
	Q 14. In my work group we treat each other with respect.	84	80
	Q 15. Diversity (such as gender, race, nationality, disability, sexual orientation) is valued in my work group.	76	73
Addresses management practices that tend to harm out-groups more than in-groups	Q 12. Staff and manager changes (for example, promotions, reassignments) in my work group are made on an objective job-related basis.	52	48
	Q 16. There is effective teamwork across the different groups with which my work group works.	74	62
	Q 28. In the WBG, staff are rewarded according to their job performance.	42	40
	Q 29. When things go well on the job, your contribution is recognized frequently or always.	49	45
	Q 30. My manager encourages open and honest discussion.	79	75
	Q. 30. My manager demonstrates the people management skills to effectively lead the group.	69	66

*Note: Unpublished tabulations from the 2002 Staff Survey produced by the Gelfond Group at the request of the authors of this study.

disproportionately adversely affected by poor practices. For example, if staff are not rewarded according to their job performances (Question 28 in the survey), the social psychological research cited earlier in this chapter suggests that out-groups are likely to be under-rewarded and in-groups likely to be over-rewarded.

The 2000 Staff Survey did not ask respondents to identify many of their personal characteristics, but

it did ask their gender. Therefore, table 2.3 compares responses for men and women on survey questions related to inclusion. The table shows that, on 100% of the 9 survey questions examined, women (a presumed out-group) found the Bank inclusive at a lower rate than men (a presumed in-group).

The limitations of the Staff Survey as a measure of Bank Group inclusiveness are typical of those

found in varying degrees in most of the 16 studies discussed in this section:

- Most encompass only one dimension of diversity, for example, only gender or only race. It is therefore not possible within the study itself to determine whether barriers to inclusion observed in the study are based on prejudice specific to that group or in-group/out-group processes affecting multiple groups.
- Most are based on perceptions that are subject to the distortions, both conscious and unconscious, discussed earlier in this chapter.
- Most do not control for alternative explanations of the observed outcomes, including differences among groups in qualifications and aspirations that may generate differences in career outcomes not based on unequal treatment.
- Most cover only a fraction of the organization, such as one department or employees in a limited range of ranks. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the extent to which barriers to inclusion observed in the study are localized rather than characteristic of the organization as a whole.

IMPLICATIONS OF THIS CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

The methodological limitations of the studies just discussed confirm the need for a more comprehensive analysis of systemic barriers to inclusion, such as the present study.

The research reviewed in this chapter also suggests how such a study should be structured. For an empirical investigation of systemic barriers to inclusion at the Bank Group to add to existing information, the study must:

- Be based on objective measures of outcomes
- Control for job-related qualifications
- Examine cumulative effects

- Examine a broad range of employment outcomes
- Examine barriers adversely affecting a broad range of groups.

Notes

- 8 Social identity theory concerns the aspects of an individual's self concept that derives from his knowledge of his membership in social groups and the value and emotional significance attached to those memberships. Social categorization theory examines the ordering of a person's social environment in groupings that make sense to that person (Jones 1997, 88).
- 9 Jones (1997, 170).
- 10 Myers (1997, 353).
- 11 Bielby (2000), Devine (1989), Bodenhausen and MacCrae (1996).
- 12 Myers (1997, 364).
- 13 Erber and Fiske (1984).
- 14 Macrae, Milne, and Bodenhausen (1994).
- 15 Hilton and Von Hippel (1996).
- 16 For example, in an experiment in which observers watched a person take a mathematics test, observers who had been told the person was of a low social status remembered the person's test score as lower than those who had been told that the person was of high social status (Darley and Gross 1983).
- 17 Swim and Sanna (1996).
- 18 Myer (1990, 363). For example, those who stereotype women as passive and dependent may split off a new category of "aggressive feminist" for women who do not fit the passive stereotype.
- 19 Bielby (2000); Nelson, Acker, and Manis (1996).
- 20 Yzerbyt and others (1994).
- 21 Taylor and others (1979).
- 22 Bielby (2000), American Psychological Association (1991).
- 23 Jones (1997, 140).
- 24 Wilder (1981).
- 25 Judd and Park (1988), Biernat, Vescio, and Manis (1998).
- 26 Pettigrew (1979).
- 27 Hewstone and others (1982).
- 28 Park and Rothbart (1982).
- 29 Linville and Jones (1980), Jones (1997, 224).
- 30 Jones (1997, 205). Group membership provides members of dominant groups with positive esteem, in part from the fact of their dominance, and subordinate groups gain strength from their shared identity and from re-evaluating group characteristics to replace negative interpretations with positive ones.
- 31 Brewer (1979).
- 32 Powell and Smith-Doerr (1994, 368).
- 33 Myers (1990, 347).

- 34 Allport (1958). However, some types of interactions are much more effective than others in breaking down these biases. For example, interactions in which the individuals are of unequal status are relatively ineffective in promoting this effect.
- 35 Granovetter (1974). In this process, a person's network of "weak ties" (someone with whom a person is acquainted but who travels in different circles) tends to have more impact than "strong ties" (such as close friends who associate with many of the same people a person already knows.)
- 36 Word, Zanna, and Cooper (1974).
- 37 Long (1990); Merton (1968). Economists sometimes refer to a ratcheting effect as hysteresis (Blanchard and Summers, 1986).
- 38 Consistent with this hypothetical calculation, one study examined professional employees in international trade occupations in the U.S. labor market in 1999. It estimated that, after an average of 12 years of experience, women earned approximately 6% less than their equally qualified male counterparts — a difference averaging 0.5 percentage points per year (Egan, Bendick, and Miller 2002).
- 39 Valian (1998), see also Fution and Wyer (1986).
- 40 Valian (1998, 2–8).
- 41 Martel, Lane, and Emrich (1996).
- 42 Myers (1990, 360).
- 43 Crosby and others (1993).
- 44 Myers (1990, 341).
- 45 The goal of the Filmer-King-van de Walle study was to analyze employment patterns by nationality and gender. To do so, the study included in its statistical analyses many personal characteristics that also appear in the present study, for example, staff member's educational backgrounds. However, in the Filmer-King-van de Walle analysis, these variables were used to represent staff members' "human capital," which must be controlled for before nationality and gender effects can be accurately measured. In the present study, these characteristics are structured and interpreted somewhat differently to represent additional dimensions of diversity. This difference in analytical approach reflects the fact that the goal of the present study is to examine systemic barriers to inclusion based on a broad range of staff characteristics, whereas the earlier study had a narrower objective. The present study is deeply indebted to the pioneering application to the World Bank by Filer, King, and van de Walle of a form of analysis that we subsequently adapted. The present study also is indebted to the earlier study for the credibility that the present study derives from the fact that, although the two studies was structured somewhat differently, they reached essentially the same conclusions with respect to the characteristics on which the results can be directly compared.
- 46 Filmer, King, and van de Walle (2003, 19–20).



3. DEVELOPING INCLUSION METRICS

*I'm surprised that these 16 factors
still make such a difference. I
thought we had made such progress.*

— A senior manager interviewed Spring 2003

This chapter develops quantitative measures corresponding to Chapter 2's conceptual framework.

THE BANK GROUP'S CURRENT METRICS MEASURE DIVERSITY, NOT INCLUSION

Diversity is defined as differences among employees in characteristics that may affect the employees' employment outcomes. In the Bank Group, diversity is measured primarily in terms of the number of employees from different demographic groups.⁴⁷ For example, each August, the Human Resource Vice Presidency's Annual Review of Human Resources presents 71 tables counting the number of women, Part II, SSA/CR staff, and specific nationalities by grade and VPUs (table 1.2, chapter 1).

While diversity is a characteristic of *employees*, inclusion is a characteristic of an *employer*. The core indicator of inclusion is that the policies and practices by which the workplace operates generate equal employment outcomes for equally qualified staff members. More broadly, an inclusive workplace also makes equally qualified staff feel equally welcome and mobilizes them equally in achieving the organization's goals.⁴⁸

In the conceptual framework presented in chapter 2, *diversity is a consequence, and inclusion is the underlying cause*. That is why progress in terms of diversity requires an analysis of inclusion itself, such as in the present study.

To conduct such analyses of inclusion, counts of staff diversity are not an adequate measure. A workplace can be inclusive while not diverse,⁴⁹ or diverse while not inclusive.⁵⁰ To test the hypothesis that the Bank Group's policies and procedures incorporate systemic barriers to inclusion requires new metrics that measure inclusion directly.

For statistical analysis to distinguish systemic barriers to inclusion from barriers specific to individual groups (for example, race prejudice), these new metrics must encompass a broad range of characteristics. In selecting these characteristics, we were guided by the criteria that each characteristic should be:

- Hypothesized to lead to differences in treatment or outcomes within the Bank Group, in such sources as Bank Group diversity metrics (table 1.2), earlier Bank Group studies (appendix C), our TOR (appendix A), or published research (chapters 2 and 5)
- Tailored to the cultural and strategic context of the Bank Group, not simply taken from an “off-the-shelf” list⁵¹
- Explicitly definable and objectively measurable using data in the Bank Group's HR Query system
- Applicable both organization-wide and at the VPU level and below.

For a single analysis to examine the inclusion experiences of multiple groups, the characteristics defining these groups must be measured in a common format. The conceptual framework in chapter 2 provides a means for doing so by describing how some groups can be favored over other groups based on the employer's attitudes and behavior, independent of anything about the affected groups themselves. Because these processes are characteristic of the workplace, not the affected groups,

these processes tend to affect many groups in a parallel fashion.

Taking advantage of this parallelism, we apply the same computational procedure to every characteristic on which we base a metric. This computational procedure assumes that the numerically dominant value on a characteristic defines a “standard” employee, who is assumed to be favored by the processes described in chapter 2. Specifically, for each characteristic, we compute the statistical mode (most frequently occurring value) among the 4,711 persons who were active, headquarters-appointed members of the Bank Group's staff at the level GF or higher (GF+) on June 30, 2002. Staff members who have the modal value on that characteristic represent an in-group with respect to that characteristic; individuals differing from that “standard” employee form the corresponding out-group. Thus, for example, in the metric for gender, 65.4% of GF+ staff is male, making male the modal gender. Hence, males are the in-group, and females the out-group.

THE 16 METRICS

The result of the process just described is 16 metrics (table 3.1). The remainder of this chapter briefly discusses each.

NATIONALITY AND CULTURAL BACKGROUND (M1–3)

Nationality (M1): As an organization that is multinational in both its funding and its operations, nationality is an important dimension of Bank Group staff diversity. In June 2002 the GF+ staff included persons holding passports from 143 nations (table 3.2).

According to this table, persons of Part I nationality constituted 61.6% of the GF+ staff in June 2002, making Part I the modal characteristic and metric M1 the proportion of GF+ staff who were Part II. On this date, the organization-wide value of this metric was 38.4%.

For some aspects of inclusion, table 3.2, which is based on the passport currently held by staff

members, presents relevant information. However, other Bank Group concerns are less about nationality per se than about the cultural perspectives that staff members bring to their work. As an indicator of cultural perspectives, passport nationality is an inexact measure at best. Some Bank Group staff born in one country were raised or educated elsewhere and may have limited cultural affiliation with the nation whose passport they hold. Some Bank Group staff have changed their nationality through immigration, so that their current passport does not reflect the majority of their life experiences.³² Cultural perspectives may vary among persons holding the same passport depending on their affiliation with regional, racial, ethnic, religious, or other groups.

To characterize staff cultural perspectives, staff members' passport nationality can be supplemented with other information in HR Query. Table 3.3 applies this process to members of the GF+ staff in June 2002 whose current passport was from 1 of the 5 nations with the largest number of GF+ employees. Combining data on race, native languages, undergraduate degrees, and changes in nationality, table 3.3 assigns a form of cultural background to each staff member. According to the table, the proportion of persons whose cultural background thus defined differs from the cultural perspective most commonly associated with that person's passport can be as high as 1 person in 4.

Our metrics include two variables to represent staff cultural background in ways not fully reflected in passport nationality:

- Native languages (M2): The modal Bank Group employee, accounting for 34.2% of the GF+ staff, speaks only English as a native language. Therefore, Metric M2 tabulates the proportion of GF+ staff who report being a native speaker of at least one language other than English (table 3.4).
- Undergraduate education (M3): 68.6% of Bank Group GF+ staff hold an undergraduate degree from a university in a Part I country. Therefore, Metric M3 tabulates the proportion of staff holding an undergraduate degree from a university in a Part II country (table 3.5).

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS (M4–7)

Staff personal characteristics are represented by four metrics:

- Gender (M4): As discussed earlier in this chapter, 65.4% of GF+ employees are male, making male the modal gender and M4 the proportion of staff who are female (table 3.1).
- Race (M5): Although the HR Query system does not contain race information, Black employees can be identified using an Office of Diversity Programs compilation from staff photographs. According to this compilation, non-Blacks account for 92.7% of GF+ staff, making Blacks the out-group tabulated in metric M5 (table 3.1).
- Family status (M6): According to table 3.6, 58.6% of GF+ staff are married with 1 or more dependents. Therefore, Metric M6 includes persons who are not married and persons, regardless of marital status, with no reported dependents.
- Age (M7): According to table 3.7, each year of age between 36 and 55 accounts for at least 3.3% of GF+ staff, while each year younger or older than that accounts for considerably less. Accordingly, Metric 7 joins in a single out-group all persons age 35 and younger, or 56 and older.

GRADUATE EDUCATION (M8–10)

Staff graduate education is represented by three metrics.

- Field of graduate study (M8): According to table 3.8, 63.1% of GF+ staff hold at least 1 graduate degree in business or economics. Metric M8 counts as an out-group all staff having no graduate degree in either field.
- Individual universities (M9): By some estimates, perhaps 7,000 degree-granting institutions of tertiary education operate in the world today. However, according to tables 3.1 and 3.9, 50.3% of GF+ staff hold at least 1 graduate degree from 1 of 20 universities, and the same 20 account for a high proportion of staff-held masters degrees in business, doctorates in

Table 3.1 Sixteen inclusion metrics defined by the proportion of GF+ staff with non-modal characteristics, June 2002

Category	Characteristic	Modal Value among GF+ Staff	% of GF+ Staff with Modal Value	Metric Number	Definition (% of GF+ Staff Who Do Not Have the Modal Value)	% of GF+ Staff with Non-Modal Value
Nationality	Nationality Group	Part I Passport	61.6	M1	% Staff w/ Part II Passport	38.4
Cultural Background	Native Languages	Only Native Language Is English	34.2	M2	% Staff w/ 1 Native Language Other than English	65.8
	Undergraduate Education	No Undergraduate Degree from a Part II University	68.2	M3	% Staff w/ 1 Undergraduate Degree(s) from a Part II University	31.8
Personal Characteristics	Gender	Male	65.4	M4	% Staff Who Are Female	34.6
	Race	Not Black	92.7	M5	% Staff Who Are Black	7.3
	Family Status	Married w/ Dependents	58.6	M6	% Staff Who Are Not Married w/ Dependents	41.4
	Age	Age 36–55	72.7	M7	% Staff Younger than 36 or Older than 55	27.3
Graduate Education	Graduate Degrees by Field of Study	1 Graduate Degree(s) in Economics or Business	63.1	M8	% Staff w/ No Graduate Degree in Economics or Business	36.9
	Graduate Degrees—Core Universities	1 Graduate Degree(s) from 20 Core Universities	50.3	M9	% Staff w/ No Graduate Degree from 20 Core Universities	49.7
	Graduate Degrees—Part II Universities	No Graduate Degrees from Any Part II University	85.5	M10	% Staff w/ 1 Graduate Degree(s) from a Part II University	14.5
Experience outside WBG	Non-WBG Employment	Has 8 Years Work Experience outside Bank Group	53.0	M11	% Staff w/ 8 Years' Experience outside Bank Group	47.0
	NGO Employment	Has No Work Experience in NGO	94.5	M12	% Staff w/ Work Experience in NGO	5.5
Experience within WBG	WBG Employment	Has 8 Years of Work Experience in Bank Group	54.4	M13	% Staff w/ 8 Years' Work Experience in Bank Group	45.6
	VPU Experience	Has Worked in No More than 1 VPU since 1999	75.7	M14	% Staff Who Have Worked in More than 1 VPU since 1999	24.3
	Network/Sectors	Affiliation w/ 1 Network/Sector	72.0	M15	% Staff w/ Some Affiliation w/ 1 Network/Sector(s)	28.0
Multiple Differences	Multiple Non-Modal Characteristics	No More than 6 Non-Modal Characteristics	84.2	M16	% Staff w/ 7 Non-Modal Characteristics	15.8

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

Variables analyzed: All variables are from HR Query, except for race, which was coded by the Diversity Office. Percents are based on persons with non-blank data.

Table 3.2 Nationality (based on current passport), GF+ staff, June 2002

Country Group	Values	Individuals in GF+ Staff		Relationship to Metric M1
		Number	%	
Part I/Part II	Part I	2,904	61.6	Mode
	Part II	1,807	38.4	Non-Mode = Metric
	TOTAL	4,711	100.0	—
Countries with 1% of GF+ Staff	USA	1,317	28.0	—
	India	367	7.8	—
	UK	273	5.8	—
	France	223	4.7	—
	Canada	193	4.1	—
	Germany	120	2.5	—
	Japan	115	2.4	—
	Australia	88	1.9	—
	Italy	87	1.8	—
	Philippines	83	1.8	—
	China	80	1.7	—
	Netherlands	70	1.5	—
	Pakistan	62	1.3	—
	Brazil	61	1.3	—
	Belgium	56	1.2	—
	Colombia	54	1.1	—
	127 Countries with < 1% of GF+ Staff	1,462	31.0	—
	8 Countries^ with No GF+ Staff	0	0.0	—
	TOTAL	4,711	100.0	—
Selected Groupings Reported in the WBG Annual Review of Human Resources*	Asia	857	18.2	—
	Europe Part II	164	3.5	—
	European Union	1,046	22.2	—
	Arab League	137	2.9	—
	Anglophone Africa	195	4.1	—
	Francophone Africa	110	2.3	—
	Sub-Saharan Africa	322	6.8	—
	Caribbean	53	1.1	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

Variable analyzed: Nationality (based on passport citizenship) reported in HR Query.

*Defined in Annual Review of Human Resources FY2002, appendix 1. These categories are not mutually exclusive.

^The number 8 is derived by subtraction from 151, which is the number of nationality codes in HR Query.

Table 3.3 Overlap between nationality (based on current passport) and cultural perspectives (based on other data), GF+ staff, June 2002, for the five nationalities with the most GF+ staff

Nationality (Current Passport)	Individuals in GF+ Staff		Cultural Perspective Suggested by Race/Ethnicity, Native Languages, Undergraduate Degrees, and Change in Nationality*							
			Black Part I	Hispanic Part I	Asian Part I	Other Part I	Black Part II	Hispanic Part II	Asian Part II	Other Part II
USA	Number	1,317	35	35	0	1,094	7	9	77	60
	%	100.0	2.7	2.7	0.0	83.1	0.5	0.7	5.8	4.6
India	Number	367	0	0	0	60	0	0	276	31
	%	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.3	0.0	0.0	75.2	8.4
UK	Number	273	3	1	0	252	0	0	9	8
	%	100.0	1.1	0.4	0.0	92.3	0.0	0.0	3.3	2.9
France	Number	223	1	4	0	210	1	0	2	5
	%	100.0	0.4	1.8	0.0	94.2	0.4	0.0	0.9	2.2
Canada	Number	193	4	4	0	161	0	1	16	7
	%	100.0	2.1	2.1	0.0	83.4	0.0	0.5	8.3	3.6

Notes:

Staff examined: 2,373 persons who were active headquarters-appointed WBG staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002 and whose nationality on that date was one of the five listed in the table.

Variables analyzed: Nationality, undergraduate education, and native language as reported in HR Query; race as coded by the Diversity Office.

*Race/ethnicity is assumed Black if individual is coded as Black by Diversity Office, Asian if is a native speaker of an Asian language, Hispanic if a native speaker of Spanish or Portuguese, otherwise "Other." Nationality is assumed Part II if an individual holds an undergraduate degree from a Part II university or is a native speaker of an Asian, Mideastern, or African language excluding Japanese; otherwise, is assumed Part I. If an individual changed nationality since being hired by the Bank Group, the person is classified as Other Part I or Other Part II based on the previous nationality.

economics, and graduate degrees in other fields of study. Accordingly, Metric M9 counts an out-group consisting of persons with no graduate degree from these 20 "core" universities.

- Part II universities (M10): According to table 3.10, 85.5% of GF+ staff with graduate degrees hold only graduate degrees from universities in Part I countries. Therefore, Metric M10 tabulates persons with any graduate degree from a university in a Part II country.

WORK EXPERIENCE (M11–15)

Individuals' employment experience outside the Bank Group is represented by two metrics:

- Total experience (M11): According to table 3.11, 53.0% of GF+ staff have 7 or fewer years of professional work experience outside the Bank Group. Therefore, metric M11 is computed from

the proportion of staff with 8 or more years of such experience.

- Experience in NGOs (M12): As the Bank Group increasingly seeks to conduct its development work in partnership with other development actors, one category of partners in which staff have the least employment experience is non-governmental organizations. According to table 3.12, 94.4% of GF+ staff have no work experience in that sector. Therefore, metric M12 is based on the proportion of staff who have ever worked in an NGO.

Individuals also can fall into in-groups or out-groups based on their work assignments since being hired by the Bank Group:

- Total experience (M13): According to table 3.11, 54.4% of GF+ staff have worked in the

Table 3.4 Native languages reported by GF+ staff, June 2002

Language Category	Number of Languages Included in Category	Individuals in GF+ Staff Reporting This as a Native Language		Relationship to Metric M2
		Number	%	
English	1	1,415	39.8	Mode
European Languages Other than English, French, or Spanish	34	635	17.9	—
Asian Languages Other than South Asian Languages	25	426	12.0	—
South Asian Languages	16	423	11.9	—
French	1	345	9.7	—
Spanish	1	299	8.4	—
Mideastern or North African Languages	5	256	7.2	—
Sub-Saharan African Languages	31	172	4.8	—
English Only	—	1,214	34.2	—
English plus ≥ 1 Other Language(s)	—	201	5.7	Not Mode =
English Not a Native Language	—	2,136	60.2	Metric
TOTAL		3,551	100.0	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 3,551 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002 and reported information on native languages in HR Query.

Variable analyzed: 3,971 reports of native languages in HR Query, assigned to categories by the authors. An individual may report more than one native language.

Bank Group, either as an employee or a consultant, for 8 years or more. Therefore, metric M13 is computed from the proportion of staff with 7 or fewer years' seniority within the Bank Group.

- Mobility among VPUs (M14): According to table 3.13, 75.7% of GF+ staff have worked within the same VPU throughout their employment in the Bank Group. Thus, Metric M14 tabulates the proportion of staff who have moved at least once from one VPU to another.⁵³
- Network/sector affiliations (M15): According to table 3.13, 72.0% of GF+ staff have either no network/sector affiliations or a single affiliation. Metric M15 computes the proportion of Bank Group staff who have affiliated with more than one network or sector, either concurrently or sequentially.

MULTIPLE NON-MODAL CHARACTERISTICS (M16)

The first 15 metrics implicitly assume that the effect of being non-modal on one metric is the same regardless of the number of other metrics on which that person also is non-modal. However, individuals who differ from the modal profile simultaneously on multiple characteristics may be perceived as especially different from the “standard” employee. To capture this effect, table 3.14 tabulates the number of persons who are members of multiple out-groups. Although only 53 individuals (1.1%) in the GF+ staff are in the in-group on all 15 characteristics examined, the majority of staff members are in the in-group on the majority of their characteristics. Metric M16 encompasses the 14.4% of GF+ staff who are in the out-group on 7 or more of the characteristics addressed in the previous 15 metrics.

Table 3.5 Undergraduate degrees held by GF+ staff, June 2002, by country of degree-granting university

Country Group	Country in Which Degree-Granting University Is Located	Individuals in GF+ Staff		Relationship to Metric M3
		Number	%	
Part I	—	2,043	68.6	—
	USA	1,234	41.4	—
	UK	272	9.1	—
	Canada	137	4.6	—
	France	68	2.3	—
	Japan	55	1.8	—
	Australia	54	1.8	—
	Germany	29	1.0	—
	Ireland	29	1.0	—
	South Africa	24	0.8	—
	New Zealand	20	0.7	—
	Belgium	19	0.6	—
	Netherlands	18	0.6	—
	Italy	17	0.6	—
	Sweden	13	0.4	—
	Spain	11	0.4	—
	Russian Federation	10	0.3	—
	Switzerland	8	0.3	—
	Denmark	7	0.2	—
	Finland	6	0.2	—
	5 Countries with 1-5 Degrees	12	0.4	—
	4 Countries with No Degrees	0	0.0	—
Part II	—	935	31.4	—
	India	294	9.9	—
	Philippines	75	2.5	—
	China	52	1.7	—
	Brazil	38	1.3	—
	Turkey	28	0.9	—
	Columbia	25	0.8	—
	Pakistan	25	0.8	—
	Peru	22	0.7	—
	Lebanon	20	0.7	—
	Mexico	20	0.7	—
	Egypt	19	0.6	—
	Kenya	19	0.6	—
	Ghana	17	0.6	—
	Israel	16	0.5	—
	Korea	14	0.5	—
	Nigeria	13	0.4	—
	Yugoslavia	13	0.4	—
	Argentina	12	0.4	—
	Bangladesh	11	0.4	—
	Chile	10	0.3	—
	Iran	10	0.3	—
	Greece	9	0.3	—
	Taiwan	9	0.3	—
	Cameroon	8	0.3	—
	Ethiopia	8	0.3	—
	Singapore	7	0.2	—
	Thailand	7	0.2	—
	Tunisia	7	0.2	—
	Uganda	7	0.2	—
	Malaysia	6	0.2	—
	Sri Lanka	6	0.2	—
	Zimbabwe	6	0.2	—
	46 Countries with 1–5 Degrees	102	3.4	—
	103 Countries with No Degrees*	0	0.0	—
TOTAL	—	2,978	100.0	—
No Undergraduate Degree from a Part II University		1,998	68.2	Mode
≥ 1 Undergraduate Degree(s) from a Part II University		933	31.8	Not Mode = Metric
TOTAL	—	2,931	100.0	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 2,931 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002 and reported one or more undergraduate degree(s) in HR Query.

Variable analyzed: 2,978 undergraduate degrees awarded in 2002 or earlier reported in HR Query.

*Calculated by subtraction from the 151 nationality codes in HR Query.

Table 3.6 Family status of GF+ staff, June 2002

Marital Status	Number of Dependents	Individuals in GF+ Staff		Relationship to Metric M6
		Number	%	
Married	≥ 1	2,759	58.6	Mode Not Mode = Metric
Married	None	917	19.5	
Not Married	≥ 1	166	3.5	
Not Married	None	709	15.0	
Partnered	≥ 1	53	1.1	
Partnered	None	1	0.0	
Separated	≥ 1	8	0.2	
Separated	None	3	0.1	
Not Reported	≥ 1	4	0.1	
Not Reported	None	91	1.9	
TOTAL	—	4,711	100.0	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who are active headquarter-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

Variables analyzed: Marital status and number of dependents as reported in HR Query.

Table 3.7 Age of GF+ staff, June 2002

Age	Individuals in GF+ Staff			
	Number	%	% for Group	Relationship to Metric M7
<24	0	0.0	14.4	Not Mode = Metric
25	1	0.0		
26	4	0.1		
27	5	0.1		
28	12	0.3		
29	40	0.8		
30	51	1.1		
31	74	1.6		
32	105	2.2		
33	125	2.7		
34	149	3.2		
35	111	2.4		
36	155	3.3	72.7	Mode*
37	160	3.4		
38	173	3.7		
39	194	4.1		
40	170	3.6		
41	155	3.3		
42	193	4.1		
43	181	3.8		
44	178	3.8		
45	163	3.5		
46	174	3.7		
47	180	3.8		
48	209	4.4		
49	178	3.8		
50	179	3.8		
51	154	3.3		
52	164	3.5		
53	156	3.3		
54	157	3.3		
55	154	3.3		
56	144	3.1	12.9	Not Mode = Metric
57	111	2.4		
58	111	2.4		
59	110	2.3		
60	72	1.5		
61	42	0.9		
62	7	0.1		
63	4	0.1		
64	4	0.1		
65	2	0.0		
TOTAL	4,711	100.0	—	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were active headquarters appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

Variables analyzed: Dates of birth as reported in HR Query.

*Mode consists of adjacent years each accounting for 3.3% or more of GF+ staff.

Table 3.8 Graduate degrees held by GF+ staff, June 2002, by field of study

Field of Study	GF+ Staff Holding a Graduate Degree in This Field		Relationship to Metric M8	% of these Persons Also Holding a Graduate Degree in Economics or Business
	Number	%		
Economics	1,185	36.3	—	—
Business	1,016	31.2		—
International Relations	306	9.4		32.4
Engineering	292	9.0		31.8
Public Administration	220	6.7		32.7
Computer Sciences	216	6.6		29.2
Law	190	5.8		24.7
Agriculture	158	4.8		32.9
Other Social Sciences	153	4.7		17.6
Environment	138	4.2		21.7
Liberal Arts/Other	124	3.8		29.0
Education	94	2.9		18.1
Health	72	2.2		19.4
≥1 Degree(s) in Economics or Business	2,058	63.1	Mode	—
No Degrees in Economics or Business	1,202	36.9	Not Mode = Metric	—
TOTAL	3,260	100.0	—	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 3,260 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002 and reported at least 1 graduate degree in HR Query.

Variable analyzed: 5,115 graduate degrees held by these persons reported in HR Query, assigned to categories by the authors.

Table 3.9 Universities accounting for a large proportion of graduate degrees held by GF+ staff, June 2002

University	Five Additional Measures																		
	All GF+ Staff Holding a Degree from This University			Relationship to Metric M9	All Managers Holding a Graduate Degree from This University			All GF+ Staff Holding Doctorates from This University			All GF+ Staff Holding Doctorates in Economics from This University			All GF+ Staff Holding Masters in Business from This University			Number of Fields (out of 13*) in Which School is among Top 5 in Graduate Degrees Held by GF+ Staff		
	No.	%	Rank		No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank
George Washington	231	5.3	1	—	18	2.5	7	33	2.6	6	9	1.6	17	108	10.9	1	7	10.8	2
Harvard	200	4.6	2	—	54	7.6	1	65	5.2	1	21	3.7	2	53	5.3	2	8	12.3	1
John Hopkins	143	3.3	3	—	21	3.0	4	27	2.2	10	9	1.6	17	7	0.7	24	6	9.2	3
Columbia	109	2.5	4	—	14	2.0	11	32	2.6	7	17	3.0	7	27	2.7	5	4	6.2	4
LSE	93	2.1	5	—	18	2.5	7	19	1.5	15	11	1.9	12	6	0.6	26	4	6.2	4
American	91	2.1	6	—	6	0.8	25	12	1.0	27	6	1.0	26	31	3.1	3	4	6.2	4
MIT	83	1.9	7	—	23	3.2	3	31	2.5	9	15	2.6	8	23	2.3	9	2	3.1	11
Oxford	83	1.9	7	—	29	4.1	2	34	2.7	5	21	3.7	2	3	0.3	52	3	4.6	8
Stanford	82	1.9	9	—	20	2.8	5	42	3.4	3	21	3.7	2	19	1.9	11	3	4.6	8
Maryland	81	1.9	10	—	7	1.0	23	25	2.0	12	15	2.6	8	27	2.7	5	3	4.6	8
Pennsylvania	76	1.8	11	—	19	2.7	6	32	2.6	7	15	2.6	8	31	3.1	3	2	3.1	12
Georgetown	74	1.7	12	—	8	1.1	20	17	1.4	19	11	1.9	12	21	2.1	10	2	3.1	12
California, Berkeley	69	1.6	13	—	17	2.4	9	47	3.8	2	21	3.7	2	8	0.8	19	3	4.6	8
Princeton	69	1.6	13	—	17	2.4	9	12	1.0	27	7	1.2	24	0	0.0	—	2	3.1	12
London not LSE or LBS	63	1.5	15	—	10	1.4	16	17	1.4	19	3	0.5	39	5	0.5	33	4	6.2	4
Cornell	59	1.4	16	—	8	1.1	20	35	2.8	4	19	3.3	6	9	0.9	20	1	1.5	19
Chicago	57	1.3	17	—	12	1.7	12	26	2.1	11	22	3.8	1	18	1.8	12	0	0.0	25
Cambridge	54	1.2	18	—	12	1.7	12	18	1.4	17	11	1.9	12	1	0.1	87	1	1.5	19
Yale	52	1.2	19	—	11	1.5	15	22	1.8	14	15	2.6	8	14	1.4	31	0	0.0	25
Sorbonne	48	1.1	20	—	10	1.4	16	23	1.8	13	9	1.6	17	2	0.2	67	2	3.1	12
Core 20 Universities^	1,817	42.0	—	Mode	334	47.0	—	569	45.4	—	278	48.3	—	413	41.6	—	61	93.8	—
All Other Universities	2,509	58.0	—	Not Mode = Metric	376	53.0	—	683	54.6	—	297	51.7	—	580	58.4	—	4	6.2	—
TOTAL	4,326	100.0	—	—	710	100.0	—	1,252	100.0	—	575	100.0	—	993	100.0	—	65	100.0	—
Average Rank on This Measure for the 20 Core Universities	10.4				11.2			11.4			11.5			22.1			10.1		

Notes:

Staff examined: 3,260 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002 and reported at least 1 graduate degree in HR Query.

Variable analyzed: 5,115 graduate degrees reported in HR Query.

*The 13 fields are listed in table 3.8.

^Sums of the individual/university combinations from the previous 20 rows. The proportion of GF+ staff with a graduate degree from at least 1 of the 20 core universities is 50.3%.

Table 3.10 Graduate degrees held by GF+ staff, June 2002, by country of degree-granting university

Country Group	Country in Which Degree Granting University Is Located	Individuals in GF+ Staff Holding This Degree		Relationship to Metric M10
		Number	%	
Part I	—	3,433	87.9	—
	USA	2,180	55.8	—
	UK	446	11.4	—
	France	243	6.2	—
	Canada	131	3.4	—
	Germany	62	1.6	—
	Belgium	46	1.2	—
	Netherlands	52	1.3	—
	Russian Federation	31	0.8	—
	Italy	34	0.9	—
	Australia	32	0.8	—
	Switzerland	26	0.7	—
	Sweden	19	0.5	—
	Spain	18	0.5	—
	New Zealand	20	0.5	—
	South Africa	9	0.2	—
	Japan	16	0.4	—
	Austria	13	0.3	—
	Denmark	14	0.4	—
	Norway	13	0.3	—
	Finland	13	0.3	—
	Ireland	11	0.3	—
	2 Countries with 1–5 Degrees	4	0.1	—
	5 Countries with 0 Degrees	0	0.0	—
Part II	—	472	12.1	—
	India	178	4.6	—
	Philippines	27	0.7	—
	China	22	0.6	—
	Brazil	18	0.5	—
	Pakistan	16	0.4	—
	Argentina	14	0.4	—
	Hungary	9	0.2	—
	Yugoslavia	11	0.3	—
	Israel	11	0.3	—
	Turkey	12	0.3	—
	Poland	8	0.2	—
	Columbia	9	0.2	—
	Egypt	6	0.2	—
	Lebanon	9	0.2	—
	Thailand	9	0.2	—
	Bangladesh	8	0.2	—
	Bulgaria	6	0.2	—
	Kenya	7	0.2	—
	Nigeria	8	0.2	—
	Peru	6	0.2	—
	Chile	7	0.2	—
	Mexico	6	0.2	—
	44 Countries with 1–5 Degrees	65	1.7	—
	111 Countries* with 0 Degrees	0	0.0	—
TOTAL	—	3,905	100.0	—
Persons with Only Part I Degree(s)		2,788	85.5	Mode
Persons with Part I and Part II Degrees		287	8.8	Not Mode = Metric
Person with Only Part II Degree(s)		185	5.7	
TOTAL		3,260	100.0	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 3,260 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 20, 2002 and reported one or more graduate degree(s) in HR Query.

Variable analyzed: 5,115 masters, doctoral, or professional graduate degrees awarded in 2002 or earlier reported in HR Query.

*This figure is created by subtraction from 205, which is the number of country codes in HR Query.

Table 3.11 Years of work experience of GF+ staff, June 2002

Years	Experience Outside Bank Group^				Experience in Bank Group*			
	Individuals in GF+			Relationship to Metric M12	Individuals in GF+			Relationship to Metric M13
	Number	%	Cumulative %		Number	%	Cumulative %	
<1	144	4.3	4.3	Mode	174	3.7	100.0	Not Mode = Metric
1	202	6.0	10.3		198	4.2	96.3	
2	229	6.8	17.0		267	5.7	92.1	
3	273	8.1	25.1		324	6.9	86.4	
4	251	7.4	32.6		406	8.6	79.5	
5	232	6.9	39.5		313	6.6	70.9	
6	241	7.1	46.6		236	5.0	64.3	
7	216	6.4	53.0	Not Mode = Metric	230	4.9	59.3	Mode
8	196	5.8	58.8		275	5.8	54.4	
9	169	5.0	63.8		236	5.0	48.5	
10	156	4.6	68.5		197	4.2	43.5	
11	146	4.3	72.8		179	3.8	39.4	
12	121	3.6	76.4		175	3.7	35.6	
13	120	3.6	79.9		167	3.5	31.8	
14	99	2.9	82.9		135	2.9	28.3	
15	79	2.3	85.2		127	2.7	25.4	
16	74	2.2	87.4		124	2.6	22.7	
17	66	2.0	89.4		119	2.5	20.1	
18	66	2.0	91.3		113	2.4	17.6	
19	51	1.5	92.8		77	1.6	15.2	
20	51	1.5	94.3		107	2.3	13.5	
21	26	0.8	95.1		91	1.9	11.3	
22	29	0.9	96.0		85	1.8	9.3	
23	31	0.9	96.9		58	1.2	7.5	
24	25	0.7	97.6		58	1.2	6.3	
25	22	0.7	98.3		49	1.0	5.1	
26	19	0.6	98.8		46	1.0	4.0	
27	12	0.4	99.2		38	0.8	3.1	
28	7	0.2	99.4		28	0.6	2.3	
29	2	0.1	99.5		22	0.5	1.7	
30	7	0.2	99.7		25	0.5	1.2	
31	2	0.1	99.7		13	0.3	0.7	
32	4	0.1	99.9		13	0.3	0.4	
33	3	0.1	99.9		2	0.0	0.1	
34	0	0.0	99.9		2	0.0	0.1	
35	1	0.0	100.0		1	0.0	0.0	
36	1	0.0	100.0		<1	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL	3,373	100.0	—	—	4,711	100.0	—	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

Variables analyzed: Non-Bank-Group work experience reported in HR Query by 3,373 of these persons who reported some non-Bank-Group work experience; Bank Group experience is recorded in HR Query for all 4,711 persons.

^Excludes time as a consultant to Bank Group.

*Includes time as a consultant to the Bank Group and time as a Bank Group staff member in a grade other than GF+.

Table 3.12 Work experience outside the Bank Group by sector of employment, GF+ staff, June 2002

Sector	Individuals in GF+ Staff with Work Experience in This Sector		Relationship to Metric M13
	Number	%	
Private Sector	2,262	79.5	—
Public Sector	1,725	60.6	—
Academic (Other than Student Positions)	1,424	50.0	—
International Organizations (Other than WBG)	811	28.5	—
Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs)	187	6.6	—
Persons with Any Experience Outside WBG	3,393	83.0	—
Persons with Any Experience in NGO(s)	187	6.6	Not Mode = Metric
Persons with No Experience in Any NGO	3,206	94.5	Mode
TOTAL	3,393	100.0	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 3,393 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002 and reported at least some work experience outside the Bank Group in HR Query.

Variable analyzed: 6,409 employment positions with a start date of 2002 or earlier reported in HR Query. An individual may report experience in more than one sector.

Table 3.13 Breadth of experience within the Bank Group, GF+ staff, June 2002

Measure	Values	Individuals in GF+ Staff			Relationship to Metric M14	Relationship to Metric M15
		Number	%	Cumulative %		
Number of Bank Group VPU* in Which Staff Member Has Ever Worked	1	3,565	75.7	75.7	Mode	—
	2	1,027	21.8	97.5	Not Mode = Metric	—
	3	117	2.5	100.0	—	—
	4	2	0.0	100.0	—	—
	TOTAL	4,711	100.0	—	—	—
Number of Network/Sector Affiliations, 1997–2002^	0	1,583	33.6	33.6	—	Mode
	1	1,807	38.4	72.0	—	—
	2	891	18.9	90.9	—	Not Mode = Metric
	3	430	9.1	100.0	—	—
	TOTAL	4,711	100.0	—	—	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF-GK level or higher on June 30, 2002.

Variables analyzed: Selected variables reported in HR Query.

*Based on the 20 Bank Group VPUs defined in table G-3 and annex III of the Annual Review of Human Resources FY2002.

^Includes both primary and secondary affiliations, either simultaneous or sequential, at any time since network affiliations were first recorded in HR Query (1997).

Table 3.14 Prevalence of individuals with multiple non-modal characteristics, GF+ staff, June 2002

Number of Non-Modal Characteristics	Individuals in the GF+ Staff			Relationship to Metric M16
	Number	%	Cumulative%	
0	53	1.1	1.1	Mode
1	345	7.3	8.4	
2	582	12.4	20.8	
3	858	18.2	39.0	
4	855	18.1	57.2	
5	782	16.6	73.8	
6	559	11.9	85.6	
7	372	7.9	93.5	Not Mode = Metric
8	191	4.1	97.6	
9	77	1.6	99.2	
10	31	0.7	99.9	
11	5	0.1	100.0	
12	1	0.0	100.0	
13, 14, or 15	0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL	4,711	100.0	—	—

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were active headquarters-appointed Staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

Variable analyzed: 15 possible non-modal characteristics defined in Metrics M1–M15 (see table 3.2).

Notes

47 Here, the Bank Group has adopted practices common, particularly, among larger firms and public agencies, in Canada, the United States, and some countries in Western Europe (Hubbard 1997, Bendick 2000).

48 Campbell (2003).

49 For example, if there were a limited supply of qualified persons with some characteristics, then a workplace could employ few persons with those characteristics (thereby being non-diverse) but treat persons with those characteristics equally (thereby being inclusive).

50 For example, if a workplace offered persons with certain characteristics better opportunities than they could find elsewhere, that workplace might employ many persons with those characteristics (thereby being diverse) but still treat these persons less well than their equally qualified peers (thereby being non-inclusive). Jackson and others (1991) conducted a study of inclusion among senior executives of large U.S. financial services firms. Applying inclusion concepts similar to those in chap. 2, these researchers defined metrics based on 10 staff characteristics: age, sex, military service, undergraduate university, level of highest degree, possession of a business degree, years of experience with present employer, experience outside the financial services industry, job rank, and functional area of expertise. The differences among these

characteristics and the 16 metrics in the present study illustrate tailoring metrics to different organizational environments.

52 Among the 4,711 persons employed as headquarters-appointed GF+ staff on June 30, 2002, 97 (2.1%) had changed the nationality recorded in HR Query after joining the Bank Group.

Counts of inter-VPU moves for individuals are based on the VPUs listed in table G–3 and annex III of the 2001 and 2002 Annual Review of Human Resources. These counts, therefore, underestimate total inter-VPU moves.



4. EVIDENCE OF SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO INCLUSION

This chapter uses the metrics developed in chapter 3 to test the hypothesis that the Bank Group's policies and procedures incorporate systemic barriers to inclusion.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Our most comprehensive test of this hypothesis applies the well-established economic theory of human capital.⁵⁴ To analyze the equitable treatment of employees in a workplace, this theory divides a worker's characteristics into two groups:

1. Educational background, work experience, credentials, skills, and similar "human capital" characteristics that are assumed to contribute to that worker's job performance
2. All other characteristics, such as race and gender, that are assumed to be irrelevant to job performance.

Under this model, equitable treatment of employees is indicated when individuals' employment outcomes, such as salaries and promotions, are determined by the first group of characteristics and are unaffected by the second group. Following the same reasoning, the hypothesis of

systemic barriers in the Bank Group would be rejected if staff members' employment outcomes are determined by their productivity-related characteristics and are unaffected by whether the staff member is in the in-groups or out-groups corresponding to the 16 metrics. Conversely, the hypothesis of barriers to inclusion would be confirmed if our analysis finds statistically significant adverse effects on employment outcomes for any of the 16 metrics. The hypothesis that these barriers are systemic would be confirmed if these adverse effects are found for many different metrics and many different outcomes.

To test this hypothesis empirically, we specified multiple regression equations with four different employment outcomes as the dependent variable: (1) annual salary, (2) the likelihood that the staff member is a manager, (3) the likelihood that the staff member is in a grade higher than GG, and (4) the likelihood that the staff member changes VPU in a one-year period.⁵⁵ As variables explaining these employment outcomes, we included 82 employee characteristics assumed to be productivity-related — for example, the number of years of professional experience that the staff member had accumulated inside and outside the Bank Group, the staff member's graduate degrees in 13 separate fields of study, and whether these graduate degrees are from "top-rated" universities.⁵⁶ We also included 16 explanatory variables representing each employee's status in the in-group or the out-group on the 16 metrics.⁵⁷ We then estimated these 4 equations using data on the 4,711 headquarters-appointed staff in grade GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

These regressions document statistically significant adverse impacts on employment outcomes for the three demographic groups for whom Bank Group has set employment targets (table D.1 in appendix D). Compared to:

Equally qualified males, being female is associated with a 5.1% lower annual salary, a 37.1% reduction in the odds of being a manager, a 44.2% reduction in the odds of being in grades GH+, and a 29.6% reduction in the odds of changing VPUs.

Equally qualified persons of any other race, being Black is associated with a 3.2% lower annual salary, a 36.3% reduction in the odds of being in grade GH+, and a 6.5% reduction in the odds of changing VPUs.⁵⁸

Staff members holding a Part I passport, holding a Part II passport is associated with a 2.5% lower annual salary, a 24.6% reduction in the odds of being a manager, a 13.1% reduction in the odds of being in grade GH+, and a 36.6% reduction in the odds of changing VPUs.

These findings are consistent in two ways with the hypothesis that the Bank Group's barriers to inclusion are systemic. First, they show parallel inequities in employment outcomes for multiple demographic groups and multiple outcomes. Second, they show that these inequities have persisted or recurred for demographic groups for which the Bank Group has made explicit group-specific efforts to eliminate inequities.

A broader way of examining the hypothesis of systemic barriers focuses on the regressions' analyses of all 16 metrics (table 4.1). The first row of the table estimates employment outcomes for GF+ staff members who would fall into none of the 16 out-groups examined in this study. That is, these staff members are modal in term of gender (male), race (not Black), nationality (Part I passport), education (have a graduate degree in economics or business, have a graduate degree from a "core 20 university"), experience (have worked fewer than 8 years outside the Bank Group, have worked more than 8 years inside the Bank Group), and so forth. The remaining rows of the table estimate scenarios in which a member of the GF+ staff⁵⁹:

- Differs from that modal staff member on all the personal and cultural characteristics represented by Metrics 1–7 but conforms to that mode for all 8 educational and experience characteristics represented by Metrics 8–15. Compared to what would be expected based on her qualifications, she would receive a 14.5% lower salary, have a 40.4% lower probability of being a manager, have a 72.7% lower probability of being in

Table 4.1 Regression-based estimates of the effect on four employment outcomes of out-group characteristics

Staff Member's Status on			Annual Salary		Probability Is a Manager		Probability Is in Grade GH+		Probability of Changing VPU in One Year	
7 Personal and Cultural Characteristics (Metrics M1–M7)	8 Educational and Experience Characteristics (Metrics M8–M15)	Multiple Characteristics (M16)	Average (\$)	Difference from First Row (%)	Average (%)	Difference from First Row (%)	Average (%)	Difference from First Row (%)	Average (%)	Difference from First Row (%)
All In-Groups	All In-Groups	In-Group	110,830	—	16.5	—	51.0	—	8.3	—
All Out-Groups	All In-Groups	In-Group	94,773	-14.5	9.8	-40.4	13.9	-72.7	1.7	-79.0
All In-Groups	All Out-Groups	In-Group	100,113	-9.7	12.1	-26.8	28.6	-44.6	0.9	-89.6
All Out-Groups	All Out-Groups	Out-Group	85,353	-23.0	7.4	-54.8	4.7	-90.7	0.7	-92.0

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

Average values are calculated using the regression coefficients in table F.1.

grade GH+, and have a 79.0% lower probability of changing VPUs.

- Conforms to that modal staff member on all the personal and cultural characteristics represented by Metrics 1–7 but differs from that mode for all 8 educational and experience characteristics represented by Metrics 8–15. Compared to what would be expected based on his qualifications, he would receive a 9.7% lower salary, have a 26.8% lower probability of being a manager, have a 44.6% lower probability of being in grade GH+, and have a 89.6% lower probability of changing VPUs.
- Differs from that modal staff member on all the personal and cultural characteristics and all the educational and experience characteristics represented by Metrics 1–16. Compared to what would be expected based on her qualifications, she would receive a 23.0% lower salary, have a 54.8% lower probability of being a manager, have a 90.7% lower probability of being in grade GH+, and have a 92.0% lower probability of changing VPUs.

The consistency of findings among 4 different employment outcomes and 16 metrics representing

a wide range of out-group characteristics supports the hypothesis of systemic barriers to inclusion.

Table 4.2 applies the data used in the regression analysis to one inclusion issue of particular interest in the Bank Group: whether Black staff members work in the Africa VPU to a greater extent than they wish because of exclusion from other opportunities.⁶⁰ According to section A of the table, Black members of the GF+ staff in 2002 were working in the Africa VPU at a higher rate than members of other racial groups — even for persons holding the same passport. Section B of the table demonstrates that Black staff in the Africa VPU were less likely to move to another region over a 5-year period than non-Blacks working in Africa or Blacks working in any other region. These findings, by themselves, do not identify the causes of these differences. However, they confirm the presence of substantial differences in career paths for staff members of different races.

Designation as a Young Professional is widely recognized as a key credential for advancement within the Bank Group.⁶¹ Table 4.3 applies the metrics to examine inclusion in this program. According to the table, for the majority of the 16 metrics, current YPs include a higher proportion of persons with

Table 4.2 Regional assignments of staff in operational VPUs*, GF+ staff, June 2002**A. Proportion of GF+ Staff in Any Operational VPU Who Are in the Africa VPU, 2002, by Race and Passport**

Passport	Race (%)	
	Black	Not Black
Africa Part II	64.6	45.5
Part I	46.2	20.4
LCR	27.3	7.7
All Other Part II	—	12.7

B. Proportion of GF+ Staff Members in an Operational VPU in 1998 Who Remained in That VPU from 1998 through 2002, by Race

VPU	Race (%)	
	Black	Not Black
Africa	83.6	56.0
5 Regional VPUs excluding Africa	36.7	64.5

C. Proportion of GF+ Staff in Regional VPUs with Part II Passports from That Region

VPU	% of GF+ Staff
LCR	35.6
AFR	23.6
SAR	22.9
MNA	17.5
ECA	12.2
EAP	11.8

Notes:

Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were headquarters-appointed WBG staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

*Operational VPUs = Regional VPUs (AFR, EAP, ECA, LCR, MNA, and SAR) plus selected Network Anchor VPUs (ESD, FSE, HDN, PRM, PSI).

out-group characteristics than comparable non-YP hires in the same period. Moreover, for the majority of metrics, the current cohort of YPs includes a higher proportion of persons with out-group characteristics than their counterpart cohort in 1996. Thus, the program appears to be contributing to expanded diversity within the Bank Group, both in terms of current staff and future leaders. However, this conclusion must be interpreted cautiously, in light of findings in an earlier study that women and

racial/ethnic minorities who start on equal terms in the YP program advance more slowly than their male, non-minority counterparts.⁶²

ILLUSTRATIONS OF PROCESSES UNDERLYING THESE STATISTICAL PATTERNS

As discussed in chapter 2, non-systematic, non-transparent HR practices tend to allow anti-inclusion

social and psychological processes to create systemic barriers to inclusion. The Bank Group has in place many open, rule-driven HR management systems and procedures and has undertaken staff training and other efforts to promote unbiased judgments throughout its organizational culture. The statistical results presented in this chapter suggest that such efforts need to be continued and substantially expanded before the inequities they address will be eliminated.

In support of this conclusion, the remainder of this chapter presents several dozen examples of remaining non-systematic, non-transparent aspects of Bank Group processes and their effects on the inclusiveness of the Bank Group workplace. These examples are drawn from the multiple meetings, interviews, and focus groups conducted as part of this study (appendix B); for simplicity, we will refer to all of these data-gathering processes as interviews.⁶³

The theme that some important Bank Group HR management decisions are reached in a non-systematic, non-transparent manner arose frequently in

these interviews. This perception was shared by both non-managers and managers and by persons with widely varying in-group and out-group characteristics.⁶⁴ Interviewees provided a range of examples of procedures not governed by explicit, job-related rules or criteria; not arrived at through consistent, methodical procedures; and not documented so that inequities can be identified and appealed (box 4.1).

In such non-systematic, non-transparent systems, interviewees — especially lower-level Bank Group staff — tended to describe their individual employment outcomes as almost entirely dependent on discretionary judgments by their direct supervisors. In interviews, some employees reported benefiting from managers who chose to be their advocates, while others reported being harmed by managers who disliked them, remained ignorant of their contributions, or chose to favor others. In either situation, power was being wielded discretionarily by individual managers largely unconstrained by mandates for consistent treatment among staff, by independent judgments by other persons, or by processes for review or appeal.

Box 4.1 Four examples of HR practices that are not fully transparent and job related

1. Good practices in interviewing job candidates call for “performance-based” interviews, that is, focusing on how candidates would perform key job functions or had demonstrated doing so in past work. Many Bank Group job interviews focus instead on credentials, reflecting implicit assumptions that “a Harvard degree guarantees competence.”
2. In deciding on promotions, some Sector Boards do not explicitly review individual candidates’ actual qualifications. Instead, they rely on “bottom-line” assessments of these qualifications by the candidates’ managers. In some cases, the process resembles “logrolling,” a process in which Board members approve candidates championed by other Board members in anticipation of reciprocal approval of their own favored candidates.
3. The Bank Group’s succession planning process operates without disclosure to affected parties of its procedures, criteria, or decisions. This lack deprives individuals seeking to advance of guidance about how to promote their own advancement, except for favored individuals, with whom such information may be shared informally.
4. In OPEs, managers make their own decisions concerning what weight to give to individual performance items in determining staff members’ overall performance ratings. These personal decisions lead to inconsistency in the criteria used to judge individuals performing similar jobs.

Table 4.3 Prevalence of out-group characteristics among Young Professionals 2000–02 and two comparison groups

Category	Metric	2000–02 YPs*	Comparable Non-YP Hires in 2000–02#	Difference from 2000–02 YPs	1994–96 Young Professionals^	Difference from 2000–02 YPs
Nationality Cultural Background	M1 % Staff Who Are Part II	46.7	49.1	2.4	29.3	-17.4
	M2 % Staff w/ a Non-English Native Language	86.2	80.4	-5.8	70.1	-16.1
	M3 % Staff w/ a Part II Undergraduate Degree	35.4	23.8	-11.6	23.5	-12.0
Personal Characteristics	M4 % Staff Who Are Female	55.0	43.5	-11.5	46.5	-8.5
	M5 % Staff Who Are Black	10.8	6.2	-4.6	7.1	-3.8
	M6 % Staff not Married-with-Dependents	68.3	70.2	1.9	74.8	6.4
	M7 % Staff Younger than 36 or Older than 55	—	—	—	—	—
Graduate Education	M8 % Staff w/ no Graduate Degree in Economics or Business	43.3	41.1	-2.3	32.0	-11.4
	M9 % Staff w/ no Graduate Degree from Core 20 Universities	45.0	42.9	-2.1	41.2	-3.8
	M10 % Staff w/ Graduate Degree from a Part II University	6.7	12.5	5.8	8.3	1.6
Work Experience outside WBG	M11 % Staff w/≥ 8 Years' Work Experience outside WBG	9.8	25.7	16.0	10.2	0.5
	M12 % Staff w/ Work Experience in NGOs	14.2	16.2	2.0	2.3	-12.0
Work Experience in WBG	M13 % Staff w/< 8 Years' Work Experience in WBG	98.3	98.1	-0.2	100.0	1.7
	M14 % Staff Who Have Worked in More than 1 VPU	80.0	14.9	-65.1	27.3	-52.7
	M15 % Staff Affiliated w/ > 1 Network/Sectors [‡]	18.3	6.8	-11.5	—	—
Multiple Differences	M16 % Staff w/ 7 Non-Modal Characteristics	35.0	12.4	-22.6	29.3	-5.7

Notes:

Staff examined: *120 persons in the YP Program on June 30, 2000, June 30, 2001, or June 30, 2002.

#99 persons in the YP program at June 30, 1994, June 30, 1995, or June 30, 1996.

^161 persons hired in grade GF at any time during 2000, 2001, or 2002 who were < age 35 at time of hire and not in YP program.

Networks/sectors cannot be compared between the two periods because the system was not in place in 1996.

One manifestation of such managerial discretion is HR actions inconsistent with organizational policies. Such violations may be allowed because, individually, they appear of too small consequence to be worth fighting over — what chapter 2 referred to as “micro-inequities.” However, as that chapter noted, the cumulative effect of micro-inequities can be substantial. From the point of view of inclusion, the statistical findings in the present chapter suggest that in-groups tend to be favored by these discretionary actions more than out-groups.

Our interviews provided numerous examples of what appeared to be discretionary breaking of Bank Group HR management policies, bending these rules, or following the policies so carelessly that they provided little assurance of equitable treatment. Many of these examples arose in the context of salaries and performance evaluations.

As chapter 2 noted, discretionary HR management systems generally fail to control the unconscious influence of stereotypes unfavorable to out-groups. In explaining employment outcomes in the Bank Group or describing the bases of their own HR decisions, interviewees who are managers provided multiple examples of such stereotypes that have influenced employment outcomes in the Bank Group.

Earlier in this chapter, table 4.2 documents the tendency of Black employees in operational VPU's to be disproportionately assigned to the Africa Region (AFR). To the extent that such assignments are involuntary, one cause appears to be stereotypes about the interests and skills of Black employees.

Another consequence of discretionary HR management systems is their tendency to encourage employees to focus on “impression management.” This term refers to actions by employees to improve how they appear to their supervisors and induce positive feelings by these supervisors toward them. Such self-enhancing tactics include: inordinate attention to dress and appearance, name-dropping, rapid speech to imply mental quickness, flattery, performing personal favors, failing to inform supervisors of negative information,

and unquestioningly agreeing with higher-level staffs' opinions (“yes men”).⁶⁵

Some attention to impression management is natural in most workplaces. It is reasonable for employees to want to “put their best foot forward,” and it is appropriate to expect staff to advocate their ideas in an articulate and positive manner. Nevertheless, in some organizations, the emphasis becomes unbalanced, with impression management playing an unreasonably large role in determining employment outcomes.⁶⁶ Such a development hampers organizational efficiency and effectiveness by leading to employment decisions not based on merit. It also significantly distorts the flow of information, because subordinates tend to avoid reporting bad news to their managers.⁶⁷ Concurrently, it affects diversity because many techniques of impression management, such as “looking and sounding like the boss,” are more readily available to members of in-groups than out-groups.

A recurrent theme in our interviews with non-supervisory staff was that employees who advance in the Bank Group use a certain style to create a favorable impression on managers, advancing their careers independently of their actual job performance. This style was frequently described in terms of employees' behavior in meetings, which staff members viewed as a key venue in which judgments of employees' performance are formed.

Finally, chapter 2 discussed the role of social capital as a “glue” to organize social relationships and a “lubricant” helping to get work done. However, as that chapter noted, social capital also can support exclusion of out-groups and favoritism toward in-groups. Our interviews provided examples of these latter processes at work.

CURRENT RATE OF CHANGE

If current Bank Group policies and practices remain in place, will staff diversity be greater or less a decade from now? Is the rate of change high enough to generate substantial change in a reasonable time? Table 4.4 addresses these questions by

Table 4.4 Bank Group average metrics, GF+ staff, comparing 1996 to 2002

Category	Metric	Grade Group	Bank Group Average 1996 2002		Annual Rate of Change (Percentage Points)	At This Rate, Year in Which Representation Would be 50% Higher than in June 1996
Nationality	M1 % Staff with Part II Passport	GF through GG	39.8	40.0	0.0	> 2028
		GH through GK	32.8	34.7	0.3	> 2028
Cultural Background	M2 % Staff w/a Non-English Native Language	GF through GG	63.9	70.5	1.1	2025
		GH through GK	56.2	58.1	0.3	> 2028
	M3 % Staff w/Part II Undergraduate Degree	GF through GG	31.9	34.0	0.4	> 2028
		GH through GK	26.2	27.3	0.2	> 2028
Personal Characteristics	M4 % Staff Who Are Female	GF through GG	30.8	39.9	1.5	2006
		GH through GK	13.9	22.8	1.5	Already Achieved
	M5 % Staff Who Are Black	GF through GG	6.2	7.7	0.3	2008
		GH through GK	3.3	6.6	0.6	Already Achieved
	M6 % Staff Not Married-with-Dependents	GF through GG	39.3	45.2	1.0	2016
		GH through GK	27.8	33.2	0.9	2011
	M7 % Staff Younger than 36 or Older than 55	GF through GG	25.3	28.6	0.6	2019
		GH through GK	23.3	24.2	0.2	> 2028
Graduate Education	M8 % Staff w/ No Graduate Degree in Economics or Business	GF through GG	39.2	40.6	0.2	> 2028
		GH through GK	31.8	30.5	-0.2	Never
	M9 % Staff w/ No Graduate Degree from Core 20 Universities	GF through GG	51.6	51.7	0.0	> 2028
		GH through GK	45.1	46.6	0.2	> 2028
	M10 % Staff w/ Graduate Degree(s) from a Part II University	GF through GG	13.9	15.4	0.3	2023
		GH through GK	12.1	12.9	0.1	> 2028
Experience Outside WBG	M11 % Staff w/ > 8 Years' Experience Outside WBG	GF through GG	51.5	43.9	-1.3	Never
		GH through GK	50.7	51.9	0.2	> 2028
	M12 % Staff w/ Work Experience in NGO	GF through GG	1.1	7.7	1.1	Already Achieved
Experience within WBG	M13 % Staff w/ < 8 Years' Experience in WBG	GF through GG	48.3	57.6	1.5	2012
		GH through GK	11.8	19.2	1.2	Already Achieved
	M14 % Staff Worked in More than 1 VPU over Previous 4 Years	GF through GG	48.3	23.2	-4.2	Never
		GH through GK	11.8	26.8	2.5	Already Achieved
	M15 % Staff Affiliated w/ More than 1 Network/Sector#	GF through GG	—	27.3	—	—
Multiple Differences	M16 % Staff w/ > 7 Non-Modal Characteristics	GF through GG	15.1	16.2	0.2	> 2028
		GH through GK	8.5	10.5	0.3	2009

Notes:

Staff examined: See table 3.1.

Metric is highlighted if 50% increase from the 1996 level will occur later than 2013 in one or both groups of grade levels.

#Network/sectors not in place in 1996.

comparing Bank-Group-wide averages on the 16 metrics in 2002 to the same measures in 1996.

Representation of some out-groups has increased over that period (table 4.4). For example, representation of females in both grades GF-GG and GH+ has increased at 1.5 percentage points per year, and for Blacks, at 0.3 percentage points per year. As an indicator of substantial change, the table estimates the year in which the representation of an out-group will be 50% higher than in 1996. By this measure, substantial change in representation of both women and Blacks among the GH+ staff has already been achieved by 2003.

These two demographic groups are ones for which the Bank Group has established numerical employment goals to be reached by 2005 (table 1.2). However, representation of the third group targeted in these goals — persons with Part II passports — has advanced little in the 6 years examined and is not projected to achieve a 50% increase from its 1996 level until more than 25 years from the present. Furthermore, employment counts for the majority of out-groups not explicitly targeted by the Bank Group have shown little increase over the past 6 years, or have decreased. This pattern holds for the 9 metrics highlighted in table 4.4.

Notes

- 54 Ehrenberg and Smith (2000, chap. 12); Bielby (2000, 2); Filmer, King, and van de Walle (2003).
- 55 The salary figure examined here is the current annual salary of staff members with approximately 7 years of Bank Group seniority (table 3.11). This figure, therefore, reflects both their starting salary and their rate of salary increases since being hired. Because the processes of determining starting salaries and annual raises are separate, a useful future refinement of the present analysis would be to examine these two processes separately — as was done, for example, by Filmer, King, and van de Walle (2003) (table 2.2).
- 56 For example, we included variables representing whether, for staff members with a doctorate in economics, that doctorate was received from 2 of the 10 graduate programs rated highest world-wide (table D.3, appendix D).
- 57 The extent to which “qualifications” variables correlate with “metrics” variables is reported in table D.2.
- 58 The one exception to this pattern is that being Black is associated with a 99.0% increase — essentially, a doubling — of the odds of being a manager. However, contrary to general patterns within the Bank Group, these managerial titles are not associated with higher salaries, grades, or mobility.
- 59 In June 2002, 53 members of the GF+ staff had the modal value on all 16 metrics. No actual staff members exactly match the configurations represented in the other rows of table 4.1.
- 60 For allegations that this is the case, see appendix C.
- 61 Consistent with this perception, table D.1 reports that current or past YPs average a 1.3% higher current salary, 54% higher odds of being a manager, 127% odds of being in grade GH+, and 219% higher odds of inter-VPU mobility than is predicted by their other qualifications and personal characteristics.
- 62 Filmer, King, and van de Walle (2003).
- 63 Many additional examples are available in the 16 earlier diversity studies summarized in appendix C.
- 64 The characteristics of persons interviewed during this study are summarized in table B.1, appendix B.
- 65 Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1990), Fandt and Ferris (1990).
- 66 Gendersen and Tinsley (1996), Wayne and Kacmar (1991), Smither and others (1988).
- 67 Fandt and Ferris (1990), Wayne and Ferris (1990).



5. NEW EVIDENCE SUGGESTS A NEW DIVERSITY STRATEGY

You know, if the Bank gets into this, they'll have to change the whole culture.

— Member of the GF+ staff interviewed Spring 2003

The empirical findings presented in chapters 3 and 4 support the conclusion that systemic barriers to inclusion operate within the Bank Group. The conceptual framework in chapter 2 identifies the source of these systemic barriers as inadequate control by the Bank Group's organizational culture, policies, and procedures of anti-inclusion social and psychological processes. Accordingly, this chapter responds to the TOR requirement "...to develop practical ...strategies to improve...representation, employment opportunities, and professional development of all World Bank Group staff."⁶⁸ The focus of this chapter is to improve these policies and procedures and the organizational culture underlying them.

This focus would represent a shift in the Bank group's fundamental understanding of what its efforts are intended to achieve: a shift from the goal of simply making the Bank Group a diverse workplace to one to make it an inclusive workplace. Anyone walking the corridors of the Bank Group's Washington headquarters immediately is struck by how extensively the organization has achieved the former goal, at least in terms of visible characteristics. The information developed in the present study suggests that the latter goal remains much more of a work in progress.

This chapter first describes the difference between the two approaches. It then discusses the advantages of the new approach in terms of the Bank Group's own stated goals.

INCLUSION DIFFERS FROM TRADITIONAL DIVERSITY EFFORTS

One hallmark of an inclusion strategy is that recommendations are not stated in group-specific terms, such as “targeted hiring of Part II job candidates,” “mentoring programs for women,” or “special training for Black staff.” Traditional diversity management tends to address problems of gender, race, and nationality separately, as though they are fundamentally different.⁶⁹ The inclusion approach focuses on processes affecting all staff with “out-group” characteristics, and “in-group” staff as well.

This focus has an obvious corollary in its assumptions about *whose* behavior must change to improve diversity outcomes. Many traditional diversity initiatives assist diverse employees to succeed within the organization by de-emphasizing their out-group characteristics — a process of “helping” individuals to assimilate to the organization's prevailing culture. In contrast, an inclusion approach seeks to change the organization's culture, policies, and procedures to make employees' out-group characteristics irrelevant to the employees' success.

Fomenting fundamental changes in an organization's culture and practices tends to be a complex and slow process. The changes often require overcoming organizational inertia to rethink assumptions taken for granted within the organization. Opposition often arises from internal political constituencies reluctant to give up arrangements under which they have prospered.⁷⁰ Barriers to inclusion that have become institutionalized rarely change in the absence of a substantial change in a firm's business, technical, or legal environment⁷¹ and sustained attention from top management.⁷²

However, such changes can provide benefits not achievable through traditional diversity efforts. This

chapter describes five potential benefits for the Bank Group from adopting an inclusion strategy.

FIRST BENEFIT: ELIMINATING INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP INEQUITIES

For most employers involved in diversity, eliminating inequities among employees is a major goal. Although the Bank Group is not subject to legal requirements to do so, it has made equitable treatment of individuals and groups an organizational principle. For example, its “...policy is one of zero tolerance for any form of discrimination or racial bias.”⁷³

The Bank Group's traditional diversity efforts over the past decade undoubtedly have moved the organization closer to this goal. Employment of the demographic groups for which hiring goals have been established — women, SSA/CR staff, and holders of Part II passports — has increased (tables 1.2 and 4.4), no doubt in large part as a consequence of targeted hiring and promotion efforts. In the same spirit, special salary audits identifying women who were underpaid compared to their male counterparts undoubtedly corrected some individual compensation inequities.

However, such traditional diversity efforts are unlikely permanently to reduce individual and group inequities to zero, no matter how vigorously they are pursued. The efforts do not address the root cause of the inequities: policies and procedures that do not effectively constrain bias-inducing social and psychological processes. Therefore, the problems will persist and recur, despite repeated special interventions. As chapter 4 reported, despite years of deliberate Bank Group efforts to eliminate these problems for these groups, adverse employment outcomes compared to their equally qualified peers are still present in the Bank Group for women, Part IIs, and Black employees. The persistence of these problems is to be expected in a workplace with systemic barriers to inclusion.

Furthermore, since these current efforts are limited to a few groups defined in demographic terms, the

efforts do not even address the same problems as they affect out-groups not explicitly targeted. Compared to their equally qualified peers, adverse effects on employment outcomes are experienced by Bank Group staff whose out-group status is based on a broad range of personal and professional characteristics other than their race, gender, and nationality (table 4.1). This pattern also is to be expected in a workplace with systemic barriers to inclusion.

Finally, special interventions to assist a limited range of targeted demographic groups also tend to be divisive, seeming to grant “special favors” to some groups and disadvantaging others.⁷⁴ These interventions may create resentment and enhance inter-group tensions within the staff. An inclusion strategy seeks to make the underlying HR processes themselves generate equitable outcomes without requiring special interventions, especially those focusing on any one group.

SECOND BENEFIT: ENHANCING CLIENT ENGAGEMENT SKILLS

Increasingly, the Bank Group conducts its development efforts through partnerships with a variety of external stakeholders. Both multilateral organizations⁷⁵ and multinational corporations⁷⁶ are acutely aware that their corporate cultures affect their external reputation, credibility with clients, and perhaps even their “license to operate.” As relationships among organizations, clients, and stakeholders in economic development continue to move from “trust me” to “show me,”⁷⁷ inconsistencies between what the Bank Group espouses to its clients and how it appears to operate internally may importantly affect its external relationships.

The same skills and practices that would make the Bank Group’s culture internally inclusive would enhance the organization’s ability to cooperate with partner organizations and increase its credibility with clients from many different backgrounds. As one Bank Group official stated in an interview, “What you do on the inside is what you do on the outside.”

Since this study has identified systemic barriers to inclusion within the Bank Group, it should not be surprising that the organization has not always been perceived as open and inclusive in terms of external relationships. For example, a recent poll commissioned by the Bank Group of opinion leaders in 48 developing and industrial countries asked what the respondents perceived as the organization’s greatest weakness. The responses targeted the Bank Group’s organizational culture, using terms paralleling this study’s discussion of internal organizational processes. Respondents were particularly critical of⁷⁸:

...its perceived arrogance and its lack of transparency and collaboration. This broad category of organizational culture tops the list of criticism cited in every region of the world, with the Bank’s bureaucracy and perceived arrogance often heading the list.

In response to such criticisms, the Bank Group has already concluded that⁷⁹:

Our internal culture needs to become more aligned with the poverty-focused, client-oriented, and accountable institution that we aspire to be. Encouraging more open communication and transparent dialogue across the institution is a key factor.

With its emphasis on openness, transparency, and accountability, an inclusion approach to diversity emphasizes these same issues.

THIRD BENEFIT: ENHANCING EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

For most employers involved in diversity work, equity concerns alone are not sufficient to sustain substantial diversity efforts. During the 1990s, advocates increasingly argued that diversity should be pursued because productivity improvements result from a diverse workforce. This “business case for diversity” typically claims that this effect occurs because staff diversity⁸⁰:

- Addresses labor shortages that require seeking out and using the capabilities of potential employees from many backgrounds

Table 5.1 US business leaders' views of how diversity affects the "bottom line" (%)

Improves recruitment of new employees*	77
Improves client relations	52
Increases retention of employees	41
Decreases complaints and litigation	41
Enables organization to move into emerging markets	37
Positively affects profitability indirectly	32
Maximizes brand identity	23
Has not impacted bottom line	7

*Note: Society for Human Resource Management and Fortune Magazine (2001, 11).

- Enhances an organization's ability to look like, understand, and communicate with diverse customers
- Increases output and creativity when work teams combine individuals who have diverse perspectives and talents.

Such claims are now widely accepted in the business community in many industrialized nations.⁸¹ For example, in a recent survey of U.S. Fortune 1000 firms, 91% of respondents said that diversity initiatives helped their firm's competitive edge, whereas only 7% felt that it had no impact on the bottom line (table 5.1).

The Bank Group's statements of its own business case for diversity echoes these same themes. For example, the 2001 HR Agenda stated⁸²:

- The way we look, sound and think counts to our clients; for clients to identify with the World Bank, our teams and country presence need to mirror the composition of the world.
- Our success in fostering respect and inclusion among diverse colleagues will lead to success in the same areas with our clients.
- Managers who bring out the best in a diverse team have the most chance of bringing the best to bear in meeting the challenges of development.
- Staff are more productive when their contributions are fully valued.

Does empirical research support the contention that workforce diversity results in a more efficient and effective organization? A comprehensive review of 63 controlled empirical studies conducted in workplaces since 1997 found few consistent relationships between the composition of work groups and firms' performance. For most diversity dimensions studied — including race/ethnicity, sex, age, nationality, and personality — results were sometimes positive and sometimes negative. In fact⁸³:

Decades of research on the effects of diversity within teams and small groups indicate that diversity can have negative effects, as well as positive ones. The empirical literature does not support the simple notion that more diverse groups, teams or business units necessarily perform better, feel more committed to their organization, or experience higher levels of satisfaction.

A further rigorous examination of this question, commissioned by U.S. corporate chief executives, recently was completed by the Diversity Research Network, a team of researchers from Harvard University, the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and other leading business schools.⁸⁴ This team conducted a 5-year field research project in 4 U.S. companies, each with a large, diverse workforce and a long-term commitment to using diversity to enhance organizational performance. This study agreed with earlier research in finding little justification for assuming that diversity had direct effects on performance, either positive or negative.⁸⁵ Instead⁸⁶:

Efforts to create and manage diverse workforces have generally paid off by eliminating many of the potentially negative effects of diversity on group processes and performance documented previously in the literature. Moreover, there appear to be some conditions under which diversity, if managed well, may even enhance performance.

Based on these findings, the Diversity Research Network concluded that the traditional business case for diversity should be replaced by a “new business case.” This case starts from the premise that a diverse workforce is inevitable in today’s labor market; it is not an option. Given this reality, active management of diversity is necessary to avoid the conflicts and disruptions likely to arise if a diverse workforce faces a workplace that is not inclusive. Organizations that invest in that active management of diversity should then outperform those not making such investments.⁸⁷

Certainly, the premise that workforce diversity is inevitable applies to the Bank Group. Inequities and recurrent conflicts within the organization are well documented (chapters 2 and 4 and appendix C). Therefore, the new business case seems directly relevant, and investment in diversity management should increase the organization’s performance. However, since the diversity issues requiring attention within the Bank Group are systemic, only efforts under an inclusion strategy are likely to generate these potential increases in efficiency and effectiveness.

FOURTH BENEFIT: SUPPORTING BANK GROUP’S ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

With its major reorganization in 1996, the Bank Group created a complex matrix structure. In subsequent years, it has decentralized substantial roles and responsibilities from headquarters to country and regional offices. Through these initiatives, the Bank Group has evolved toward a form of organization that has some elements of a “transnational organization” (table 5.2).⁸⁸

The transnational organizational structure is designed to respond quickly to changes in the global environment, ensure the speedy transfer of

knowledge and staff around the organization, and sustain organizational learning through staff relationships.⁸⁹ However, the structure is complex and demands much from employees. Individuals must work in teams with constantly changing membership, support multiple goals, function collaboratively while being individually motivated, and proactively manage their own careers.⁹⁰ The organizational challenge is “...not so much to change the structure into a matrix as it is to create a matrix in the minds of managers.”⁹¹

To function, a transnational structure relies on substantial social capital: the resources embedded in social relationships among individuals and groups that facilitate cooperation and collaboration. Typical forms of social capital include common bonds, a sense of trust, norms of reciprocity, shared vocabulary, and open lines of communication.⁹² In workplaces such as transnational organizations⁹³:

- Social capital provides informal coordination and control, which facilitate productive interdependence among the units. Formal methods of coordination, such as official reporting relationships, rules and policies, do not suffice, especially in complex interrelationships and uncertain situations.⁹⁴
- Social interaction and trust have significant effects on creativity. Favorable conditions for work teams to translate shared knowledge into innovations include shared team objectives, feelings of safety, and effective conflict management.⁹⁵
- Interaction among business units and individuals helps to build trust relations; helps individuals to learn organizational values, codes, languages and practices; and creates a shared vision among disparate units.⁹⁶

Social capital does not form spontaneously. Like other forms of capital, it must be created through investment and actively managed to maximize its benefits.⁹⁷ Inclusion-focused diversity activities can be part of this development effort. Equally, inclusion-focused diversity initiatives are required to control social capital’s possible negative effects.

Table 5.2 Characteristics of transnational organizations

Topic	Characteristics of Transnational Organizations
Organizational structure*	Networks and matrixes. Complex management processes to link units. Coaching relationships rather than control-based management.
Role of non-headquarters units	Local units make differentiated contributions to integrated world wide operations.
Development and diffusion of knowledge	Knowledge is developed jointly and shared worldwide.
Constraining strategic resource	Individuals with skills, knowledge, and experience.
Location of this strategic Resource	Resides in (a) individuals at all levels of organization, not just senior management, (b) relationships within and among work groups, and (c) those closest to key clients
Key roles for HR	Develop human capital; link individuals through social networks; reduce barriers to rapid decisionmaking; open cross-unit communication and collaboration; create commitment to organization and goals
Role of increased diversity	Open perspectives and increase flexibility; improve decisionmaking and information flow; expand inter-unit linkages.

*Note: Adapted from Bartlett and Ghoshal (1998, 75).

That is, as discussed in chapters 2 through 4, social capital shared only by subgroups within a workplace can favor in-groups and exclude out-groups, limit access to information, promote conformity and assimilation, and increase intergroup conflict.

FIFTH BENEFIT: POSITIONING BANK GROUP AS THE INDUSTRY LEADER

One source of the Bank Group's strength, prestige, and influence is its reputation for excellence in all aspects of its operations. Its strategic positioning relative to other organizations in its industry is as an innovator and leader in all aspects of development.⁹⁸ For example, a recent study of the Bank Group's possible interest in the inclusion of physical disability policies in its development programs noted that other institutions were paying attention⁹⁹:

Disabled peoples' organizations, government officials and development specialists applauded the World Bank for undertaking [this study] because it signals that innovative approaches to disability and development are likely to come

from the World Bank in coming years. Those cognizant of the history of development are aware that the World Bank was a forerunner in the development of best practices on women and development and anticipate the emergence of catalytic new practices on disability and development from the Bank.

This signaling role applies to policies applied internally as well. In a widely influential analysis, Ely and Thomas identify three alternative approaches to diversity efforts at the work group level (table 5.3).¹⁰⁰ These researchers' empirical findings conclude that only initiatives that adopt the "integration and learning" approach achieve sustained benefits from diversity. This conclusion is supported by the empirical work of the Diversity Research Network¹⁰¹ and other prior research.¹⁰²

The integration and learning approach is the counterpart at the work group level of the inclusion approach. In contrast, the Bank Group's past and present diversity efforts predominantly combine elements of the approaches Ely and Thomas label

Table 5.3 Three approaches to managing diversity in work groups

Elements of the Approach	Integration and Learning	Access and Legitimacy	Discrimination and Fairness
Rationale for Diversifying Workforces*	Inform and enhance core work	Gain access and legitimacy with diverse markets and clients	Ensure justice and equality, eliminate discrimination; no link between work and diversity
Value of Diversity to the Organization	High: A resource for learning, change, and renewal.	Moderate: A resource only for interface between organization and markets/clients; otherwise, staff should assimilate to dominant culture	Low: Diversity triggers discrimination, so staff should assimilate to dominant culture to reduce conflict
Connection between Cultural Diversity and Work	Direct: Integrate cultural differences throughout work and work processes	Indirect: Divide work along diversity lines to enhance access and legitimacy	Limited: Organization's norms discourage connecting them
Indicators of Progress	Increased representation of under-represented groups with power to change the organization's processes and products	Increased representation of under-represented groups, especially in boundary or visible positions	Increased representation of traditionally under-represented groups

*Note: Adapted from Thomas and Ely (1996).

“discrimination and fairness” and “access and legitimacy.” Thus, the organization is not currently demonstrating leadership through implementing state-of-the-art approaches. Many of the Bank Group’s peer organizations have not focused on eliminating systemic barriers to inclusion, in part, because of lack of exposure to state-of-the-art approaches and lack of role models. By implementing an inclusion strategy, the Bank Group would enhance the visibility of state-of-the-art approaches and demonstrate important techniques for others to adopt.

Notes

- 68 TOR (appendix A).
- 69 As chap. 1 noted, the majority of Bank Group diversity efforts over the past decade reflect a traditional diversity management approach.
- 70 Doeringer and Piore (1971), Tomaskovic-Devey (1993), Acker (1989).
- 71 Stinchcombe (1965), Hannan and Freeman (1984), Baron (1991).
- 72 Bendick, Egan, and Lofhjelm (2001).
- 73 Wolfensohn (1998).
- 74 Negative attitudes toward these special initiatives are not limited to the groups presumably disadvantaged by the efforts. In interviews conducted during this study, staff from groups covered by employment targets made repeated statements such as “We never want to be tokens” or “We want to be promoted based on competence, not a diversity profile.”

- 75 For example, the International Monetary Fund's annual diversity report states that the "...benefits of diversity are two-fold: internally, diversity benefits the Fund's work environment, externally, it...sends the message that the Fund incorporates diverse perspectives...." (IMF, 2001, 5).
- 76 Paine (1999), Egan and Bendick (2003).
- 77 Sustainability/UNEP (1999). Reflecting the importance of "show me," the Bank Group's Office of Diversity Programs has argued: "As we urge our clients to tackle difficult policy issues — such as the inclusion of women in the development process or addressing the plight of indigenous peoples and Afro-Latins — we need to model these participatory behaviors ourselves at both the institutional and working levels" (Oyegun and others, 2002, 3).
- 78 McIntosh and others (2003, 66).
- 79 World Bank (2001b, 14).
- 80 Kochan and others (2003, 5), quoting the CEO of Hewlett-Packard.
- 81 Citing "business case" reasons for diversity efforts is not only a North American practice. In particular, within the European Union, the aging workforce and the impending expansion of EU membership have focused employers' attention on obtaining productivity from increasingly diverse workforces (Egan and Bendick 2003, Shaw 2002, Doomernik 1998, Eurostat 2001, Sing 2002).
- 82 World Bank (2002d, 3). Other Bank Group statements have argued that diversity efforts assist the organization to be "...an excellent institution able to attract, excite, and nurture diverse and committed staff with exceptional skills" (World Bank n.d., a) and "an environment that values all human differences and mobilizes them as strategic assets in service of the Bank's mission of poverty reduction" (World Bank 2003a).
- 83 Jackson and others (2003, 5). Two exceptions to the general pattern of mixed findings were (1) functional/occupational diversity improves some types of performance (Barsade and others 2000, Carpenter 2002, Jehn and Bezrukova 2002); and (2) teams that engage in vigorous debate may gain the most from functional diversity (Simons and others 1999; Tjosvold, Hui, Ding and Hu 2003).
- 84 Kochan and others (2003, 3).
- 85 Kochan and others (2003, 17) suggest this is true in part because "context is crucial in determining the nature of diversity's impact on performance."
- 86 Kochan and others (2003, 17).
- 87 Kochan and others (2003, 18).
- 88 Bartlett and Ghoshal (1998), Harzing (2000).
- 89 Hamel and Prahalad (1994), Bartlett and Ghoshal (2002), Bean (2002).
- 90 At the World Bank, "Each staff member is primarily responsible for managing his/her own career....The institution is responsible to provide career development support in the form of information, tools, appropriate processes and programs" (World Bank 2002a, 4).
- 91 Bartlett and Ghoshal (1998, 227).
- 92 Portes (1998, 6, 9).
- 93 Tsai and Ghoshal (1998), Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1997), Baker (1997).
- 94 Kostova and Roth (2003), see also Adler and Kwon (2002), Fukuyama (1995).
- 95 Tsai and Ghoshal (1998), West (2002).
- 96 Egan and Mody (1992), Krackhardt (1992), Hakansson and Snehota (1995).
- 97 Portes (1998, 4) argues that the acquisition of social capital requires deliberate investments of both economic and cultural resources.
- 98 Swift (2001).
- 99 Stienstra, Fricke, D'Aubin and Research Team (2002, 4).
- 100 Ely and Thomas (2001).
- 101 Kochan (2003, 11–12).
- 102 Jackson and others (2003, 26), citing Gilbert and Ivancevich (2000) and Dass and Parker (1999).



APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A. EXCERPTS FROM THE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THIS STUDY

The World Bank Group prides itself on being one of the most culturally diverse multilateral institutions, with staff representing over 165 countries. Such diversity provides the Bank with unparalleled advantage in pursuing its global development agenda. Any team that reflects the composition of its client groups and other stakeholders in gender, race, nationality, and other characteristics brings a wide range of experiences and perspectives to bear on the complex problems of development and poverty alleviation.

More than a decade ago, the Bank Group embarked on serious efforts to mobilize diversity, beginning with gender and expanding to racial equality. Diagnosis and analysis have been the basis for these initiatives. In 1992, 1997, and 2001, studies were conducted to look at disparities in pay and grade. In 1996 a major study was carried out by Catalyst, a pioneer on workplace gender issues, to identify constraints to women's advancement. In 1998 a unit-specific study on racial equality (Dewey Ballantine) led to the creation of the Racial Equality program.

However, gaps in our analytical foundation remain. To date, there have been no Bank-wide studies on race- or nationality-based inequities. In addition, the gender analysis needs to be updated. Finally, in a context of far-reaching change over the past several years — including the move to a matrix organization, increasing decentralization, a shift from a lending bank to a knowledge bank — new diversity issues are emerging, including the very definition, that is, recognition of the value of different educational backgrounds and work experience. In the context of a more holistic approach to diversity, approved by the Board and operationalized with the appointment of a Director of Diversity Programs, it is time to fill these gaps and develop some crucial baselines and metrics for the organization as a foundation for assessing future progress.

OBJECTIVE

The goal of the project is (1) through diagnosis, to identify persistent systemic barriers that constrain full inclusion of all staff and (2) to develop practical baselines, metrics, and recommendations as to critical success factors, with strategies to enable the organization to improve representation, employment opportunities, and professional development of all World Bank Group staff.

SCOPE OF WORK

The study is to be conducted by Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc. (B&E). B&E will identify, as far as the data permit, the characteristics, trends, and systemic factors that prevent certain groups of staff from realizing their full potential as World Bank Group staff.

Using earlier studies of representation, advancement, and other indicators, B&E will analyze patterns of representation based on variables including nationality (Part I/Part II as well as regional groupings and individual nationalities as identified by the project managers), gender, age, race/ethnicity, educational background, and previous work experience. The study will look at internationally recruited staff (IRS)

— both Washington- and Country-Office-based — at levels E (entry-level professional), GF-GG (key professional), managerial (GH+), and the levels and groups that feed into these ranks.

Data will be collected through complementary qualitative and quantitative information-gathering exercises. B&E's approach is to sequence data-collection activities so that up-front quantitative analyses will inform qualitative data collection and analysis. The success of the quantitative analysis will rely heavily on the type and quality of personnel data available.

Quantitative, statistical analysis by employee characteristics will include:

- Profiles of representation of key groups (race, gender, nationality) at different organizational levels and in different organizational components of the Bank Group (for example, operations, non-operations, HQ- and country-office-based)
- Longitudinal studies of the work histories of cohorts of Bank staff to determine whether different groups of employees tend to follow different career paths (tracer studies)
- Statistical measurement of differences in rates of success in recruitment, hiring, assignments, rotations, promotions, participation in high-profile activities, succession planning, shortlisting for managerial/leadership positions, turnover, terminations, and other HR processes
- Integration of data from existing pay-grade equity studies with data from the preceding activities.

Most of these analyses will be completed before the bulk of the qualitative data-gathering which will include:

- Interviews and focus groups with Bank Group staff at all levels, including senior managers
- Document review.

B&E will work under the direction of the Director of Diversity Programs, assisted by the Senior

Adviser on Racial Equality. Work will be guided by a Project Advisory Group, of a composition to be determined by the World Bank Group Office of Diversity Programs. B&E also will be expected to consult extensively with members of the IBRD, IFC, and MIGA HR and Diversity staff and key stakeholders (for example, the Bank/IMF Africa Club, the Caribbean Association, and the Arab Club).

APPENDIX B: ADVISORY COMMITTEES, FOCUS GROUPS, AND INTERVIEWS

Throughout the study, the research team met with Bank Group staff to obtain guidance as well as qualitative information illuminating our quantitative analyses. In particular, we sought (1) suggestions on the study design, (2) information on related studies, (3) information on data availability and data quality, (4) reactions to study findings and conclusions, (5) illustrations consistent or inconsistent with statistical findings, and (6) suggestions for study recommendations. Staff members were assured that their comments would not be individually identified.

The set of informants from whom we sought such information was not intended to be a statistically representative sample of Bank Group staff; the statistical analyses based on 4,711 headquarters-appointed Bank Group GF+ staff fulfilled that role within this study. Instead, the goal of our qualitative data-gathering was to obtain illustrations and explanations of Bank Group institutions and processes underlying the findings of the statistical analyses. For this purpose, it was important that our informants constituted a diverse range of backgrounds and perspectives but not necessarily a statistically representative one. Table B.1 suggests that, taken together, the informants from whom we obtained such information were diverse in terms of both personal characteristics and organizational perspectives.

We sought information from these diverse informants through six processes.

1. PRESENTATIONS TO THE BANK GROUP'S DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ADVISORY GROUP (DIAG): October 29, 2002 and December 18, 2002. Members of DIAG included: Aysegul Akin-Karasapan, John Alves, Jane Armitage, Jacqueline Gates, Hennie van Greuning, Judy Heumann, Shigeo Katsu, Elizabeth King, Mohamed Muhsin (deputy chair), Jean-Louis Sarbib (chair), Vincent Rague, John Roome, Ann Rennie, Thyra Riley, Anand Seth, Narendra Sharma, Daniel Tytiun, Jeffrey Waite, and Tony Wan.

Table B.1 Selected characteristics of staff members who provided information for this study through interviews, focus groups, advisory committees, or other means

Characteristic	Values	%
Affiliation	IBRD – Operations*	36.2
	IBRD – HR	27.5
	IBRD – Other	23.2
	IFC, MIGA, and GEF	13.1
	TOTAL	100.0
Managerial Status	Non-Manager	58.0
	Manager	42.0
	TOTAL	100.0
Gender	Male	56.0
	Female	44.0
	TOTAL	100.0
Race	Black	18.0
	Not Black	82.0
	TOTAL	100.0

*Note: Defined in table 4.2.

2. PRESENTATIONS TO A TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP FOR THIS STUDY: April 8, 2003 and May 7, 2003. Members of this group included: Aysegul Akin-Karasapan, Nicholas E Arroyo, Paul Cadario, Elizabeth King, Vinh Nguyen, and Ray Rist (chair).
3. OTHER PRESENTATIONS. Preliminary findings were presented to Katherine Sierra (February 24, 2003 and November 24, 2003) and Shengman Zhang (March 7, 2003). Comments were received from these senior managers and their staff.
4. FOCUS GROUPS. Focus groups were conducted with employees in grades GF and GG from 2 VPUs: EAP (May 7, 2003) and LCR (May 12, 2003). Participants consisted of volunteers who responded to an invitation emailed to all non-managerial employees in these grades in these VPUs. The participants in each group encompassed a range of race, gender, nationality, age, and professional backgrounds. Both focus groups followed the same series of topics.
5. INTERVIEWS. We interviewed 43 individuals who had been suggested by the Diversity Office, suggested by other interviewees, or independently identified by the authors. Most of the interviews took place between May and July 2003, lasted between 30 and 90 minutes, and followed a semi-structured interview guide. Other interviews occurred in other time periods and involved more varying formats.
6. INTERACTION WITH THE OFFICE OF DIVERSITY PROGRAMS. The following staff from the Office of Diversity Programs and Information Solutions Group provided guidance and assistance throughout the study:

Aklog Birara, former Senior Adviser on Racial Equality, HRSDP
Jeanne d’Arc Lewis, Program Assistant, HRSDP
Julie Oyegun, Director, HRSDP
Jamil Ramadan, Program Assistant, HRSDP
Sheila Reines, Senior HR Officer, HRSDP
Aymeric Saha, Financial Officer, SFRCS
Chitra Wimalasiri, Program Assistant, HRSDP.

APPENDIX C. TOPICS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC BARRIERS EXAMINED IN 16 BANK GROUP STUDIES/REPORTS, 1992-2002

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...				
Topic		Gender	Nationality*	Race*
Recruitment	WBG does not recruit all demographic groups equally.	WBG does not recruit women effectively from outside the Bank (Catalyst, 4).		Black staff perceive that they are not recruited at mid-career (PD, 1).
				Black staff perceive that WBG recruitment strategy ignores historically Black educational institutions in the US and the prominent institutions in the UK and Africa in which Blacks can be found (PD, 6).
		"We have an opportunity with the projected growth in recruitment to make an important shift in diversity outcomes" (SSIC, iv).	"We have an opportunity with the projected growth in recruitment to make an important shift in diversity outcomes" (SSIC, iv).	"We have an opportunity with the projected growth in recruitment to make an important shift in diversity outcomes" (SSIC, iv).
		"[Staff who transition from STC status to regular status] tend to be less diverse than those hired through targeted external recruitment exercises" (SSIC, 38).		
		"Long-standing networks of personal and professional contacts reinforce tendencies to identify and hire male candidates" (Stern, 3).		
		"The Bank has found it easier to recruit.... single women" (Stern, 4).	The Bank has found it easier to recruit Part I... women (Stern, 4).	

Notes:

*In some studies, SSA or SSA/CR nationality is intended to proxy Black race.

Key to Studies:

ABPG "Assessing Bias in Pay and Grade at the World Bank: A Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Analyses," DEC, 1998

ARHR "Annual Review of Human Resources FY2001," Human Resources, World Bank Group, 2001

Catalyst "World Bank Gender Equality Project: Final Report," Catalyst Inc., 1998

Catalyst 2 "Performance Review Analysis," Catalyst Inc., 1997

D@WBG "Diversity at The World Bank Group: FY02 Second Quarter (as of 12/31/01)," Julie Oyegun, Diversity, 2001

DB "Summary of the Observations, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Report of the Dewey Ballantine Audit Team," Dewey Ballantine, 1997 (partial results only)

DEC "Differences in Pay and Grade at the World Bank: 2001 Study," Deon Filmer and Elizabeth M. King, DEC, 2001

FRSG "Final Report of the Steering Group on Survey Follow-up," Mark Baird and others, World Bank Group, 1998

Kraut "The 1999 Staff Survey: A Special Report Prepared for the World Bank Group," Kraut Associates, 1999

MDFDE "Mobilizing Diversity for Development Effectiveness," Human Resources, World Bank Group, 2002

PD "Report on Interviews with Staff of Sub-Saharan African Origin," People Dynamics, 2001

Pedersen "A Farewell Statement: Reflections of Gender Equality in the World Bank Group," Anette Steen Pedersen, World Bank Group, 2000

SSIC "Strategic Staffing: Issues and Challenges for FY03-05," HRS, 2002

Stern "Excellence Through Equality: An Increased Role for Women in the World Bank," Advisory Group on Higher Level Women, 1992

Voices "The Voices of the LCR/Sub-Saharan African Origin Staff," Office of Diversity, World Bank Group, 2000

WIBG "Women in the Bank Group: A Review of Progress, Issues and Future Actions," Marit Wiig, World Bank Group, 1994

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
	<p>"Men and women newly hired by the Bank said the Bank's recruiting generally is insensitive to family concerns... Focus group participants mentioned the need for parental and flexible leave policies, and mechanisms to mitigate the Bank's heavy travel requirements at certain times" (Stern, 5).</p>		
	<p>"A candidate may begin to form a poor impression of the Bank early in the recruitment process. Some women recently hired by the Bank described interview questions that were too personal — asking about or commenting on marriage prospects, intentions to have children, or spousal income — suggesting an atmosphere in which managers feel free to ask such questions" (Stern, 5).</p>		
	<p>"[Internal advertising of positions] was popular with staff, but had serious shortcomings in terms of limiting our ability to groom and fast-track women... staff and managers with high management potential" (HRPSD, 14).</p>	<p>"[Internal advertising of positions] was popular with staff, but had serious shortcomings in terms of limiting our ability to groom and fast-track... Part II staff and managers with high management potential" (HRPSD, 14).</p>	
	<p>"While JPA numbers are not reckoned for the purposes of diversity... it is nevertheless useful to highlight that 64% of JPAs hired to date are women" (SSIC, 18).</p>	<p>"While JPA numbers are not reckoned for the purposes of diversity... it is nevertheless useful to highlight that... 40% [of JPAs hired to date] are Part II" (SSIC, 18).</p>	
WBG has made unequal progress toward its diversity goals.	<p>Women's representation in HQ staff at grades GF and GG (38.0%) is below the FY03 target of 45% (ARHR, 7).</p>	<p>Part II representation in HQ staff at grades GF+ (38.2%) is below the FY03 target of 40% (ARHR, 7).</p>	
	<p>Women's representation in HQ staff at grades GH+ (21.6%) is below the FY03 target of 30% (ARHR, 7).</p>	<p>SSA/CR representation in HQ staff at grades GF+ (7.9%) is below the FY03 target of 10% (ARHR, 7).</p>	
	<p>Women's representation in HQ and CO staff at grades GF and GG (36.9%) is below the FY03 target of 45% (ARHR, 7).</p>	<p>Part II representation in HQ and CO staff at grades GF+ (46.0%) is above the FY03 target of 40% (ARHR, 7).</p>	

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic		Gender	Nationality*	Race*
Hiring		Women's representation in HQ and CO staff at grades GH+ (21.6%) is below the FY03 target of 30% (ARHR, 7).	SSA/CR representation in HQ and CO staff at grades GF+ (10.5%) is above the FY03 target of 10% (ARHR, 7).	
		"While we remain one of the most multi-cultural and diverse organizations in the world and have made some progress against stretch goals, we have not fully met our key diversity targets for women" (SSIC, iii).	"While we remain one of the most multi-cultural and diverse organizations in the world and have made some progress against stretch goals, we have not fully met our key diversity targets for...staff of Part II... origin" (SSIC, iii).	"While we remain one of the most multi-cultural and diverse organizations in the world and have made some progress against stretch goals, we have not fully met our key diversity targets for...staff of... SSC/CR origin" (SSIC, iii).
	WBG does not hire all demographic groups equally.		Black staff perceive that African Americans are hired in fewer numbers than other Blacks (PD, 2).	Black staff perceive that they are hired in fewer numbers than other ethnic groups (PD, 2).
		WBG does not evaluate the qualifications of all demographic groups equally in hiring.		Black staff perceive that management does not consider the experience Blacks bring with them to the WBG and treats them as entry-level staff with regard to salary and level (PD, 6).
				Black staff perceive that they are hired at lower grades than other staff despite comparable education and sometimes more and relevant work experience (PD, 4).
			"Country where the education degree was obtained" is included as an "individual characteristic" along with highest education level, area of specialization, tenure, and pre-Bank work experience (ABPG, 1).	
	In entry salaries, WBG does not compensate all demographic groups equally for the same qualifications.	Among staff hired 1999-2001, women (both Part I and Part II) received lower average entry salaries than men (both Part I and Part II) (DEC, 16).	Among staff hired 1999-2001, Part II nationals (both men and women) received lower average entry salaries than Part I nationals (both men and women) (DEC, 16).	Perhaps as a result of affirmative action, Black staff received higher average entry salaries than non-Black staff among those hired in 1999-2001 (DEC, 16).
			Perhaps as a result of affirmative action, SSA/CR staff received higher average entry salaries than non-SSA/CR staff among those hired in 1999-2001 (DEC, 16).	

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic		Gender	Nationality*	Race*
				Black staff perceive that they are hired at lower pay rates despite comparable education and sometimes more and relevant work experience (PD, 4).
		Among Part I staff hired 1999-2001, 19% of the gap in average entry salary between men and women (or 1.7% of the total average entry salary) was attributable to gender (DEC, 16).	Among men hired 1999-2001, the gap in average entry salary between Part I and Part II (8.1% of total average entry salary) was entirely attributable to differences in average qualifications; in fact, Part II men were slightly advantaged (0.3% of total average entry salary) when controlling for qualifications (DEC, 16).	Among staff hired 1999-2001, 23% of the gap in average entry salary between Blacks and non-Blacks (or 0.7% of total average entry salary) was attributable to race (DEC, 16).
		Among Part II staff hired 1999-2001, 65% of the gap in average entry salary between men and women (or 5.1% of the total average entry salary) was attributable to gender (DEC, 16).	Among women hired 1999-2001, 46% of the gap in average entry salary between Part I and Part II (or 3.1% of total average entry salary) was attributable to Part I/Part II nationality (DEC, 16).	
			Among staff hired 1999-2001, 33% of the gap in average entry salary between SSA/CR staff and non-SSA/CR staff (or 1.3% of total average entry salary) was attributable to SSA/CR nationality (DEC, 16).	
Assignments	Rotation to new assignments is not equally available to all demographic groups.	HR raised the concern that emphasis on CO posts will disadvantage women (MDFDE, 12).	SSA staff perceive “heavy cultural bias” against them in the Spanish language requirement to work in LCR (Voices, 5).	Blacks report that they experience problems getting rotations into different departments (PD, 5).

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
	<p>"Issues of spouse employment are already a serious constraint for staff considering a CO-assignment... It is already evident that very few female staff/managers are willing to take on field-based assignments as Country Directors or Country Managers (currently about 5% women in field-based CD positions, 14% as Country Managers), or transfer to the Country Office in a senior technical position (currently only 19% of CO-based internationally recruited staff are women)" (HRPSD, 18).</p>		
		<p>"Staff working on [projects in LICs] tend to be 'long-timers' with limited choices of movement and career development in the Bank" (SSIC, 39).</p>	
Developmental assignments are not equally available to all demographic groups.			<p>There is a low reassignment rate of Black professionals from Africa Region to LCR (Voices, 5).</p>
			<p>Blacks experience problems getting developmental assignments that would give them global knowledge and visibility (PD, 5).</p>
			<p>Blacks are told to leave the Africa department in order to prove themselves, but when they try to act on this advice, they are not supported or assisted by their managers or HR (PD, 5).</p>

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...			
Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
		<p>"Some units are beginning to experiment with shorter term appointments to remain responsive to changing business and skills needs. The Bank can only move so far in this direction since it needs to be able to attract staff for whom moving to Washington from their home countries represents a watershed in their personal and family lives that they cannot easily reverse" (SSIC, 16).</p>	
	<p>"The proportion of women Country Directors started out high but quickly dipped from 31.3% in FY97 to 18.6% in FY98, and at 24% has not returned to earlier levels. The percentage of women Resident Representatives improved from 7.3% in FY95 to 13.9% in FY99, but has gone down in the past year to 10.9%" (Pedersen, 5).</p>		
	<p>"The VPU's at the core of the Bank's business — IBRD Regional and Central VPU's, IFC, MIGA — tended to be below the Bank Group average [for representation of women]. Women's representation tended to be lowest in the sectors that dominated the Bank's portfolio — agriculture, industry and energy, infrastructure, and public-sector management. Consequently, women did not have an equal role in decisionmaking and in work with clients; and the pipeline for management positions was inadequate" (Pedersen, 4).</p>		
Stereotypical perceptions about demographic groups influence assignments.	Travel is not a major work/life issue because staff expect it when they join WBG (Catalyst, 5).	SSA staff are told that they can only work in the Africa department [Region] because they can be more competitive there (PD, 7).	SSA staff are told that Brazilians do not want to work with Blacks (PD, 7).



How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic		Gender	Nationality*	Race*
		<p>"Managers may assume that women would not or should not take a field assignment, that women should not go to particular countries or regions, that women are poor negotiators, that women cannot lead large missions, or that having a woman on mission upsets the camaraderie" (Stern, 9).</p>		Black staff perceive that there is a deep-seated attitude that Blacks are not bright or competent and therefore they should not expect to work in areas of the WBG that are on the front lines of the business, such as the departments that actually put investments on the books (PD, 7).
				Managers have said that East Asians are particularly suited to some departments because they are skilled with numbers (DB, 13).
				Managers have said that it is difficult to find qualified African accountants, reinforcing the stereotype that Africans lack technical skills (DB, 13).
Promotion	Speed of promotion is different for different demographic groups.	WBG has not effectively developed the pipeline of women from lower grades to fill openings within the Bank (Catalyst, 4).		Black staff perceive that they get fewer promotions than non-Black staff in IFC (PD, 5).
				Black staff perceive that they spend more time in each grade than do non-Black staff (PD, 4).
				Black staff perceive that they are denied promotions even when their performance warrants it (PD, 1).
				Black staff say they are not aware of any clearly laid out policy on promotion and that if there is such a policy, it is not fairly applied (PD, 6).

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
			Probable instances of ethnicity- or race-based favoritism in promotion decisions have been identified (DB, 1).
	“One group of particularly disaffected staff, with a high proportion of women, is found at grades 18 to 21... Even if staff with academic qualifications appropriate for grades 22-23 initially enter at these lower grades because they lack of work experience, or if they undertake further education, they are generally not considered competitive with external candidates” (Stern, 7).		
	“Inconsistency in promotions to higher grades is not perceived so much as a gender issue as it is a matter of fair treatment. But because about two-thirds of staff in grades 18 to 21 are women, they are affected by this immobility more than men” (Stern, 7).		
	“There is no evidence, from the data reviewed, of a difference in the promotion rates between men and women, once the candidates have been cleared” (WIBG, 10).		
Reliance on networks based on shared demographic characteristics to “get ahead” disadvantages staff from demographic groups that are under-represented.	Employees are advised to use networks based on shared “other” common factors to “get ahead” in the WBG (DB, 11).	Employees are advised to use networks based on shared nationality to “get ahead” in the WBG (DB, 11).	Employees are advised to use networks based on shared race to “get ahead” in the WBG (DB, 11).
			Black staff say that the lack of representation at mid- and upper-management levels means that there are few Blacks in policy- and decisionmaking positions who could ask questions about personnel actions such as rotations, developmental assignments, and promotions for Blacks (PD, 6).

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
			Black staff say that the lack of representation at management levels means that there are no mentors for them, no support groups, and no one to ask questions about their career development (PD, 6).
			Black staff say that because of their small numbers and their lack of representation at management levels, they have no support to change the disparities between Blacks and non-Blacks (PD, 4).
		"The Bank has had a 'free market' approach to career progression, where staff have been expected to search out their next assignment through the internal job posting system. While this system has the advantage of transparency, staff who have been in field managerial positions are at a disadvantage when seeking out new assignments: [among other factors,] their informal networks have usually weakened" (HRPSD, 13).	The Bank has had a 'free market' approach to career progression, where staff have been expected to search out their next assignment through the internal job posting system. While this system has the advantage of transparency, staff who have been in field managerial positions are at a disadvantage when seeking out new assignments: [among other factors,] their informal networks have usually weakened (HRPSD, 13).
		"At the Bank, as elsewhere, networking is a key element in selection, reassignment, promotion and job-related support. Managers in the Bank and elsewhere have a tendency to hire, support, and promote those with whom they feel personally comfortable. For many, networks are based on professional ties established many years ago. There were then few women with whom to share work experiences, cultural ties, influence, or other affinities. Women are often not in these networks, which means that women staff and consultants are less likely to hear informally of upcoming job openings, and are less likely to come to mind when managers are seeking candidates" (Stern, 8).	

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...				
Topic		Gender	Nationality*	Race*
		<p>"While the network of senior women is growing, it is still small. And even effective informal networks for women are not a substitute for formal mechanisms to facilitate advancement" (Stern, 8).</p>		
Performance Evaluation	Evaluation processes are biased against certain demographic groups.	<p>"There appears to be a bias toward promoting men that is found in the formal performance appraisals. Catalyst believes this bias is not deliberate, but rather unconscious" (Catalyst 2, 2).</p>		Black staff perceive that they are held to a higher standard in evaluations (PD, 5).
				Black staff perceive that certain labels are used in their evaluations to disadvantage them (PD, 4).
				Black staff perceive that they risk being demoted if they confront their managers about their evaluations (PD, 5).
				Black staff perceive that a "clique" dynamic exists in which "networking" or "pleasing those that count" becomes more important than productivity (Voices, 6).
		<p>A study by Pilat (UK), Ltd., "found an inconsistency between the overall favorableness of PMPs and the actual merit ratings given by Bank managers. For grades 27-28, the PMPs suggest better performance by men than by women, but there is no significant relationship between the narrative text and the merit rating given. For the lower grades, the performance rating predicted by the analysts from the text has a correlation of only 0.3 with actual merit ratings. In particular, the analysts found that overall favorableness of a review translates into higher actual ratings for men, but not for women" (ABPG, 10).</p>		

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
Compensation	The WBG does not pay all demographic groups equally, controlling for qualifications.		Black staff perceive that the pay differential from their entry salaries follows them throughout their tenure at WBG (PD, 4).
		“Compared to the findings by Oaxaca and Ransom using 1992 data, the share of the differences in current salaries that are due to structure [that is, differences based on race, nationality, or gender] decreased by 47% for Part I women, by 38% for Part II women, and by 4% for Part II men, all relative to Part I men... This dramatic reduction in just five years has been achieved largely by reducing the differences in entry levels” (ABPG, 4).	
		Women (Part I and Part II) are paid less on average than men (DEC, 7).	Black staff are paid less on average than non-Black staff (DEC, 8).
		The gap in average pay between Black and non-Black is greater among women (DEC, 3).	
			In 2001, Black staff had on average “better” characteristics and would have entry salaries 1.8 percent higher than non-Black staff if they had been equally rewarded for those characteristics (DEC, 3).
		Among Part I staff, 35% of the gap in average salary between men and women (or 4.4% of total average salary) was attributable to gender (DEC, 13).	Among all staff, 77% of the gap in average salary between Black staff and non-Black staff (or 3.3% of total average salary) was attributable to race (DEC, 14).
		Among women, the gap in average salary between Part I and Part II (6.7% of total average salary) was entirely attributable to Part I /Part II nationality differences; in fact, Part I women should have earned 0.9% less than Part II women when controlling for qualifications (DEC, 16).	

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
		Among Part II staff, 53% of the gap in average salary between men and women (or 7.8% of total average salary) was attributable to gender (DEC, 13).	The gap in average salary between SSA/CR and non-SSA/CR staff was entirely attributable to differences in SSA/CR nationality; in fact, non-SSA/CR staff should have earned a very small amount less (approximately 0.03% of total average salary) than SSA/CR staff (DEC, 14).
		"While for non-YPs, there is evidence of a small amount of catching up or 'convergence' [in pay], among YPs the exact opposite is found as growth rates favor men over women — a reversal of the non-YP case" (ABPG, 7-8).	
	The gaps among demographic groups in average current salaries are changing over time.	The gap between men and women has narrowed since 1997 for Part I women, but grown for Part II women (DEC, 7).	The gap between Part I and Part II has grown for both men and women (DEC, 7).
		The gap between men and women is becoming more attributable to differences in qualifications (DEC, 13).	The gap between Part I and Part II is becoming less attributable to differences in qualifications (DEC, 13).
Fringe Benefits and Support Services	Fringe benefits and support services offered by WBG do not meet the needs of all demographic groups.	Staff perceive that the recuperative leave travel policy is either ambiguously defined or inconsistently implemented by managers (Catalyst, 5).	
		The culture of long hours and managerial attitudes are barriers to implementing desirable flexible time options (Catalyst, 5).	
		Staff expressed dissatisfaction with the availability of on-site child care (Catalyst, 5).	
		"Emergency back-up child care was implemented this fall [1998]. There have been four orientation sessions for interested parents" (FRSG, 3).	
Treatment and Atmosphere	The culture of WBG is biased against certain demographic groups.		SSA/CR staff perceive that management is not "fully on-board" concerning inclusion and diversity (Voices, 5).
			Black staff perceive that stereotypes and discrimination are "entrenched" (PD, 5).

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
Gender		There is a perception that managers and staff are not as interested in the development of Caribbean countries; and that clients in these countries do not have much of a voice in shaping regional policy (Voices, 9).	Black staff feel that the general sense of powerlessness, and lack of inclusion, is partly a mirror of the attitude of managers toward Africa, the Caribbean, and other parts of the world populated by Blacks (Voices, 9).
		"Many LIC country programs, particularly those in the Africa Region, experience difficulties in attracting outstanding staff members as Team Leaders and Team Members. The teams in working on these countries have a proportionately higher number of unfilled vacancies.. compared to those working on other countries" (SSIC, 39).	
			Black staff perceive the WBG work environment to be hostile and prejudiced (DB, 1).
	"About half (53%) of staff feel 'men and women are treated equally in the work environment' (and 29% do not). Men are more likely to agree (64%) than women (43%). National staffs are also more positive (76% agree) than are Washington-based staff (48%). But most people feel 'the World Bank Group is serious about dealing with gender discrimination' (65%) and especially with sexual harassment (78%)" (Kraut, 14-5).	"Less than half of respondents (48%) agree 'the World Bank Group is serious about dealing with nationality discrimination' and a quarter (25%) disagree" (Kraut, 15).	"A majority of staff... feel 'the World Bank Group is serious about dealing with race discrimination' (59% agree)" (Kraut, 15).

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
	<p>"Nine percent of respondents say they have at least once 'within the last two years, in the course of performing duties for the World Bank Group, personally experienced unwelcome sexual attention (for example, comments, suggestions, advances).' The proportion is higher among women (14%) than among men (4%). This unwelcome attention may be under-reported, as only 9% of those who experienced it sought help" (Kraut, 15).</p>		<p>"Racial bias or prejudice has been experienced at work during the last two years by 21% of the respondents. This... may be an under-reported occurrence, as only 10% of those who have had such experience say they have sought help" (Kraut, 15).</p>
	<p>"Women generally are not willing to complain about [sexual harassment] or to report it to Personnel for fear [of] personal and professional retribution by managers or their colleagues. Most simply try to escape their situations as soon as possible. The lack of attention to the issue, the absence of secure and supportive channels to discuss problems, and the uncertainty that remedial action will be taken are seen as official tolerance of such behavior. General policy statements have proven insufficient deterrents" (Stern, 10).</p>		
	<p>"Differences in attitudes [toward gender equity] are compounded at the Bank, where staff come from so many cultures with different standards for male-female relationships. Many staff believe that the Bank — instead of trying to appreciate such differences and deal with them — has tended to ignore them" (Stern, 9).</p>		
	<p>"[Many staff] believe that women are viewed as not having careers at the Bank the way men have careers" (Stern, 9).</p>		

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
	<p>"Women considering Bank employment see the small number of women at senior and management levels, and are discouraged by real or perceived lack of career opportunities. Too many women see the Bank as an unsympathetic place to work, with insufficient support for balancing work and family responsibilities. They also see a Bank that has not done enough to change discriminatory attitudes and practices" (Stern, 2).</p>		
The culture of WBG is inflexible.	<p>The culture of long hours and managerial attitudes are barriers to implementing desirable flexible time options (Catalyst, 5).</p>	<p>A Japanese focus group indicated that adjusting to WBG culture is the hardest part of integration (MDFDE, 16).</p>	<p>Black staff perceive that change is unlikely (Voices, 6).</p>
			<p>Black staff perceive that attitudes, mind-sets, behavior, and culture need to change dramatically (Voices, 4).</p>
	<p>The demographic composition of the management does not reflect the composition of the staff.</p>		<p>Black staff perceive that they are under-represented at the higher levels of management (PD, 1 and 6) (Voices, 3 and 4).</p>
Retention and Separation	<p>There are different rates of separation across demographic groups.</p>	<p>Part II women separated disproportionately in FY01 (MDFDE, 12).</p>	<p>Staff from Japan separate disproportionately (MDFDE, 16).</p>
			<p>Staff from ECA countries separate disproportionately (MDFDE, 16).</p>
			<p>Staff from Part II countries separate disproportionately (MDFDE, 16).</p>

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic	Gender	Nationality*	Race*
		"At both levels GF-GG and GH+, there has been an increase in the cumulative share [of terminations] of Part II nationals since last quarter" (D@WBG, 2).	"At GF-GG, the percentage of terminations equals staff-on-board representation (8.3%); at GH+, there is almost no difference (SSA/CR nationals are 7.1% of staff-on-board, 7% of terminations). In the redundancies/mutually-agreed separations, 5 SSA/CR nationals at GF+ have been affected — 1 more since last quarter — out of 34 total (14.7%, well above staff-on-board representation)" (D@WBG, 3).
The reasons for separation are different for different demographic groups.			Black staff sometimes leave the WBG because they feel that their race prevents them from being promoted (PD, 5).
			Blacks are sometimes encouraged to leave WBG so that they can return at a higher grade (PD, 5).
		German and Japanese staff in the Young Professionals program have a markedly higher retention rate than German and Japanese staff not in the Young Professionals program (MDFDE, 16).	
HR Policies and Practices	Human Resources does not treat all demographic groups equitably.		Black staff perceive that HR policies on promotion are selectively enforced against them (PD, 4 and 7).
			Black staff perceive that HR has given Black staff erroneous information and has told them that if they do not like what is happening to them, they should leave the WBG (PD, 7).
	HR policies regarding discrimination are not clear to all staff.	Only 34% of staff responded favorably to the statement "The World Bank Group's zero tolerance policy for discrimination has been discussed in my unit," while 45% responded unfavorably (Kraut, 13).	Only 34% of staff responded favorably to the statement "The World Bank Group's zero tolerance policy for discrimination has been discussed in my unit," while 45% responded unfavorably (Kraut, 13).

How the Topic Is Discussed in Studies in Which the Out-Group Is Defined by...

Topic		Gender	Nationality*	Race*
Monitoring and Accountability	HR does not provide effective “checks and balances.”	Progress toward gender-related targets are not sufficiently evaluated in managers’ PMPs/OPEs (Catalyst, 7).		
				Black staff perceive that HR is very aware that Blacks are treated differently and they have taken no steps to prevent it (PD, 7).
				Black staff perceive that complaining to HR often leads to no result (PD, 4).
				Black staff perceive that HR sees itself as part of management, and its role as helping managers accomplish whatever they want to do (PD, 7).
	HR’s accountability for diversity outcomes is unclear.	“While accountability remains with the hiring VPU, HR will take a more proactive role in ensuring diversity in external recruitment, and by reviewing and monitoring VPU hiring decisions. Diversity will be integrated into strategic staff planning, cascaded down to the decisionmaking point for recruitment, and followed up through the Quarterly Business Review Process. Accountability for diversity will form part of the managerial performance evaluations at the VP and Director levels” (SSIC, iv).	“While accountability remains with the hiring VPU, HR will take a more proactive role in ensuring diversity in external recruitment, and by reviewing and monitoring VPU hiring decisions. Diversity will be integrated into strategic staff planning, cascaded down to the decisionmaking point for recruitment, and followed up through the Quarterly Business Review Process. Accountability for diversity will form part of the managerial performance evaluations at the VP and Director levels” (SSIC, iv).	“While accountability remains with the hiring VPU, HR will take a more proactive role in ensuring diversity in external recruitment, and by reviewing and monitoring VPU hiring decisions. Diversity will be integrated into strategic staff planning, cascaded down to the decisionmaking point for recruitment, and followed up through the Quarterly Business Review Process. Accountability for diversity will form part of the managerial performance evaluations at the VP and Director levels” (SSIC, iv).

APPENDIX D. REGRESSION ANALYSIS CITED IN CHAPTER 4

Table D.1 Multiple regression analysis cited in chapter 4

Category	Explanatory Variable	Employment Outcome Being Modeled											
		Log of Annual Salary			Log of Odds of Being a Manager			Log of Odds of Grade > GG			Log of Odds of Changing VPU		
		Regression Coefficient	t Value	% Change in Salary	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds
Intercept	Intercept	10.08345	77.61	—	-22.22000	-5.4	—	-19.29720	-5.5	—	-4.74860	-1.0	—
Metrics on 7 Personal or Cultural Characteristics	1 = Has a Part II Passport (M1)	-0.02495	-4.1	-2.5	-0.28220	-1.8	-24.6	-0.14036	-1.0	-13.1	-0.45565	-2.1	-36.6
	1 = Speaks > 1 Native Language Other than English (M2)	-0.01922	-2.4	-1.9	-0.12893	-0.7	-12.1	-0.39356	-2.4	-32.5	-0.40563	-1.5	-33.3
	1 = Has ≥ 1 Undergraduate Degree(s) from a Part II University (M3)	-0.01781	-2.3	-1.8	-0.16604	-0.9	-15.3	-0.11798	-0.7	-11.1	-0.09531	-0.3	-9.1
	1 = Female (M4)	-0.05272	-10.3	-5.1	-0.46306	-3.5	-37.1	-0.58281	-5.0	-44.2	-0.35099	-2.0	-29.6
	1 = Black (M5)	-0.03303	-3.6	-3.2	0.68822	3.2	99.0	-0.45141	-2.1	-36.3	-0.06717	-0.2	-6.5
	1 = Not Married-with-Dependents (M6)	-0.01812	-3.7	-1.8	0.09341	0.8	9.8	-0.04543	-0.4	-4.4	-0.18072	-1.0	-16.5
	1 = Younger than 36 or Older than 55 (M7)	0.00932	1.0	0.9	-0.33583	-1.3	-28.5	-0.13079	-0.6	-12.3	-0.07234	-0.2	-7.0
Metrics on 8 Educational or Experience Characteristics	1 = Has No Graduate Degree in Economics or Business (M8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1 = Has No Graduate Degree from 20 “Core” Universities (M9)	-0.00360	-0.6	-0.4	-0.07360	-0.5	-7.1	-0.10214	-0.8	-9.7	0.36741	1.8	44.4
	1 = Has ≥ 1 Graduate Degree(s) from a Part II University (M10)	0.00137	0.2	0.1	0.13814	0.6	14.8	0.30558	1.7	35.7	-0.72951	-2.2	-51.8
	1 = Has > 8 Years’ Experience outside Bank Group (M11)	-0.00002	0.0	0.0	-0.00262	0.0	-0.3	0.34068	1.6	40.6	0.06267	0.2	6.5
	1 = Has Work Experience in NGOs (M12)	-0.01967	-1.6	-1.9	-0.50358	-1.3	-39.6	-0.16198	-0.5	-15.0	-0.42582	-1.1	-34.7
	1 = < 8 Years Work Experience in Bank Group (M13)	-0.01184	-1.3	-1.2	0.25135	1.0	28.6	-0.61586	-3.0	-46.0	-0.57275	-1.7	-43.6
	1 = Has Worked in >1 VPU since 1999 (M14)	0.00114	0.2	0.1	0.28235	2.1	32.6	0.07679	0.7	8.0	—	—	—
	1 = Affiliated w/ > 1 Network/ Sector(s) (M15)	-0.02120	-3.5	-2.1	-0.17630	-1.2	-16.2	-0.30050	-2.5	-26.0	0.03917	0.2	4.0
Metric on Multiple Differences	1 = Has > 7 Non-Modal Characteristics (M16)	-0.00298	-0.3	-0.3	0.06043	0.3	6.2	-0.22234	-1.1	-19.9	1.35987	4.6	289.6
Educational Qualifications	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Agriculture	0.01048	0.6	1.1	-0.42259	-1.2	-34.5	0.03493	0.1	3.6	0.37982	0.7	46.2
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Business	0.00154	0.2	0.2	0.25235	1.2	28.7	-0.18710	-1.1	-17.1	0.14979	0.5	16.2
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Economics	0.01013	1.2	1.0	0.00431	0.0	0.4	0.04152	0.2	4.2	0.52116	1.8	68.4
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Education	-0.07129	-3.7	-6.9	-1.15610	-1.4	-68.5	-1.19342	-2.6	-69.7	—	—	—
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Engineering /Sciences	0.01483	1.3	1.5	0.11029	0.4	11.7	0.21925	0.9	24.5	-0.16307	-0.4	-15.0
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Environment	-0.00857	-0.5	-0.9	-1.11983	-2.3	-67.4	0.13553	0.4	14.5	0.02319	0.0	2.3
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Health	0.00795	0.3	0.8	0.87904	1.2	140.9	0.13578	0.3	14.5	0.40905	0.5	50.5
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Liberal Arts	-0.03304	-2.1	-3.2	0.14542	0.4	15.7	-0.83194	-2.5	-56.5	-1.28503	-1.6	-72.3
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Law	0.01298	0.8	1.3	-0.77571	-2.3	-54.0	0.10043	0.3	10.6	-1.13979	-1.5	-68.0
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Computer Science	0.03979	3.0	4.1	0.34717	1.1	41.5	-0.40610	-1.3	-33.4	0.89606	2.0	145.0
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in International Relations	-0.02271	-2.1	-2.2	-0.08578	-0.3	-8.2	-0.46842	-2.0	-37.4	-0.37221	-1.0	-31.1
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Public Administration	0.01626	1.3	1.6	0.45851	1.6	58.2	0.21665	0.8	24.2	0.52738	1.4	69.4
	1 = Has a Master’s Degree in Other Social Sciences	-0.03805	-2.1	-3.7	-0.38194	-0.8	-31.7	-0.09715	-0.3	-9.3	0.66286	1.2	94.0
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Agriculture	0.03526	1.8	3.6	-0.88895	-2.0	-58.9	0.63871	1.7	89.4	1.09109	1.8	197.8
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Business	0.01745	1.0	1.8	-0.09212	-0.2	-8.8	0.39779	1.2	48.9	-0.87780	-1.1	-58.4
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Economics	0.04633	4.4	4.7	0.02725	0.1	2.8	0.68492	3.3	98.4	0.92755	2.8	152.8
1 = Has a Doctorate in Education	-0.00003	0.0	0.0	1.86406	2.9	545.0	0.13983	0.3	15.0	0.20289	0.2	22.5	
1 = Has a Doctorate in Engineering/ Sciences	0.08332	4.3	8.7	0.67914	1.6	97.2	0.78768	2.2	119.8	-0.15126	-0.2	-14.0	

Notes: Staff examined: 4,711 persons who were active headquarters-appointed staff at GF or higher on June 30, 2002.

Variables analyzed: All variables are from HO Query, except for race, which was coded by the Office of Diversity Programs.

Category	Explanatory Variable	Employment Outcome Being Modeled											
		Log of Annual Salary			Log of Odds of Being a Manager			Log of Odds of Grade > GG			Log of Odds of Changing VPU		
		Regression Coefficient	t Value	% Change in Salary	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds
Experience Qualifications	1 = Has a Doctorate in Environment	0.00608	0.3	0.6	-1.16905	-2.0	-68.9	-0.38029	-0.8	-31.6	-0.04018	-0.1	-3.9
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Health	0.07227	2.7	7.5	0.99697	1.6	171.0	1.11443	2.2	204.8	0.77632	1.1	117.3
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Liberal Arts	-0.06088	-1.7	-5.9	-0.25169	-0.3	-22.3	0.11788	0.2	12.5	—	—	—
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Law	0.07290	3.9	7.6	-1.10413	-2.9	-66.9	0.55016	1.4	73.4	-0.33788	-0.5	-28.7
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Computer Science	0.05019	1.9	5.1	-0.66924	-0.9	-48.8	0.71896	1.4	105.2	0.70985	0.8	103.4
	1 = Has a Doctorate in International Relations	0.04030	2.1	4.1	0.03751	0.1	3.8	-0.04585	-0.1	-4.5	0.23962	0.4	27.1
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Public Administration	0.05788	2.9	6.0	0.26214	0.6	30.0	1.00607	2.7	173.5	0.52888	0.8	69.7
	1 = Has a Doctorate in Other Social Sciences	0.01047	0.5	1.1	-0.45274	-1.0	-36.4	0.44437	1.2	56.0	-1.10015	-1.0	-66.7
	1 = Has Reported a Bachelors Degree but No Graduate Degree(s)	-0.02435	-2.2	-2.4	-0.24243	-0.9	-21.5	-0.24944	-1.1	-22.1	-0.04722	-0.1	-4.6
	1 = Has Reported a Graduate Degree but No Bachelors Degree(s)	0.00158	0.2	0.2	-0.02630	-0.2	-2.6	0.21940	1.6	24.5	0.02552	0.1	2.6
	1 = Has No Education Information in HO Query	0.00493	0.5	0.5	-0.48307	-1.7	-38.3	-0.13262	-0.6	-12.4	0.45242	1.2	57.2
	1 = Has a Graduate Economics Degree from a Top-10-Ranked School	0.05429	3.8	5.6	-0.24812	-0.9	-22.0	0.55831	2.0	74.8	0.63552	1.7	88.8
	1 = Has a Graduate Business Degree from a Top-10-Ranked School	0.05834	5.0	6.0	0.14963	0.6	16.1	0.90847	3.9	148.1	0.65707	1.4	92.9
	1 = Received Highest Degree after Being Hired by Bank Group	-0.07896	-8.2	-7.6	-0.55280	-2.3	-42.5	-0.72035	-3.5	-51.3	0.14825	0.5	16.0
	Years of Experience in the Bank Group	0.00154	0.8	0.2	0.06783	1.3	7.0	0.03436	0.8	3.5	-0.15444	-2.2	-14.3
	Years of Experience in the Bank Group Squared	0.00010	2.0	0.0	0.00069	0.5	0.1	0.00016	0.1	0.0	0.00456	2.4	0.5
	Years of Experience outside the Bank Group	0.00013	0.1	0.0	-0.03137	-0.7	-3.1	-0.06985	-1.7	-6.7	-0.00582	-0.1	-0.6
	Years of Experience outside the Bank Group Squared	0.00007	1.2	0.0	0.00156	1.1	0.2	0.00222	1.8	0.2	0.00095	0.5	0.1
	1 = HO Query Reports No Experience outside Bank Group	-0.01746	-1.3	-1.7	-0.17986	-0.5	-16.5	-0.71892	-2.4	-51.3	-0.01384	0.0	-1.4
	1 = Has Participated in Young Professional Program	0.01314	1.5	1.3	0.42997	2.0	53.7	0.82011	4.0	127.1	1.15875	4.8	218.6
Current VPU	1 = VPU = AFR	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1 = VPU = EAP	0.01635	1.4	1.6	-0.09197	-0.3	-8.8	0.39047	1.7	47.8	—	—	—
	1 = VPU = SAR	0.02234	1.6	2.3	0.22180	0.7	24.8	0.49998	1.8	64.9	3.14712	5.9	2226.9
	1 = VPU = ECA	0.00663	0.6	0.7	0.03081	0.1	3.1	0.36299	1.7	43.8	1.92610	3.5	586.3
	1 = VPU = MNA	0.01736	1.2	1.8	-0.08005	-0.2	-7.7	0.09051	0.3	9.5	2.76772	5.0	1492.2
	1 = VPU = LCR	0.02266	2.0	2.3	-0.04628	-0.2	-4.5	0.23524	1.0	26.5	2.05368	3.8	679.7
	1 = VPU = ESD	0.02410	1.5	2.4	-0.60033	-1.4	-45.1	0.63834	1.8	89.3	1.49801	2.1	347.3
	1 = VPU = FSE	0.11090	5.1	11.7	-0.36526	-0.5	-30.6	1.81363	4.2	513.3	1.66778	1.9	430.0
	1 = VPU = HDN	0.00995	0.5	1.0	0.25765	0.5	29.4	0.72875	1.9	107.2	3.10978	4.9	2141.6
	1 = VPU = PRM	0.01319	0.6	1.3	-0.48883	-1.0	-38.7	0.52925	1.2	69.8	4.04201	7.0	5594.1
	1 = VPU = PSI	0.03818	2.9	3.9	0.36735	1.0	44.4	0.96599	3.6	162.7	2.64820	4.8	1312.9
	1 = VPU = OPC	0.02951	1.3	3.0	0.55449	1.1	74.1	0.41086	0.9	50.8	3.69754	6.0	3934.8
	1 = VPU = Operations-Other	-0.02776	-2.5	-2.7	-0.23942	-0.9	-21.3	-0.08032	-0.3	-7.7	1.97040	3.6	617.4
	1 = VPU = Finance	0.03603	2.7	3.7	0.54425	1.6	72.3	0.39265	1.4	48.1	0.89994	1.1	145.9
	1 = VPU = Corporate	0.03754	2.8	3.8	0.05971	0.2	6.2	-0.07840	-0.3	-7.5	2.88994	5.2	1699.2
	1 = VPU = Institutional Services	-0.03168	-2.6	-3.1	0.30106	1.1	35.1	-0.65307	-2.2	-48.0	3.45575	6.5	3068.2
	1 = VPU = Institutional Governance	0.03996	1.8	4.1	0.55924	1.1	74.9	-0.26860	-0.6	-23.6	1.00238	0.9	172.5
	1 = VPU = GEF	0.02818	1.0	2.9	-1.54920	-1.4	-78.8	0.07516	0.1	7.8	3.42711	4.0	2978.8
	1 = VPU = IFC	0.02883	2.5	2.9	0.84144	3.1	132.0	1.10356	4.3	201.5	0.30941	0.4	36.3
	1 = VPU = MIGA	0.02619	1.3	2.7	-1.68182	-2.4	-81.4	1.29804	2.8	266.2	0.85696	0.7	135.6
Current Job Family	1 = in job family 1	-0.07368	-5.8	-7.1	-1.97941	-7.1	-86.2	-0.59158	-2.2	-44.7	1.09016	2.8	197.5
	1 = in job family 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1 = in job family 3	-0.01906	-1.1	-1.9	-4.21109	-4.1	-98.5	0.05178	0.2	5.3	—	—	—
	1 = in job family 4	-0.02157	-1.6	-2.1	—	—	—	-0.76915	-2.6	-53.7	0.48641	1.0	62.6

Category	Explanatory Variable	Employment Outcome Being Modeled											
		Log of Annual Salary			Log of Odds of Being a Manager			Log of Odds of Grade > GG			Log of Odds of Changing VPU		
		Regression Coefficient	t Value	% Change in Salary	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds	Regression Coefficient	Z Value	% Change in Odds
Language Qualifications	1 = in Job Family 5	-0.07893	-3.8	-7.6	-3.29085	-3.2	-96.3	0.18377	0.4	20.2	1.04533	1.8	184.4
	1 = in Job Family 6	0.03106	2.8	3.2	-2.20880	-8.6	-89.0	0.69136	3.2	99.6	0.32795	0.7	38.8
	1 = in Job Family 7	-0.11675	-4.7	-11.0	—	—	—	-12.81992	0.0	-100.0	—	—	—
	1 = in Job Family 8	0.00635	0.4	0.6	-3.80891	-4.9	-97.8	0.27967	1.0	32.3	0.24072	0.4	27.2
	1 = in Job Family 9	-0.02774	-1.6	-2.7	-3.30196	-5.3	-96.3	-0.54741	-1.2	-42.2	-0.41652	-0.6	-34.1
	1 = in Job Family 10	-0.12860	-10.4	-12.1	-4.60287	-6.3	-99.0	-1.87220	-4.5	-84.6	-1.55435	-2.5	-78.9
	1 = in Job Family 11	-0.00788	-0.5	-0.8	-4.09076	-4.0	-98.3	-0.21910	-0.8	-19.7	0.26863	0.5	30.8
	1 = in Job Family 12	-0.01274	-1.0	-1.3	-3.87393	-9.3	-97.9	-0.04750	-0.2	-4.6	0.71619	1.1	104.7
	1 = in Job Family 13	0.00206	0.1	0.2	—	—	—	0.56537	1.5	76.0	1.42072	2.7	314.0
	1 = in Job Family 14	0.08224	6.4	8.6	—	—	—	1.63010	6.3	410.4	0.62504	1.5	86.8
	1 = in Job Family 15	-0.02234	-2.3	-2.2	-2.91422	-10.7	-94.6	0.40162	2.2	49.4	0.60969	1.9	84.0
	1 = in Job Family 16	0.09062	6.6	9.5	-2.84871	-6.4	-94.2	1.97876	6.9	623.4	1.55552	4.5	373.8
	1 = in Job Family 17	0.00589	0.4	0.6	-4.08789	-4.0	-98.3	-0.25884	-0.8	-22.8	0.68879	1.6	99.1
	1 = in Job Family 18	-0.00907	-0.4	-0.9	—	—	—	-0.34133	-0.8	-28.9	-0.31460	-0.3	-27.0
	1 = in Job Family 19	-0.20481	-6.1	-18.5	-2.89288	-2.7	-94.5	-1.90349	-1.7	-85.1	0.64184	0.6	90.0
	1 = is Currently a Manager	0.18578	17.1	20.4	—	—	—	2.84410	12.6	1618.6	0.09080	0.2	9.5
	Number of Languages among French and Spanish in Which Is Fluent	0.00325	0.8	0.3	0.13450	1.4	14.4	0.03994	0.5	4.1	0.25374	1.9	28.9
	Number out of 7 Languages Groups but Excluding English, French, or Spanish in Which Has > 1 Fluent Language(s)	-0.00255	-0.4	-0.3	0.10434	0.8	11.0	0.00026	0.0	0.0	0.14927	0.7	16.1
	1 = No Information on Language Skills in HO Query	-0.01244	-1.5	-1.2	0.07380	0.3	7.7	-0.07675	-0.4	-7.4	0.42898	1.4	53.6
Other Variables	1 = No Sector or Network Affiliations Reported in HO Query	-0.01067	-1.4	-1.1	0.49895	2.6	64.7	-0.18437	-1.0	-16.8	-0.19934	-0.7	-18.1
	Age in Years	0.05188	9.1	5.3	0.82001	4.6	127.1	0.64657	4.4	90.9	0.03515	0.2	3.6
	Age Squared	-0.00042	-6.8	0.0	-0.00802	-4.3	-0.8	-0.00545	-3.5	-0.5	-0.00090	-0.4	-0.1
Regression Method R Squared F or Chi-square Degrees of Freedom Probability		Multiple			Logistic			Logistic			Logistic		
		0.69			0.37			0.50			0.25		
		105.9			1,367.7			2,899.5			425.3		
		97, 4613			91			97			91		
		< .0001			< .0001			< .0001			< .0001		

Table D.2 Correlations among selected explanatory variables utilized in regression analysis

Variable	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M9	M10	M11	M12	M13	M14	M15	M16
M1	1.00	0.41	0.54	-0.01	0.27	-0.10	0.00	-0.04	0.02	0.33	-0.05	-0.04	-0.07	0.00	0.03	0.33
M2	0.41	1.00	0.44	-0.02	0.05	-0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.10	0.23	-0.05	-0.01	0.07	0.01	-0.02	0.25
M3	0.54	0.44	1.00	-0.05	0.06	-0.11	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	0.41	-0.02	-0.04	-0.04	-0.03	-0.01	0.33
M4	-0.01	-0.02	-0.05	1.00	-0.02	0.23	-0.02	0.01	-0.05	-0.04	-0.11	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.14
M5	0.27	0.05	0.06	-0.02	1.00	-0.05	0.00	0.02	0.03	-0.03	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.16
M6	-0.10	-0.03	-0.11	0.23	-0.05	1.00	0.23	0.03	-0.02	-0.09	-0.02	0.05	0.13	0.03	-0.05	0.14
M7	0.00	0.03	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.23	1.00	0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.07	0.04	0.17	0.00	-0.05	0.18
M8	-0.04	-0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04	1.00	0.05	-0.02	0.12	0.08	0.06	-0.06	0.01	0.18
M9	0.02	0.10	0.08	-0.05	0.03	-0.02	0.05	0.05	1.00	0.14	0.11	-0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.03	0.23
M10	0.33	0.23	0.41	-0.04	-0.03	-0.09	-0.03	-0.02	0.14	1.00	0.05	0.02	0.01	-0.05	0.01	0.32
M11	-0.05	-0.05	-0.02	-0.11	0.02	-0.02	0.07	0.12	0.11	0.05	1.00	0.03	0.07	-0.04	0.00	0.14
M12	-0.04	-0.01	-0.04	0.07	0.00	0.05	0.04	0.08	-0.03	0.02	0.03	1.00	0.19	0.02	-0.02	0.16
M13	-0.07	0.07	-0.04	0.06	0.02	0.13	0.17	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.07	0.19	1.00	-0.02	-0.21	0.08
M14	0.00	0.01	-0.03	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.00	-0.06	-0.04	-0.05	-0.04	0.02	-0.02	1.00	0.10	0.18
M15	0.03	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.05	-0.05	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.21	0.10	1.00	0.21
M16	0.33	0.25	0.33	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.18	0.18	0.23	0.32	0.14	0.16	0.08	0.18	0.21	1.00
Mas1	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.05	0.03	-0.03	0.00	0.08	0.04	0.00	0.02	0.00	-0.06	0.01	0.04	0.05
Mas2	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.04	-0.46	0.00	0.02	-0.08	-0.07	-0.12	0.01	0.02	-0.01
Mas3	-0.01	-0.03	-0.03	0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03	-0.36	-0.06	0.00	-0.08	0.01	-0.11	0.06	0.03	-0.02
Mas4	-0.01	-0.04	-0.02	0.08	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.13	0.00	-0.02	0.04	0.05	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	0.04
Mas5	0.06	0.11	0.05	-0.10	-0.02	-0.05	0.01	0.15	0.07	0.07	0.06	-0.02	-0.06	-0.01	0.03	0.07
Mas6	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.11	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.07	0.05
Mas8	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	0.05	0.03	0.01	-0.02	0.09	-0.03	0.01	0.03	0.05	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	0.03
Mas9	-0.04	-0.05	-0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.01	-0.01	0.12	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.06
Mas10	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.13	-0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.06	0.01
Mas11	0.10	0.09	0.12	-0.04	0.00	-0.02	-0.02	0.17	-0.03	0.10	-0.05	-0.03	-0.08	0.00	-0.02	0.06
Mas12	-0.06	-0.05	-0.09	0.05	-0.03	0.04	-0.02	0.17	-0.08	-0.02	-0.01	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.07
Mas13	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.04	0.13	-0.04	0.01	0.00	0.03	-0.03	0.04	0.06	0.03
Mas14	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.05	0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.12	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.00	0.03	0.05
Doc1	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.05	0.03	-0.02	0.03	0.13	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.01	-0.04	0.00	0.06	0.07
Doc2	0.02	0.03	0.04	-0.03	0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.12	-0.02	0.00	0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.03	-0.02	-0.01
Doc3	0.05	0.04	0.04	-0.05	0.01	-0.03	-0.04	-0.34	-0.02	0.04	-0.05	-0.03	-0.14	0.11	0.09	0.01
Doc4	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.09	0.01	-0.03	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01
Doc5	0.03	0.04	0.04	-0.05	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.14	0.03	0.02	0.06	-0.02	-0.04	0.01	0.06	0.09
Doc6	0.00	0.00	0.04	-0.02	0.00	0.00	-0.03	0.13	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.00	-0.01	0.07	0.06
Doc8	-0.02	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.10	-0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.02	0.04
Doc9	-0.04	-0.03	-0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.04
Doc10	-0.06	-0.03	-0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.04	0.15	-0.07	-0.04	0.01	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	-0.05	-0.02
Doc11	0.03	0.05	0.05	-0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.08	-0.02	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.02
Doc12	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.10	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.04
Doc13	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.01	-0.03	0.00	0.11	-0.02	0.04	0.03	0.01	-0.05	0.03	0.07	0.07
Doc14	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.17	0.00	-0.04	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.07
Onlybach	-0.03	-0.08	-0.06	0.03	-0.03	0.00	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	-0.02	-0.07	-0.07	0.00	-0.08
Onlygrd	-0.04	0.21	0.00	-0.06	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.12	0.04	0.02	-0.02	-0.01	0.04	0.04	0.03
Noed	-0.06	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.44	-0.07	-0.19	-0.19
Top10econ	0.02	-0.03	0.00	-0.04	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03	-0.17	-0.18	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.09	0.08	0.04	-0.04
Top10mba	-0.01	-0.03	-0.05	-0.03	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.21	-0.16	-0.09	-0.03	-0.03	-0.07	0.01	-0.06	-0.08
Hdegafterhire	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.00	-0.04	-0.07	-0.06	-0.14	-0.04	-0.12	-0.04	-0.16	0.00	0.07	-0.03
Yrsexp	0.07	-0.09	0.01	-0.04	-0.01	-0.12	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08	-0.03	-0.19	-0.16	-0.78	0.02	0.20	-0.05
E2	0.06	-0.08	0.00	-0.03	-0.02	-0.09	-0.02	-0.08	-0.08	-0.05	-0.23	-0.15	-0.63	0.01	0.15	-0.05
Pexp	-0.05	-0.07	0.01	-0.13	0.00	-0.05	0.06	0.12	0.11	0.05	0.63	0.03	-0.19	-0.01	0.12	0.21
P2	-0.07	-0.07	-0.02	-0.12	-0.01	-0.01	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.05	0.60	0.03	-0.07	-0.03	0.07	0.17
Pexpmissing	-0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.04	0.00	0.09	0.11	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.45	-0.06	-0.21	-0.18
Everyyp	0.03	0.07	-0.01	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.06	-0.08	-0.05	-0.02	-0.19	-0.01	0.03	0.23	0.06	0.06
Pmucd2	0.01	-0.04	0.01	-0.04	-0.04	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	-0.03	-0.05	0.03	0.12	0.05
Pmucd3	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.01	-0.04	0.02	0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	-0.04	0.05	0.08	0.04
Pmucd4	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.06	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	-0.07	0.00	0.10	0.02
Pmucd5	0.02	0.06	0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.05	0.02
Pmucd6	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.00	-0.04	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	-0.04	0.02	0.14	0.06
Pmucd7	0.00	-0.03	0.00	-0.02	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.04
Pmucd8	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.04	-0.01	0.00	0.03	-0.02	0.06	0.01	-0.03	-0.01
Pmucd9	-0.02	-0.02	-0.04	0.06	-0.02	0.00	-0.03	0.02	-0.04	-0.03	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.01
Pmucd10	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.04	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	-0.01	-0.04	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.01	0.00
Pmucd11	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.01	-0.02	0.04	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	-0.02
Pmucd12	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.15	0.07	0.02

Variable	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M9	M10	M11	M12	M13	M14	M15	M16
Pmucd13	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.03	-0.03	0.02	0.02	-0.04	-0.01	0.02	-0.04	0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.07	0.00
Pmucd14	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.06	0.02	0.00	-0.03	-0.04	0.01	-0.07	0.04	-0.03
Pmucd15	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.07	0.01	0.01	-0.04	0.08	-0.04	-0.03	0.01	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	-0.07	-0.04
Pmucd16	0.00	-0.03	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.04	-0.02	0.12	0.03	0.04	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	-0.05	-0.13	-0.02
Pmucd17	0.00	-0.03	0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.02	0.05	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01
Pmucd18	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.03
Pmucd19	-0.02	0.00	-0.03	-0.04	-0.01	0.01	0.08	-0.10	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	0.10	-0.07	-0.29	-0.11
Pmucd20	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.01	0.01	0.06	-0.03	-0.07	-0.02
Jobfam1	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.00	-0.03	-0.02	-0.06	0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.15	0.00
Jobfam3	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.08	-0.01	-0.03	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.08	-0.01	0.00	-0.03	-0.02	0.01
Jobfam4	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.15	0.03	0.02	0.07	0.10	0.08	-0.03	0.02	0.05
Jobfam5	-0.04	-0.06	-0.03	0.05	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.07	0.06	-0.01	-0.05	0.01
Jobfam6	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.13	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.01
Jobfam7	-0.04	-0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.04	-0.02	0.02	-0.06	-0.02	0.00
Jobfam8	0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.12	-0.03	-0.01	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.04
Jobfam9	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	0.10	0.01	0.04	-0.02	0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	-0.05	-0.07	-0.02
Jobfam10	0.05	0.03	0.06	-0.05	-0.03	0.02	-0.04	0.13	0.00	0.06	-0.06	-0.01	-0.03	-0.07	-0.11	-0.03
Jobfam11	-0.02	0.03	0.00	-0.05	0.01	-0.04	0.02	0.12	0.05	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.15	0.07
Jobfam12	0.03	0.04	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.03	0.07	-0.13	0.01	0.00	-0.04	-0.02	0.10	-0.10	-0.18	-0.06
Jobfam13	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.06	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.12	-0.05	-0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.05	-0.06	-0.12	-0.05
Jobfam14	-0.02	-0.08	-0.04	-0.08	0.03	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07	-0.04	-0.05	-0.01	-0.07	-0.19	0.03	-0.04	-0.05
Jobfam15	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.05	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	-0.04	0.04	0.13	0.02
Jobfam16	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.04	0.10	0.01	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08	-0.02	0.03
Jobfam17	-0.03	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.05	-0.04	0.00
Jobfam18	-0.01	0.02	0.02	-0.05	0.01	-0.04	0.02	0.06	0.05	-0.01	0.06	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.06	0.03
Jobfam19	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.00
Mgr	-0.02	-0.06	-0.04	-0.08	0.03	-0.07	-0.08	-0.08	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-0.07	-0.20	0.04	-0.02	-0.06
Langsum1	-0.06	0.13	-0.08	0.01	-0.04	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.10	-0.01	-0.01	-0.18	0.09	0.11	0.05
Langsum2	0.32	0.54	0.30	-0.03	0.03	-0.08	-0.03	-0.03	0.03	0.18	-0.05	-0.02	-0.18	0.04	0.08	0.23
Nolang	-0.06	0.00	-0.03	0.00	0.03	0.08	0.10	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.07	0.49	-0.06	-0.18	-0.16
Nosects	-0.07	-0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.01	0.05	0.07	-0.03	-0.01	-0.05	0.01	-0.03	0.17	-0.12	-0.44	-0.15
Age	-0.06	-0.12	0.00	-0.18	0.00	-0.14	-0.04	0.06	0.05	0.01	0.32	-0.12	-0.47	-0.07	0.12	0.01
Agesq	-0.06	-0.12	0.00	-0.18	0.00	-0.12	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.01	0.32	-0.12	-0.45	-0.07	0.12	0.02

Table D.3 Top 10 ranked programs worldwide in 2 fields of graduate study

Rank	Doctoral Degrees in Economics*	Master's Degrees in Business^
1	Harvard	Pennsylvania
2	Chicago	Harvard
3	Pennsylvania	Columbia
4	Stanford	Stanford
5	MIT	Chicago
6	California, Berkeley	INSEAD
7	Northwestern	MIT
8	Yale	New York University
9	Michigan	London Business School
10	Columbia	Northwestern

Notes:

*Ranking of economics graduate programs worldwide based on faculty publications 1990–2000, <http://homepages.ulb.ac.be/~tcoupe/updaterevealedperformance.pdf>.

^Ranking of MBA programs worldwide in 2002 by the *Financial Times*, <http://specials.ft.com/spdocs/FT31UUB8MWC.pdf>.

ACRONYMS

ABPG	“Assessing Bias in Pay and Grade at the World Bank”*
ACS	Administrative and Core Support
AFR	Africa Region
ARHR	“Annual Review of Human Resources FY2001”
B&E	Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc.
CO	Country Office
D@WBG	“Diversity at The World Bank Group: FY02 Second Quarter”
DB	Dewey Ballantine Audit Team
DEC	Development Economics VPU and Office of the Chief Economist; also, a study
FRSG	“Final Report of the Steering Group on Survey Follow-up”
HQ	Headquarters
HR	Human Resources
HRS	Human Resources Vice Presidency
HRSDP	Office of Diversity Programs
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDA	International Development Association
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IRS	internationally recruited staff
JPA	Junior Professional Associate
LCR	Latin American and Caribbean Region
LIC	Low-Income Countries
LRS	locally recruited staff
M	Metric
NGO	nongovernmental organization
MDFDE	“Mobilizing Diversity for Development Effectiveness”
OPE	Overall Performance Evaluation
PD	People Dynamics
PMP	Performance Management Process (forerunner of OPE)
SEP	Staff Exchange Program
SHRM	Society for Human Resource Management
SSAS/CR	Sub-Saharan Africa and Caribbean Region
SSIC	“Strategic Staffing: Issues and Challenges”
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
VPU	vice presidential unit
WBG	World Bank Group
WIBG	“Women in the Bank Group”
YP	Young Professional

*Note: For full publication information, see appendix C and References.

FREQUENTLY USED HUMAN RESOURCES TERMS AND NOTES TO THE READER

Gross Staff Count: All staff regardless of appointment type

Net Staff Count: Excludes coterminous appointments and SEP participants

HQ-Appointed Staff: Staff on one of the following salary plans—US, France, Italy, Belgium, Japan, Great Britain, Switzerland, Germany (regardless of location)

CO-Appointed Staff: Staff on all other salary plans

IRS: Staff hired for positions subject to international recruitment; most common for GF+ staff hired at HQ

LRS: All CO-appointed staff, all levels

Part I/Part II: Part I employees are from countries that are contributors to IDA, the lending window of the World Bank that provides low-interest loans to the poorest countries. Part II employees are from non-IDA contributor countries.

The World Bank comprises the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). Staff working for the International Development Association (IDA) and the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), are counted as IBRD staff. IBRD is structured as a matrix of geographic Regions (RVPU) and substantive Networks which are divided into Sectors, managed by Sector Boards (staff are “mapped” to one or more sectors).

The World Bank Group uses a grading system from GA-GK:

Grades GA-GD: Administrative and Core Support (ACS)

Grade GE: Entry-grade Professional Staff

Grades GF-GG: Key Professional Staff

Grades GH+: Managerial and Senior Technical Staff

The World Bank Group fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30.

The World Bank Group does not ask staff for self-reported data such as race, ethnicity, disabilities or sexual orientation. Therefore, in order to measure racial equality, we use a proxy of Sub-Saharan African and Caribbean nationals for staff of Sub-Saharan African origin (i.e., black staff).

The staff numbers in this report are expressed in net terms, excluding coterminous appointments and Staff Exchange Program participants. Net numbers produce slightly better results than gross for HQ-appointed staff, except for women at levels GH+; the same is true for HQ+CO appointments (there is no change for SSA/CR nationals). The use of gross rather than net numbers will have considerable impact on units with large numbers of coterminous staff, notably IFC.

GLOSSARY

ASSIMILATION: An approach to workforce diversity in which employees who differ from the organization's dominant employees in visible or invisible ways (out-groups) are encouraged to conform as much as possible to the characteristics of the dominant employees (in-groups).

BARRIER: Any aspect of an organization's operations, including attitudes, perceptions, policies, or practices, that cause some staff to be treated differently from their equally qualified peers.

CONSCIOUS: Aware of one's own perceptions, motivations, actions, and their consequences. See Unconscious.

CORPORATE CULTURE: The interdependent system of beliefs, values, expectations, and ways of behaving that are common to a workplace. Informally, "the way things are done around here."

CULTURAL CONTACT: The process of reducing stereotypes, in-group bias, and limited social networks by interaction between individuals from in-groups and out-groups.

DISCRIMINATION: In the workplace, negative behavior toward a group and its members not based on productivity-related characteristics.

DIVERSITY: Visible or invisible differences among individual employees that may affect their treatment within the workplace, their feeling of being welcome in their workplace, or their opportunities to contribute to their employer's goals.

DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT: At its most general level, an organization's policies and practices relating to the treatment of staff with differing characteristics; more specifically, an approach to these issues emphasizing voluntary actions by the employers (as distinct from legally mandated

actions) and the role of diversity as an asset in pursuing the organization's business objectives.

EQUITY: Equal access to employment opportunities for equally qualified workers.

GLASS CEILING: A pattern of occupational segregation in which employees with equal credentials and interests have different probabilities of working at different levels in a workplace, with less-favored groups occupying lower levels than favored groups.

GROUP THINK: The tendency for members of highly cohesive groups to conform so strongly to group pressures regarding a decision that they fail to think critically, rejecting the potential correcting influence of outsiders.

HR: Human resources; personnel.

HUMAN CAPITAL: Educational background, work experience, credentials, skills, and similar characteristics of a worker that increase that worker's productivity.

HUMAN CAPITAL THEORY: An economic theory that applies the general theory of competitive markets to hypothesize that a worker's employment outcomes (such as compensation) will be determined by the employee's human capital and not by other personal characteristics such as race and gender.

IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT: Efforts by individuals to improve how they appear to others, sometimes leading to evaluations based on appearance rather than actual job performance.

IN-GROUP: In this study, employees who share the characteristics of the Bank Group's numerically typical employee (see Mode); more generally, employees whose employment outcomes, compared to their equally qualified peers, are enhanced by processes such as stereotyping, in-group bias, and social networks. See Out-Group.

IN-GROUP BIAS: The tendency to favor persons who share characteristic(s), which create a feeling of common identity.

INCLUSION: A multifaceted characteristic of a workplace that leads equally qualified employees to be treated equally, feel equally welcome, and contribute equally to organizational goals.

INEQUITY: Differences in treatment for equally qualified peers in such processes as hiring, assignment, training, performance evaluation, salary-setting, and terminations.

INVISIBLE DIFFERENCES: Differences among individual employees in characteristics other than obvious demographic ones, for example, educational background, cultural perspectives, or thinking style. See Visible Differences.

MAINSTREAMING: A strategy for managing diversity that, rather than focusing on "stand-alone" efforts within HR, emphasizes the integration of diversity considerations in routine business processes across the organization.

MATRIX ORGANIZATION: A cooperative organizational structure in which lines of responsibility and reporting relationships go in at least two directions. For example, projects may cut across functional departments, or professional specialties may cut across geographical departments.

MICRO-INEQUITY: Differences in treatment experienced by equally qualified employees that, in isolation, are of a small scale and appear to be of marginal significance.

MODE: The most frequently occurring value in a set of numerical values.

OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION: A pattern of employment in which employees with equal credentials and interests have different probabilities of working in occupations or administrative units; sometimes referred to as "glass walls."

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: See Corporate Culture.

OUT-GROUP: In this study, employees who do not share the characteristics of the Bank Group's numerically most typical employee (see Mode); more generally, employees who are perceived as distinctly different from or apart from the in-group.

PREJUDICE: Unjustified negative attitudes toward a group and its members.

RACISM: Prejudicial attitudes, discriminatory behavior, or institutional practices that subordinate people of a given race.

REGISTRATION OF INTEREST: Formal process by which employees can state to their employer their interest in, and availability for, various types of work assignments, skills development, promotions, or similar opportunities.

SCHEMA: Cognitive frameworks encompassing multiple stereotypes that tend to reinforce one another to create increasing divergences in careers over time.

SEXISM: Prejudicial attitudes, discriminatory behavior, or institutional practices that subordinate people of a given gender.

SOCIAL CAPITAL: The resources embedded in social relationships among individuals, groups, and organizations that facilitate cooperation and collaboration; typical forms of social capital include common bonds, a sense of trust, norms of reciprocity, shared vocabulary, and open lines of communication.

SOCIAL CATEGORIZATION: The ordering of one's environment in terms of groupings of persons that make sense to the person doing the categorization.

SOCIAL IDENTITY: The part of an individual's self-concept that derives from his or her knowledge of membership in a social group or groups together with the value and emotional significances that the individual attaches to that membership.

SOCIAL NETWORK: Bonds of affiliation among individuals that serve as both a "glue" that provides order and meaning to social life and a "lubricant" to get things done.

STEREOTYPE: Beliefs held by an individual that all members of a specific group have similar traits and behaviors.

STEREOTYPING: The process by which an individual employs a stereotyped belief in the evaluation of, or behavior toward, members of a group.

SYSTEMIC: Operating widely across an organization, for example, affecting multiple policies and practices, influencing the attitudes or behavior of a substantial fraction of the staff, or affecting employment outcomes for many different groups.

TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZATION: An organizational form for an international business or organization in which assets and resources are distributed in a world-wide integrated network. This form of organization depends heavily on the ability of employees to integrate multiple perspectives and capabilities.

TRANSPARENCY: Open communication with employees and applicants in all aspects of human resource decisionmaking, including available opportunities, selection criteria, decision processes, and decision outcomes.

UNCONSCIOUS: Not aware of one's own perceptions, motivations, actions, and their consequences. See Conscious.

VISIBLE DIFFERENCES: Differences among staff in terms of generally obvious demographic characteristics, such as sex, race, age, and ethnicity. See Invisible Differences.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. 1989. *Doing Comparable Worth: Gender, Class, and Pay Equity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Adler, P., and S. Kwon. 2002. "Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept." *Academy of Management Review* 27: 17–40.
- Allport, G. 1958. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- American Psychological Association. 1991. "In the Supreme Court of the United States: *Price Waterhouse v. Ann B. Hopkins*, Amicus Curiae Brief for the American Psychological Association." *American Psychologist* 46: 1061–70.
- Baird, M. and others 1998. "Final Report of the Steering Group on Survey Follow-up." World Bank. http://wbln0011.worldbank.org/News/a_InfoKi.nsf/0/063d2ccb7905abdd852566de004e0911?OpenDocument
- Baker, W. 1990. "Market Networks and Corporate Behavior." *American Journal of Sociology* 96: 589–625.
- Baron, J. N. 1991. "Organizational Evidence of Ascription in Labor Markets." In Richard Cornwall and Phanindra Wunnavu, eds., *New Approaches to Economic and Social Analyses of Discrimination*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Barsade, S., A. Ward, J. Turner, and J. Sonnenfeld. 2000. "To Your Heart's Content: A Model of Affective Diversity in Top Management Teams." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 45: 802–36.
- Bartlett, C., and S. Ghoshal. 1998. *Managing Across Borders: The Transnational Solution*, 2d ed. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- . 2002. "Building Competitive Advantage Through People." *Sloan Management Review* 43 (2): 34–41.
- Bean, L. 2002. "Does Diversity Belong in HR? This Major Corporation Says 'No.'" DiversityInc.com. <http://www.diversityinc.com/members/2248print.cfm>.
- Bendick, M. 2000. "Using EEO-1 Data to Analyze Allegations of Employment Discrimination." Presentation to the Section on Labor and Employment Law, American Bar Association Annual Meeting, July 10. <http://www.bendickegan.com>.
- Bendick, M., M. L. Egan, and S. Lofhjelm. 1998. *The Documentation and Evaluation of Anti-discrimination Training in the United States*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- . 2001. "Diversity Training: From Anti Discrimination Compliance to Organization Development." *Human Resource Planning* 24 (2): 10–25.
- Bielby, W. 2000. "Minimizing Workplace Gender and Racial Bias." *Contemporary Sociology* 29 (1): 120–30.
- Biernat, M., T.K. Vescio, and M. Manis. 1998. "Judging and Behaving toward Members of Stereotyped Groups: A Shifting Standards Perspective." In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, and C. Insko, eds., *Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Birara, A. 2000. "The Voices of the LCR/Sub-Saharan African Origin Staff for The Challenge of Inclusion." World Bank.
- Blanchard, O.J., and L.H. Summers. 1986. "Hysteresis and the European Unemployment Problem." In S. Fischer, ed., *NBER Macroeconomic Annual*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bodenhausen, G., V., and N. Macrae. 1996. "The Self Regulation of Intergroup Perception: Mechanisms and Consequences of Stereotype Suppression." In C.N. Macrae, C. Stangor, and M. Hewstone, eds., *Stereotypes and Stereotyping*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bodenhausen, G.V., N. Macrae, and J. Garst. 1998. "Stereotypes in Thought and Deed: Social-Cognitive Origins of Intergroup Discrimination." In Constantine Sedikides, John Schopler, and Chester A. Insko, eds., *Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Braddock, J.H., and J.M. McPartland. 1987. "How Minorities Continue to Be Excluded from Equal Employment Opportunities: Research on Labor Market and Institutional Barriers." *Journal of Social Issues* 43: 5–39.
- Brass, D. 1985. "Men's and Women's Networks, A Study of Interaction Patterns and Influence in Organizations." *Academy of Management Journal* 28: 327–43.
- Brewer, M. 1979. "In-Group Bias in the Minimal Intergroup Situation: A Cognitive-Motivational Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 86: 307–24.
- Campbell, T. 2003. "Diversity in Depth." *HR Magazine*. (March): 152.
- Carpenter, M. 2002. "The Implications of Strategy and Social Context for the Relationship Between Top Management Team Heterogeneity and Firm Performance." *Strategic Management Journal* 23 (3): 275–84.
- Catalyst Inc. 1997. "Performance Review Analysis." New York: Catalyst.
- . 1998. *World Bank Gender Equality Project: Final Report*. New York: Catalyst.
- Cox, J., and J. Toolan. 1997. "Study of Gender Bias in World Bank Performance Evaluation." London: Pilat Ltd.

- Crosby, F. 1984. "The Denial of Personal Discrimination." *American Behavioral Scientist* 27: 338–86.
- Crosby, F., D. Cordova, and K. Jaskar. 1993. "On the Failure to See Oneself as Disadvantaged: Cognitive and Emotional Components." In M. Hogg and D. Abrams., eds., *Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives*. Hertfordshire, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Darley, J., and P. Gross. 1980. "A Hypothesis-Conforming Bias in Labeling Effects." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 44: 20–33.
- Dass, P., and B. Parker. 1999. "Strategies for Managing Human Resource Diversity: From Resistance to Learning." *Academy of Management Executive* 13 (2): 68–80.
- Deaux, K. 1984. "Blue-Collar Barriers." *American Behavioral Scientist* 27 (3): 287–300.
- Devine, P.G. 1989. "Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56 (1): 5–18.
- Dewey, B. 1997. *Summary of the Observations, Conclusions, and Recommendations of Report of the Dewey Ballantine Audit Team*. Washington, D.C.
- Distefano, J., and M. Maznevski. 2000. "Creating Value with Diverse Teams in Global Management." *Organizational Dynamics* 29 (1): 45–63.
- Doeringer, P.B., and M.J. Piore. 1971. *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Doomernik, J. 1998. *The Effectiveness of Integration Policies towards Immigrants and their Descendants in France, Germany and The Netherlands*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Earley, P.C., and E.M. Mosakowski, 2000. "Creating Hybrid Team Cultures: An Empirical Test of International Team Functioning." *Academy of Management Journal* 43 (1): 26–49.
- Egan, M.L., and M. Bendick, Jr. 1994. "International Business Careers in the United States: Salaries, Advancement, and Male-Female Differences." *The International Journal of Human Resources Management* 5 (1): 33–50.
- . 2003. "Workforce Diversity Initiatives of US Multinational Corporations in Europe." *Thunderbird International Business Review* 45 (6): 701–27.
- Egan, M.L., M. Bendick, Jr., and J.J. Miller. 2002. "US Firms' Evaluation of Employee Credentials in International Business." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 13 (1): 76–88.
- Egan, M.L., and A. Mody. 1992. "Buyer-Seller Links in Export Development." *World Development* 20 (3): 321–34.
- Ehrenberg, R., and R. Smith. 2000. *Modern Labor Economics, Theory and Public Policy*, 4th ed., Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Ely, R., and D. Thomas. 2001. "Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 46 (2): 229–74.
- Erber, R., and S.T. Fiske. 1984. "Outcome Dependency and Attention to Inconsistent Information." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47: 709–26.
- Eurostat. 2001. "Regional Labour Force in the EU: Recent Patterns and Future Perspectives." <http://www.europa.eu.int/comm./eurostat/datashop>.

- Fant, P.M., and G.M. Ferris. 1990. "The Management of Information and Impressions: When Employees Behave Opportunistically." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 45: 140–58.
- Fiske, S.T., M. Lin, and S. Neuberg. 1999. "The Continuum Model: Ten Years Later." In S. Chaiken and T. Yaacov, eds., *Dual-process Theories in Social Psychology*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Filmer, D., and E.M. King. 2001. "Differences in Pay and Grade at the World Bank: 2001 Study." World Bank.
- Filmer, D., E.M. King, and D. van de Walle. 2003. "Testing for Pay and Promotion Bias in an International Organization." Presented at the Royal Economic Society Annual Conference, April. <http://www.warwick.ac.uk/res2003/papers/Filmer.pdf>.
- Fukuyama, F. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
- Gendersen, D., and D. Tinsley. 1996. "Empirical Assessment of Impression Management Biases, The Potential for Performance Appraisal Error." *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 11 (5): 57–76.
- Gentile, M. 1996. *Differences That Work: Organizational Excellence Through Diversity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Giacalone, R.A., and P. Rosenfeld, eds. 1990. *Impression Management in the Organization*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gilbert, J. and J. Ivancevich. 2000. "Valuing Diversity: A Tale of Two Organizations." *Academy of Management Executive* 14 (1) 93–105.
- Glick, P., and S. Fiske. 1996. "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 70 (3): 491–512.
- Granovetter, M.S. 1974. *Getting a Job*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hakansson, H., and I. Snehota. 1995. *Developing Relationships in Business Networks*. London: Routledge.
- Hamel, G., and C.K. Prahalad. 1994. *Competing for the Future*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hannan, M.T., and J.H. Freeman. 1984. "Structural Inertia and Organizational Change." *American Sociological Review* 43: 143–64.
- Harzing, A.-W. 2000. "An Empirical Analysis and Extension of the Bartlett and Ghoshal Typology of Multinational Companies." *Journal of International Business Studies* 31 (1): 101–20.
- Hewstone, M., J. Jaspars, and M. Lalljee. 1982. "Social Representations, Social Attribution and Social Identity: The Intergroup Images of 'Public' and 'Comprehensive' Schoolboys." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 12: 241–69.
- Hilton, J.L., and W. Von Hippel. 1996. "Stereotypes." In J.T. Spence, J.M. Darley, and D.J. Foss, eds., *Annual Review of Psychology* 47 (1): 237–71.
- Hubbard, E.E. 1997. *Measuring Diversity Results*. Petaluma, CA: Global Insights Publishing.
- Huffman, M.L. 1995. "Organizations, Internal Labor Market Policies, and Gender Inequality in Workplace Supervisory Authority." *Sociological Perspectives* 38 (3): 381–97.
- Ibarra, H. 1993. "Personal Networks of Women and Minorities in Management: A Conceptual Framework." *Academy of Management Review* 18 (1): 56–87.
- International Monetary Fund. 2001. *Diversity Annual Report 2001*. <http://www.imf.org/external/np/div/2001/index.htm#II>.

- Jackson, S., J. Brett, V. Sessa, D. Cooper, J. Julin, and K. Peyronnin. 1991. "Some Differences Make a Difference, Individual Dissimilarity and Group Heterogeneity as Correlates of Recruitment, Promotions, and Turnover." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76 (5): 675–89.
- Jackson, S., A. Joshi, and N.L. Erhardt. 2003. "Recent Research on Team and Organizational Diversity: SWOT Analysis and Implications." *Journal of Management*. 26 (6): 801-31.
- Jehn, K., and K. Bezrukova. 2002. "Field Study of Group Diversity, Group Context, and Performance." Unpublished manuscript. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Jehn, K., G.B. Northcraft, and M.A. Neale. 1999. "Why Differences Make a Difference: A Field Study of Diversity, Conflict, and Performance in Workgroups." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44: 741–63.
- Jones, J. M. 1997. *Prejudice and Racism*. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Judd, C., and B. Park. 1988. "Out-Group Homogeneity: Judgments of Variability at the Individual and Group Levels." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54 (5): 778–88.
- Kochan, T., K. Bezrukova, R. Ely, S. Jackson, A. Joshi, K. Jehn, J. Leonard, D. Levine, and D. Thomas. 2003. "The Effects of Diversity on Business Performance: Report of the Diversity Research Network." *Human Resource Management* 42 (1): 3–21.
- Konrad, A., and F. Linnehan. 1995. "Formalized HRM Structures: Coordinating Equal Employment Opportunity or Concealing Organizational Practices?" *Academy of Management Journal* 38 (3): 787–829.
- Kostova, T., and K. Roth. 2003. "Social Capital in Multinational Corporations and a Micro-Macro Model of its Formation." *Academy of Management Review* 28 (2): 297–319.
- Krackhardt, D. 1992. "The Strength of Strong Ties: The Importance of Philos in Organizations." In N. Hohria and R.G. Eccles, eds., *Networks and Organizations: Structure, Form and Actions*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kraut Associates. 1999. *The 1999 Staff Survey: A Special Report Prepared for the World Bank Group*. Washington, D.C.
- Leonard, J. 1985. "What Promises are Worth: The Impact of Affirmative Action Goals." *The Journal of Human Resources* 20 (1): 3–20.
- Levinthal, D.A., and J.G. March. 1993. "The Myopia of Learning." *Strategic Management Journal* 14 (8): 95–112.
- Llewellyn, R.N. 2002. "When to Call the Organization Doctor." *HR Magazine* 47 (3): 79–82.
- Linville, P., and E. Jones. 1980. "Polarized Appraisals of Out-Group Members." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 38 (5): 689–703.
- Lippmann, W. 1922. *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Long, S. 1990. "The Origins of Sex Differences in Science." *Social Forces* 68 (4): 1297–315.
- Macrae, C.N., A.B. Milne, and G.V. Bodenhausen. 1994. "Stereotypes as Energy Saving Devices: A Peek Inside the Cognitive Toolbox." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 66 (1): 37–47.
- Malnight, T.W. 1996. "The Transition from Decentralized to Network-Based MNC Structures: An Evolutionary Perspective." *Journal of International Business Studies* 27 (1): 43–64.
- Martell, R.F., D.M. Lane, and C. Emrich. 1996. "Male-Female Differences: A Computer Simulation." *American Psychologist* 51 (2): 157–58.

- McIntosh, M., A. Poikolainen, K. Hewitt, T. Lubin, K. Knoll, E. McGaha, and J. d'Amico. 2003. *The Global Poll, Multinational Survey of Opinion Leaders 2002*. Washington, D.C.: Princeton Survey Research Associates. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/NEWS/Resources/globalpoll.pdf>
- Merton, R. K. 1968. "The Matthew Effect in Science." *Science* 159: 56–63.
- Millikin, F.J., and L.L. Martins. 1996. "Searching for Common Threads: Understanding The Multiple Effects of Diversity in Organizational Groups." *Academy of Management Review* 21 (2): 402–33.
- Mullen, B. 1992. "Ingroup Bias as a Function of Salience, Relevance, and Status: An Integration." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 22 (2): 103–22.
- Myers, D. 1990. *Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nahapiet, J., and S. Ghoshal. 1997. "Social Capital, Intellectual Capital and the Creation of Value in Firms." *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings*: 35–39.
- Nelson, R.L., and W.P. Bridges. 1999. *Legalizing Gender Inequality: Courts, Markets, and Unequal Pay for Women in America*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, T.E., M. Acker, and M. Manis. 1996. "Irrepressible Stereotypes." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 32 (1): 13–28.
- Neuberg, S., and S. Fiske. 1987. "Motivational Influences on Impression Formation: Outcome Dependency, Accuracy-Driven Attention, and Individuating Processes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 53 (3): 431–44.
- Oaxaca, R.L., and M.R. Ransom. 1994. "On Discrimination and the Decomposition of Wage Differentials." *Journal of Econometrics* 61 (1): 5–21.
- Oyegun, J. 2001. "Diversity at the World Bank Group." World Bank.
- Oyegun, J., S. Reines, and V. Nguyen. 2002. "Towards Mobilizing Diversity in the World Bank Group." World Bank.
- Paine, L. 1999. "Royal Dutch/Shell in Transition (A)." Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Park, B., and M. Rothbart. 1982. "Perception of Out-group Homogeneity and Levels of Social Categorization: Memory for the Subordinate Attributes of In Group and Out Group Members." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 42: 1051–68.
- Pedersen, A.S. 2000. "A Farewell Statement: Reflections on Gender Equality in The World Bank Group." World Bank.
- Pendry, L.F., and C. N. Macrae. 1996. "What the Disinterested Perceiver Overlooks: Goal-Directed Social Categorization." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22: 249–56.
- People Dynamics. 2001. *Report on Interviews with Staff of Sub-Saharan African Origin*. Washington, D.C.
- Pettigrew, T. 1979. "The Ultimate Attribution Error: Extending Allport's Cognitive Analysis of Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 5: 461–76.
- Portes, A. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1): 1–24.
- Powell, W.W., and L. Smith-Doerr. 1994. "Networks and Economic Life." In Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg, eds., *Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Reskin, B. 1988. "Bringing the Men Back In: Sex Differentiation and the Devaluation of Women's Work." *Gender and Society* 2 (1): 58–81.
- Reskin, B., and D. McBrier. 2000. "Why Not Ascription? Organizations' Employment of Male and Female Managers." *American Sociological Review* 65 (2): 210–33.
- Richard, O.C., T.A. Kochan, and A. McMillan-Capehart. 2002. "The Impact of Visible Diversity on Organizational Effectiveness: Disclosing the Contents in Pandora's Black Box." *Journal of Business and Management* 8: 1–26.
- Shaw, G. 2002. *Ethnic Minority Employment Through Partnership*. Copenhagen: The Copenhagen Centre.
- Simons, T., L.H. Pelled, and K.A. Smith. 1999. "Making Use of Difference: Diversity, Debate and Decision Comprehensiveness in Top Management Teams." *Academy of Management Journal* 42 (6): 662–73.
- Singh, V. 2002. *Managing Diversity for Strategic Advantage*. London, UK: Council for Excellence in Management and Leadership. <http://www.managementandleadershipcouncil.org>.
- Smither, J.W., R. Reilly, and R. Buda. 1988. "Effect of Prior Performance Ratings on Present Performance: Contrast versus Assimilation Revisited." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 73 (3): 487–96.
- Stienstra, D., Y. Fricke, A. D'Aubin, and Research Team. 2002. "Baseline Assessment: Inclusion and Disability in the World Bank Activities." Winnipeg: Canadian Centre on Disability Studies. <http://www.disabilitystudies.ca>.
- Stinchcombe, A.L. 1965. "Social Structure and Organizations." In James G. March, ed., *Handbook of Organizations*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Sturm, S. 2001. "Second Generation Employment Discrimination: A Structural Approach." *Columbia Law Review* 101 (3): 459–568.
- Society for Human Resource Management. 1998. "SHRM Survey of Diversity Initiatives." Alexandria, VA: SHRM.
- . 2002. "What Is the 'Business Case' for Diversity?" Alexandria, VA: SHRM. <http://www.shrm.org/diversity/diversityvsaffirmaction.htm>.
- Society for Human Resource Management and Fortune Magazine. 2001. "SHRM/ Fortune Survey on the Impact of Diversity Initiatives on the Bottom Line." Alexandria, VA: SHRM.
- SustainAbility/UNEP. 1999. "The Social Reporting Report." London, UK: Sustainability.
- Swift, T. 2001. "Trust, Reputation and Corporate Accountability to Stakeholders." *Business Ethics: A European Review* 10 (1): 16–26.
- Swim, J.K., and L.J. Sanna. 1996. "He's Skilled, She's Lucky: A Meta-Analysis of Observers' Attributions for Women's and Men's Successes and Failures." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22: 507–19.
- Taylor and others 1979. "The Generalizability of Salience Effects." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37: 357–68.
- Tetlock, P.E. 1992. "The Impact of Accountability on Judgment and Choice: Toward a Social Contingency Model." In M.P. Zanna, ed., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 23: 331–76.
- Thomas, D.A., and R.D. Ely. 1996. "Making Differences Matter: A New Paradigm for Managing Diversity." *Harvard Business Review* (September–October): 79–90.

- Tjosvold, D., D. Hui, D. Ding, and J. Hu. 2003. "Conflict, Values and Team Relationships: Conflict's Contribution to Team Effectiveness and Citizenship in China." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 24 (1): 69–88.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D. 1993. *Gender and Racial Inequality at Work: Sources and Consequences of Job Segregation*. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Townsend, B. 1997. Memorandum to Anette Pedersen re Performance Review Analysis. Catalyst, New York.
- Tsai, W., and S. Ghoshal. 1998. "Social Capital and Value Creation: The Role of Intrafirm Networks." *Academy of Management Journal* 41 (4): 464–76.
- Valian, V. 1998. *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wayne, S.J., and G.M. Ferris. 1990. "Influence Tactics, Affect, and Exchange Quality in Supervisor-Subordinate Interactions: A Laboratory Experiment and Field Study." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75 (5): 487–99.
- Wayne, S.J. and K. Kacmar. 1991. "The Effects of Impression Management on the Performance Appraisal Process." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 48: 70–88.
- West, M.A. 2002. "Sparkling Fountains or Stagnant Ponds: An Integrative Model of Creativity and Innovation Implementation in Work Groups." *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 51: 355–424.
- Wiig, M. 1994. "Women in the Bank Group: A Review of Progress, Issues and Future Actions." World Bank.
- Wilder, D.A. 1981. "Perceiving Persons as a Group: Categorization and Intergroup Relationships." In D. L. Hamilton, ed., *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Williams, K., and C. O'Reilly. 1998. "Demography and Diversity in Organizations: A Review of 40 Years of Research." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 20: 77–140.
- Wolfensohn, J. 1998. Quoted in *Celebrating Racial Inclusion at the World Bank*. World Bank. (April 22).
- Word, C. O., M. P. Zanna, and J. Cooper. 1974. "The Nonverbal Mediation of Self-Fulfilling Prophecies in Interracial Interaction." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 10: 109–20.
- World Bank. 1992. "Excellence Through Equality: An Increased Role for Women in the World Bank."
- . 1998. "Assessing Bias in Pay and Grade at the World Bank: A Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Analyses."
- . 2001a. "Annual Review of Human Resources FY2001."
- . 2001b. "World Bank Group Strategic Framework."
- . 2001c. "The Medium-Term Human Resources Agenda: Aligning with the Bank's Strategic Directions." November 19.
- . 2002. "Annual Review of Human Resources FY2002."
- . 2002a. "HR Policies to Support Decentralization: A Discussion Paper." May 28.
- . 2002b. "Mobilizing Diversity for Development Effectiveness: Presentation to the Personnel Committee of the Board." April 29.
- . 2002c. "Strategic Staffing: Issues and Challenges for FY03–05." May 23.
- . 2002d. "Towards Mobilizing Diversity in the World Bank Group. December 9.

- . 2003a. Towards Mobilizing Diversity at the World Bank Group, Action Plan FY03–10. Presentation. July 1.
- . 2003b. “Evolution of Grades, Bank Experience and Rotation Patterns, IBRD GE+ Staff, FY96–03.” July.
- . 2003c. “Evaluation of the World Bank’s Diversity Office.”
- . 2003d. “Strategic Staffing Update Paper.” May 21.
- . No Date a. “Mission Principles and Values.” Brochure.
- . No Date b. “Diversity in Action: The Value of Inclusion.” Brochure.
- Yzerbyt, V., G. Schadron, J.-P. Leyens, and S. Rocher. 1994. “Social Judgeability [sic]: The Impact of Meta-Informational Cues on the Use of Stereotypes.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 66 (1): 48–55.



THE WORLD BANK

1818 H STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20433
USA
WWW.WORLDBANK.ORG

BENDICK AND EGAN ECONOMIC CONSULTANTS, INC.
4411 WESTOVER PLACE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20016 USA
202 686 0245 FAX: 202 363 4429
BENDICKEGAN@MINDSPRING.COM
WWW.BENDICKEGAN.COM