Diversity in New Zealand Organisations: A Case Study

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Psychology

at Massey University, Manawatu, New Zealand

Jessica Voon

2019

ABSTRACT

Workplace diversity has become a hot topic in organisations worldwide. Although many organisations have expressed a commitment to diversity, the trade-off between the positive and negative outcomes of diverse workgroups are creating challenges for organisations to manage. As a result, very little progress has been made in terms of actual hiring of under-represented groups. In New Zealand, the higher unemployment rates for those identifying as Māori and Asian, and the under-representation of women in male-dominated occupations, are major considerations for organisations striving to achieve diversity in their workgroups.

Names presented on resumes have been showed to act as cues to the ethnicity and gender of the candidate, which trigger cognitive processes such as social categorisation, stereotypes, and biases. This study aims to explore the cognitive processes that can affect selection decisions during resume screening and whether these effects are related to participants' perceived diversity outcomes; whether they perceive diversity as beneficial or threatening to workgroup outcomes.

A total of 233 participants from a New Zealand organisation completed an online hypothetical resume screening task asking them to select 4 candidates from a list of 12, who varied in gender, ethnicity, and level of experience. Participants completed 3 separate assessment types: competence, social fit, and interview shortlist. Following on from this task, participants indicated their agreement with a series of sentences designed to measure their perceptions regarding cultural and gender diversity outcomes in the workplace, before providing their demographic information.

The findings indicated that biases and stereotypes are still likely to exist during selection decisions, in much subtler forms. Māori and Asian candidates are disadvantaged compared to equally qualified NZ/European candidates, and men are likely to perceive less benefits and more threats from diversity than women. Greater perceived benefits from diversity did influence the preference for diversity when selecting candidates. These findings have significant implications at an individual, organisational and societal level, and those tasked with hiring need to be aware of the processes that can influence selection during resume screening.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLES

FIGURES

CHAPTER 1: DIVERSITY

Diversity in the workplace has recently become a hot topic that is drawing the attention of organisations from all around the world. Diversity, in its broadest sense, refers to differences between individuals. These differences include both objective and subjective differences, that may not necessarily be related to actual differences, and that group members are not necessarily aware of (Harrison & Klein, 2007; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Based on this definition, diversity can be based on any attribute of interest such as ethnicity, gender, age, marital status, sexuality, social status, religion, educational background, job attitudes, and personal values (Brooks, Guidroz, & Chakrabarti, 2009; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Harrison & Klein, 2007; Kossek, Lobel, & Brown, 2005; Shen, Chanda, Monga, & D'Netto, 2009; Van Knippenberg, Van Ginkel, & Homan, 2013). Workplace diversity is concerned with how differences in individuals' attributes within a work group affect group processes and performance, as well as group member attitudes toward one another, and their subjective wellbeing (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). A diverse workforce is considered to be one that comprises different beliefs, understandings, and values, that bring varied perspectives and approaches to work (Shen et al., 2009). Although attributes can be either demographic or non-demographic, demographic factors such as ethnicity and gender have typically been the primary focus for diversity research; largely due to their historical association with discrimination and their observable nature (Strauss, Connerly, & Ammermann, 2003; Tsusaka, Reeves, Hurder, & Harnoss, 2017; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013).

Whether it be managing diversity (Houkamau & Boxall, 2011), striving to achieve diversity (Kossek et al., 2005) or learning about the outcomes of diversity (Hofhuis, van der Zee, & Otten, 2015, 2016), workplace diversity is on the research and practice agenda now more than ever before (Van Knippenberg et al., 2013). Currently, not only has diversity research increased by almost double every 5 years since 1988 (Harrison & Klein, 2007), but over 75% of organisations globally state that diversity is gaining momentum in their organisation (Lorenzo, Voigt, Tsusaka, Krentz, & Abouzahr, 2018). While the concept of diversity itself is not new (originating back in the 1950s) (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998), factors such as changing demographics in the labour force, technological advances, internalisation, a change in societal values, and rapid globalisation (Shen et al., 2009; Strauss et al., 2003), are causing new challenges for managers and organisations worldwide. As organisations are recognising the

value of individual differences in the workplace, they are also increasingly recognising both the positive and negative outcomes that can characterise diverse workgroups (Hofhuis et al., 2016; Hostager & De Meuse, 2002; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). With little consensus regarding how to best achieve positive outcomes (Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; McMahon, 2010; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998), organisations are left unsure on best practice to manage diversity. What has gained consensus however, is that diversity can offer a great opportunity for organisations, as well as a testing challenge.

Worldwide, gender diversity has been the oldest and most common diversity issue for organisations; however, each country has their own predominant issues which are relevant to their own labour force. Racial inequality is of particular importance in countries such as America and South Africa due to the long-standing history of systematic discrimination against ethnic minorities. Religion and ethnicity are distinguishing factors in India, and household status often differentiates individuals in China. In New Zealand, and most other Western countries, multiculturalism has always been an important dimension of diversity due to the large number of international migrants with diverse cultural backgrounds (Jones, Pringle, & Shepherd, 2000; Shen et al., 2009). In addition, the recognition and presence of Māori as the indigenous people of New Zealand has driven many policies and legislation around equal employment opportunities and continues to be a major consideration in diversity initiatives in New Zealand (Jones et al., 2000).

The New Zealand context

Much like the rest of the world, gender diversity issues have been, and continue to be, a persistent issue for New Zealand organisations. Historically, the under-representation of women in the workplace led to traditional attitudes holding men as the breadwinners of the household and women as being responsible for domestic household activities (Varuhas, Fursman, & Jacobsen, 2003). Today, the New Zealand labour market has seen great improvements in the representation of women in the labour force. The New Zealand population is now made up of 51.3% women, with over 63% women in employment – the highest recorded rate of employment to date (Statistics New Zealand, 2013, 2018). In addition, women are almost as likely as men to work in managerial roles and outnumber men in professional occupational groups; however, the New Zealand labour market continues to be highly segregated by gender (Statistics New Zealand, 2015). A recent Women at Work report

issued by Statistics New Zealand (2015), highlighted this point, revealing that almost 50% of women and men work in occupations in which 70% or more of the workers are the same gender as them. Women are typically overrepresented in occupations such as clerical workers, nursing and midwifery, primary and early childhood teaching, personal care work and social work. Further, female-dominated occupations are typically lower paid, with findings showing men's median income as being 1.6 times that of women's median income, and more than twice as many men than women having an income over $70,000 (Statistics New Zealand, 2013).

As well as high levels of participation of women in the labour force, the New Zealand labour market is made up of an increasingly diverse pool of workers (Houkamau & Boxall, 2011; Statistics New Zealand, 2017, 2018). New Zealand's rich history of emigration and immigration dates back to the colonial era, where British and Irish settlers arrived in successive waves of migration and settlement. Following on from this, immigration from neighbouring Pacific Islands increased from the 1960s and from Asian countries from the 1990s (Coates & Carr, 2005). Today, New Zealand's population of approximately 4.7 million people is made up of roughly 74% European, 15% Māori, 12% Asian, 7% Pacific, and 1% Other ethnicities. Further, a quarter of the population were born overseas, with England, China and India being the most common countries of birth - a 22.9% increase from 2006 (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). These trends have been projected to continue, with population estimates reaching 5 million within the next 2 years, and migration being the largest component of this growth. The Asian population is expected to almost double over the next 20 years representing 22% of the total population by 2038. This is expected to surpass the Māori population, which has been projected to rise to 18% by 2038. Although the proportion of those identifying as 'European' is growing, the overall representation of this group in the population has been projected to fall to 66% due to the slower growth rate in comparison to Māori, Asian and Pacific ethnic groups (Statistics New Zealand, 2017).

Since the early 1990's, unemployment rates for Māori, Pacific and Asian ethnic groups have been considerably higher than those for European/Other ethnic groups (Ministry of Social Development, 2016). Currently, both unemployment rates and underutilisation rates remain higher for those who identify as Māori (8.2%,20.7%), Pacific (8.5%,20.3%) and Asian (4.3%,12.5%), compared to those who identify as Europeans (3.6%,11.4%) (Statistics New Zealand, 2018). Further, representation of these social groups tend to be clustered in

particular industries, with ethnic minority groups typically underrepresented in well-paying, high-level occupations and industries (Callister, 2007; OECD, 2015; Statistics New Zealand, 2015).

Both gender and ethnic diversity are major considerations for New Zealand organisations. As the demographics of the labour force change, so too does the nature of work. Recent trends have indicated long-term shifts away from full-time, ongoing employment arrangements, toward flexible employment relationships, flexibility in work scheduling, and flexibility in location of work (Guest, 2004; McLean Parks, Kidder, & Gallagher, 1998; Spreitzer, Cameron, & Garrett, 2017). Innovations such as activity-based workplaces (ABW) have created environments fostering trust, responsibility, and increased productivity by allowing workers to use different types of work settings depending on the type of activity at hand and their personal preferences (Appel-Meulenbroek, Groenen, & Janssen, 2011). Diversity has become an issue that affects all organisations, and managers are tasked with finding ways to best manage these changes.

Since the early 1990s, the term 'diversity management' has become prominent in New Zealand business, media, and government policy analysis (Houkamau & Boxall, 2011), but there seems to be limited understanding of how to actually manage the increasing diversity in our communities and workplaces. In relation to formal policies and initiatives, only 38% of New Zealand organisations had one for bias, 42% for gender and 40% for ethnicity. Further, less than 20 % of organisations actually measured the outcomes of these policies and programs (Diversity Works NZ, 2018). A part of this dilemma is that a considerable amount of the literature is based in America and may not be applicable to New Zealand organisations (Colella, Hebi, & King, 2017). For example, in a case study conducted by Jones et al. (2000), a NZ subsidiary of a United States multinational organisation found that the diversity values and initiatives that were given to them to implement were not presented in language that applied in a New Zealand environment, making initiatives difficult to support even at management level. Further, studies based on contexts from abroad are unlikely to encompass the unique status of Māori in New Zealand, and local perspectives on diversity management (Houkamau & Boxall, 2011). This highlights the importance of recognising that diversity issues differ across different countries, cultures, organisations, and even teams. Diversity initiatives should be flexible in their approach and tailored to suit the needs of the organisation. In light of these limitations, this study aims to contribute to the New Zealand literature to provide a real

workplace example of diversity theories at play, and to guide future diversity initiatives in New Zealand organisations.

The New Zealand legislation

In New Zealand, employers are not entitled to 'hire at will, and fire at will' (Cook, 2009). Introduced in the 1970's, the term 'employment discrimination' has been used to refer to occurrences when job irrelevant factors are taken into consideration when making an employment decision (Colella et al., 2017 ; Wilson, Gahlout, Liu, & Mouly, 2005). To maintain fairness in employment, legislation in New Zealand has shaped the selection practices of organisations to ensure that there are equal employment opportunities for all individuals and that employment relationships are fair and just. Legislation such as the Human Rights Act 1993 and the Employment Relations Act 2000 have de-legitimised discriminatory policies and practices, and strengthened the requirements of employers to demonstrate that their selection practices do not discriminate on non-job related variables (Jones et al., 2000; Taylor, Keelty, & McDonnell, 2002). In this section, we will briefly summarise the two key statutes that influence employment relationships in New Zealand.

Human Rights Act 1993

The Human Rights Act 1993 covers potential discrimination across the public and private sectors, in relation to employment, public access, and the provision of goods and services including housing, education and superannuation. According to this Act, discrimination occurs when an individual is treated unfairly or less favourably than another person in the same or similar circumstances (Human Rights Commission, 2019). The Act prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex, marital status, religious belief, ethical belief, colour, race, ethnic or national origin (including citizenship), disability, age, political opinion, employment status, family status (including pregnancy) and sexual orientation (Human Rights Act 1993). Discrimination on these 13 grounds are prohibited at all stages of employment, including recruitment, hiring, remuneration, training, promotion, transfers, retirement and termination (Human Rights Act 1993).

The Employment Relations Act 2000

The Employment Relations Act 2000 provides a legal backdrop for all employment relationships once employment has commenced. The Act complements the Human Rights Act 1993, by promoting fairness and good faith in all aspects of the employment relationship and environment, particularly when resolving any employment problems. If either party has a grievance to be resolved, the Employment Relations Act 2000 governs the process and promotes effective enforcement of employment standards.

Disparate treatment and adverse impact

Under employment legislation, organisations need to be aware of two types of discrimination: disparate treatment and adverse impact. Disparate treatment can be defined as direct discrimination and occurs when different standards are applied to different groups of applicants – this can be intentional or unintentional (Jacques, 1991). A well-known example is from Goldin and Rouse (2000) who used naturally-occurring data to observe the difference in hiring outcomes for male and female musicians when auditioning for an orchestra. In this experiment, they found that the use of a screen to conceal the identity of the candidate resulted in a higher number of women selected than when the screen was not used. This example highlights an important point; while legislation prohibits discrimination on the basis of non-job-related variables, such as gender, discrimination still exists in subtler forms.

The second form of discrimination, adverse impact, occurs when selection standards are applied uniformly to all groups of applicants, but the overall effect produces differences in the selection of various groups (Cook, 2009; Ryan & Tippins, 2004). For example, during the selection process for becoming a police officer, candidates are required to pass a series of physical agility tests, and this often results in an underrepresentation of women police officers due to differences in physical ability between males and females (Colella et al., 2017 ; Lonsway, 2003). To prove adverse impact, statistical analysis can be used to compare selection rates of different gender and ethnic groups (Cook, 2009). Because no employer is likely to have a perfect balance of gender and ethnicity groups in their workforce, a commonly adopted rule is referred to as the 4/5th's Rule of Thumb which states that adverse impact exists when the hiring rate of a protected group of people is less than 80% of the majority group (Jacques, 1991). Given the ease of proof via statistical analysis, adverse impact is a very powerful tool in

the hands of those seeking to claim discrimination. Once adverse impact has been demonstrated, it is up to the employer to provide good business reasoning regarding their business selection procedure. This can be a difficult and expensive process, and one that employers would be better off avoiding by removing risk of adverse impact in the first place (Cook, 2009). As a result, it is recommended that organisations choose selection tools which are based on a thorough job analysis and use structured and well-documented selection procedures in order to minimise the potential for discrimination (Taylor et al., 2002).

The present study

This research is interested in the processes involved during organisational selection that are preventing organisations from achieving positive outcomes of diversity at work; namely the resume screening stage of the selection process. Due to greater presence of women in the workforce and the increasing ethnic diversity of the selection pool, we have chosen to focus this study on gender and ethnicity diversity. In addition, we are interested in the varying levels of experience that complement a diverse workforce and the weight placed on candidates' experience in selection decisions. Previous New Zealand research on the influence of gender, ethnicity and experience on selection outcomes has looked at the adverse impact of psychometric assessments (Guenole, Taylor, & Englert, 2003), and interview situations (Singer & Eder, 1989b); however, there has been minimal research on the influence of gender, ethnicity and experience during the resume screening phase of the selection process (Derous, Nguyen, & Ryan, 2009; Jackson & Fischer, 2007). Those that have focussed on this area, have used samples made up of students (Jackson & Fischer, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005), resulting in very limited findings involving real workplace settings.

This research aims to contribute to the diversity literature by investigating how resume screening may contribute to the representation of women and ethnic minorities in New Zealand organisations. Specifically, we are interested in the cognitive processes that are present during resume screening and exploring if the way an individual perceives diversity outcomes has an influence on their selection preferences. In the following sections, we offer a review of the two main perspectives, social categorisation and information/decision making perspective, which have guided the diversity literature. Second, we look at stereotypes and biases and the challenges faced by those tasked with making hiring decisions. Next, we apply Similarity Attraction Theory and Lack of Fit Theory to examine how differences between

workgroup members affects workgroup outcomes and apply findings from abroad to a New Zealand context. Following on from this, we introduce perceived diversity outcomes and explore the role these have in the choices people make when choosing who they would most prefer to work with. Before sharing the findings, a brief summary of the case study organisation will be provided, as well as the details of the present research. Finally, we will discuss the findings and consider the implications for New Zealand organisations.

CHAPTER 2: THE DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

Initially, the movement toward diversity began as a response to government and legal requirements. Today, diversity has become a strategic priority to maintain/gain a competitive advantage (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004). In today's changing business environment, organisations require continual innovation and creativity in their products, services and strategies in order to remain competitive and become resilient to change (Cox, 1991; Richard, 2000). In principle, diverse workgroups enable organisations to access a broader range of knowledge, skills, and information, which more accurately reflect their target markets (Carrell, Mann, & Sigler, 2006; Hostager & De Meuse, 2008), provide equal employment opportunities to an increasingly diverse labour force, and present a positive image to the outside world regarding social responsibility (Hofhuis et al., 2015). From a recruitment perspective, there is also greater marketing capability to attract and retain the best talent (Avery & McKay, 2006; Cox, 1991) as well as having access to a larger pool of talent to make filling vacancies easier (Hofhuis et al., 2015).

Although appealing, this strategic priority does not come without its challenges. The 'double-edged sword' represents the trade-off between positive and negative outcomes of diverse work groups. While diverse work groups can bring increased opportunities for knowledge sharing, creativity, and innovation, this comes with the risk that group members may fail to identify with the group, become dissatisfied, and leave the organisation (Milliken & Martins, 1996). This contrasting reality is well documented (Milliken & Martins, 1996; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998) and has raised questions such as: which diversity attributes lead to the greatest performance outcomes? (Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; McMahon, 2010; Webber & Donahue, 2001), what sort of tasks are diverse workgroups better suited to? (Bowers, Pharmer, & Salas, 2000; Lee, Pitesa, Insead, & Pillutla, 2015), and what environments are required to support positive outcomes? (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009; Groggins et al., 2013; Guillaume, Dawson, Otaye-Ebede, Woods, & West, 2017; Richard, 2000). Findings have been mixed and inconsistent, with a consensus that the relationship between diversity in workgroups and outcomes is complex, and that the double-edged sword is a likely reality for most organisations striving to achieve diversity (Bowers et al., 2000; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998).

While it is unclear exactly what is required to achieve positive diversity outcomes (Bowers et al., 2000), it is clear that diverse workgroup composition does have an effect on group processes and outcomes (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). The key question in diversity research, is *how* differences between work group members affect group process, performance, attitudes and wellbeing outcomes (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Two main perspectives have guided diversity research in this space: the social categorisation perspective and the information/decision making perspective (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). These perspectives offer contrasting outcomes for diverse workgroups, presenting diversity both as a benefit and as a threat to group processes and performance (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007).

Social categorisation

The social categorisation perspective assumes that variations in the demographic makeup of a work group affect group processes, and these processes affect group performance (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). It rests on the assumption that individuals naturally engage in a process of social comparison in order to satisfy their underlying desire to maintain a high level of self-esteem. This process involves classifying themselves and others into social categories using salient characteristics such as age, ethnicity, gender, or status, in order to distinguish between similar ingroup members and dissimilar outgroup members (Tajfel & Turner, 1968; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). In order to maintain a sense of positive self-identity within the group, individuals seek to maximise inter-group distinctions, resulting in the perception that those belonging to the ingroup are more attractive or superior based on certain criteria (Kramer, 1991; Tajfel & Turner, 1968).

Complementing this perspective is the similarity attraction paradigm proposed by Byrne (1971). Byrne (1971) suggested that similarity in attributes ranging from demographic variables, to attitudes and values, would increase interpersonal attraction and liking between individuals. This attraction is partly due to the ease of interaction as a result of sharing the same life experiences but can also be viewed as an interaction which reinforces one's beliefs and attitudes to support a positive self-identity. Because it is difficult to learn about these life experiences immediately, people assume similarity based on visible traits (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009). This makes demographics differences, such as ethnicity and gender, particularly

vulnerable to intergroup bias and negative outcomes, as a result of social categorisation processes (Goldberg, 2005).

Diversity outcomes as proposed by Similarity Attraction Theory (SAT) and the social categorisation perspective are centred around a preference to work with similar others due to perceived threats that are associated with deviations from the status quo (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). The introduction of unfamiliar norms, values, beliefs and attitudes can provoke anxiety, resistance, and conflict amongst existing group members toward having to change familiar behaviours and being confronted with a different worldview (Hofhuis et al., 2015, 2016). As well as perceiving a threat to a positive self-identity (Kramer, 1991; Tajfel & Turner, 1968), some individuals may perceive a threat to their career opportunities, power, or the status quo of the current ingroup (Hofhuis et al., 2015, 2016). The perceived ease of interaction with similar others can increase cooperation amongst groups that are demographically similar (Chatman & Flynn, 2001) and result in more favourable evaluations of ingroup members (Lau & Murnighan, 2005). As a result, individuals experience a reluctance to interact with outgroup members (Hofhuis et al., 2015, 2016), causing the isolation of members who are different, or more formal but less frequent communication (Smith et al., 1994). With the resulting reduction in social cohesion, there is a greater risk of productivity loss due to miscommunication and conflict (Hofhuis et al., 2015). Based on this perspective, homogenous workgroups are expected to function more smoothly with flow-on effects such as decreased absenteeism (Avery, McKay, Wilson, & Tonidandel, 2007; Carrell et al., 2006), lower turnover (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009; Sacco & Schmitt, 2005), and increased morale and satisfaction (Ellison & Mullin, 2014).

Information/decision-making perspective

In contrast, the information/decision-making perspective proposes that variance in work group composition can result in positive performance outcomes. This perspective views diverse groups as likely to possess a broader range of knowledge, skills and abilities, which gives access to a larger pool of resources that will be particularly helpful in non-routine situations (Tziner & Eden, 1985; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). While the social categorisation perspective emphasises the relational aspect of diversity and its effect on group processes and interpersonal outcomes, the information/decision-making perspective focuses

on task-related performance and the effect on group performance outcomes (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998).

Diversity outcomes as proposed by the information/decision-making perspective are based loosely on the disruption of group processes described by SAT. Based on this perspective, diverse groups are expected to achieve more creative and innovative levels of group performance due to the need to consciously reconcile differences and integrate diverse information, rather than engaging in groupthink and reaching premature consensus without careful consideration (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Hofhuis et al., 2015; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). For example, during brainstorming tasks, heterogeneous groups have shown wider perspectives, generated a wider range of alternatives in problem-solving tasks (Watson, Kumar, & Michaelson, 1993), and produced higher quality ideas (although the quantity of unique ideas was no greater) when compared to homogenous groups (McLeod & Lobel, 1996; Nakui, Paulus, & Van der Zee, 2011; Watson et al., 1993). Although diverse groups may experience communication problems internally, the information/decision making perspective proposes that members are able to communicate with a wider range of external groups to bring in information that may not have been otherwise accessible (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). In relation to performance outcomes, organisations with diverse workgroups report a greater achievement of organisational goals (Carrell et al., 2006), increased productivity (Richard, 2000), and increased financial performance (Lorenzo & Reeves, 2018; Lorenzo et al., 2018). Advocates of the information/decision-making perspective believe that heterogenous work groups will have a positive impact on group performance through greater access to a larger pool of resources, regardless of potential dysfunction within the group as proposed by SAT (Tziner & Eden, 1985).

Although there is evidence to support the main effects proposed by both perspectives, the overall consensus is that research examining the impact of diverse workgroups on group processes and performance is mixed at best (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004; McMahon, 2010; Milliken & Martins, 1996; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). In their extensive review, Van Knippenberg and Schippers (2007) claim that neither the social categorisation perspective nor the information/decision-making perspective should be considered as clearly articulated theoretical frameworks; rather, they should be considered as loosely defined preferences for either working with similar others, or for valuing diverse knowledge, information, and perspectives.

12

Organisational approaches to diversity

Diversity climates are defined as the aggregate employee perceptions around the formal structures of an organisation, as well as the values that reflect daily life in the organisation (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009). Pro-diversity organisational climates, particularly those that foster perceptions of trust and psychological safety (Guillaume et al., 2017), can safeguard against the negative effects of diverse workgroups, improve social integration and enhance performance outcomes (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009; Groggins et al., 2013; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Employees are not presumed to be immune to social categorisation processes or free from frustrations due to individual differences, but they are equipped with individual and organisational capacity to overcome these challenges (Groggins et al., 2013).

There are strategies and practices that organisations have adopted in order to create positive diversity climates (Konrad & Linnehan, 1995; Kossek et al., 2005; Windscheid, Bowes-Sperry, Mazei, & Morner, 2017). One human resource (HR) practice is diversity training, which is used to bring awareness to biases and to disconfirm stereotypes in order to support positive personal relationships between groups (Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Noon, 2018). Other approaches include mentoring, which involves teaming a successful senior team member with a member of a minority group to help enable under-represented groups to overcome barriers to advancement (Ragins, 2002). In terms of selection strategies, hiring quotas have been used to meet pre-determined numbers of minority group representation (Shaughnessy, Braunt, Hentschels, & Peuss, 2016; Windscheid et al., 2017), and hiring individuals high on personality factors such as agreeableness, conscientiousness and emotional stability has been used to increase the likelihood of positive interpersonal relationships (Guillaume et al., 2017; Nakui et al., 2011; Strauss et al., 2003). Research in this area has generally shown that there is a positive association between formalised HR practices and workgroup diversity outcomes (see Kossek et al. (2005) and Shen et al. (2009) for a full review).

While some organisations have achieved positive outcomes as a result of their HR practices, the research indicates that these initiatives are more likely to be ineffective and there is a lack of clear evidence that they actually improve the achievement of diversity goals (Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Hostager & De Meuse, 2002; Kossek et al., 2005). For example, training which focuses on reducing stereotypes and unconscious bias can often reinforce stereotypic beliefs

and normalise discriminatory behaviour (Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Hostager & De Meuse, 2002; Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006), produce short-lived improvements (Gonzalez & Denisi, 2009), and result in other undesirable impacts (Hostager & De Meuse, 2002; Noon, 2018). Similarly, while quota systems may allow organisations to appear diverse (see Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly (1992) for a distinction between diversity and relational demography), they have been found to negatively impact the perceived favourability of the organisation from the perspective of employees (Shaughnessy et al., 2016; Windscheid et al., 2017), risk the successful candidate being perceived as incompetent (Harrison, Kravitz, Mayer, Leslie, & Levarey, 2006), and have often disregarded issues such as glass ceilings resulting in an overrepresentation of some groups in lower level jobs (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Sauers, Kennedy, & O'Sullivan, 2002). In addition, although many organisations have expressed their commitment to diversity and have declared strategies and policies in place, very little progress has been seen in terms of actual hiring of under-represented groups (Antwi-Boasiako, 2008; Ministry of Social Development, 2016; Shen et al., 2009; Statistics New Zealand, 2015).

In light of these findings, we focus this research on the first stage of the hiring process: resume screening. Despite being the first point of contact between the prospective employee and the organisation, the resume screening stage of the selection process is often not included in diversity strategies (Antwi-Boasiako, 2008). Resume screening is considered as the first hurdle in the selection process as it determines the quality and quantity of the applicant pool (Derous, Pepermans, & Ryan, 2017; Jackson & Fischer, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005). This study will explore the cognitive processes that can affect selection decisions at this first point of contact, examine how they may contribute to the actual hiring of under-represented groups, and use the findings to inform future organisational initiatives.

CHAPTER 3: COGNITIVE PROCESSES AND SELECTION

Ng and Sears (2010) state that one of the central challenges that managers and organisations face in improving workplace diversity is adverse impact in their selection practices. Despite legislation that prevents organisations from explicitly discriminating against candidates on the basis of non-job-related variables, there are biases that might still operate during selection (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Himmelstein & Gopalakrishnan, 2017; Jackson & Fischer, 2007). Research has consistently found that irrelevant cues such as name and ethnic affiliations can have dramatic consequences during hiring decisions (Blommaert, Coenders, & Tubergen, 2014; Derous et al., 2017; Derous & Ryan, 2012; Hofhuis et al., 2016; Jackson & Fischer, 2007; Ployhart & Holtz, 2008; Ward & Masgoret, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005). While there is evidence that this occurs, the cause of this behaviour is hard to pin point as these types of behaviours can occur in extremely subtle ways due to societal norms and legislative restrictions (Harvie, Marshall-McCaskey, & Johnston, 1998; Skans & Åslund, 2012; Son Hing, Chung-Yan, Hamilton, & Zanna, 2008; Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016). As stated by Kalev et al. (2006, p. 580) 'we know a lot about the disease of workplace inequality, but not much about the cure'. To further complicate the pursuit of a cure, selection decisions are generally justified as achieving specific business strategies or goals, allowing discriminatory behaviour to be rationalised as just (Derous, Ryan, & Serlie, 2015; Hofhuis et al., 2016; Son Hing et al., 2008). As a result, selection rates for minority groups are often lower than for majority groups – a finding that has been consistent in New Zealand contexts as well as abroad (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Hiemstra, Derous, Serlie, & Born, 2013; Hofhuis et al., 2016; Jackson & Fischer, 2007; Ward & Masgoret, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005).

Bias and discrimination

Diversity is often viewed through an "us" and "them" lens (Van Knippenberg et al., 2013), which can create a greater distinction between social groups and often lead to self-fulfilling expectations (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). This makes differences in gender and ethnicity particularly vulnerable due to their salient and observable nature, which can evoke responses that are linked directly to biases, stereotypes, or prejudice, regardless of how true those links may be (Eriksson & Lagerström, 2012; Milliken & Martins, 1996). This has major implications for minority applicants who are facing disadvantage at the first selection 'hurdle,' where

screening presents a greater challenge for minority applicants trying to get a foot in the door (Wilson et al., 2005).

A body of research in social psychology and cognitive neuroscience has shown that there are numerous cognitive biases working against diversity (Himmelstein & Gopalakrishnan, 2017). Bias can be referred to as a cognitive "shortcut" that enables people to make decisions quickly without having to pursue and weigh up all available evidence (Himmelstein & Gopalakrishnan, 2017). It is a process that may sometimes be true, but will often be an inaccurate evaluation based on a generalisation rather than a reflection of true qualities (Koch, Sackett, & D'Mello, 2015). For example, this "shortcut" is particularly useful when needing to make simple decisions such as determining if an animal is dangerous or not, or which café is the most likely to serve chai lattes, but can place an organisation at legal risk and result in the deprivation of valuable sources of talent if employment decisions are made in the same way (Cole, Field, & Giles, 2004). Stereotyping can be considered as one type of cognitive bias and can be defined as the process of categorising people based on traits or attributes such as age, race, or religion (Himmelstein & Gopalakrishnan, 2017; Perry, Davis-Blake, & Kulik, 1994). Stereotypes are based on accepted learned beliefs about the members of a group, which then drive expectations about how members of the group will behave (Koch et al., 2015; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013).

Zschirnt and Ruedin (2016) highlight the distinction between two types of selection discrimination: taste-based discrimination and statistical discrimination. Taste-based discrimination describes a scenario when an employer has explicit racial or gender-based preferences (Becker, 1957). These types of racist or sexist preferences can cause an employer to discriminate irrespective of the amount of information available to them (Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016). In contrast, statistical discrimination describes when a specific group is discriminated against due to a lack of relevant information available to decision-makers (Arrow, 1973), who rely instead on stereotypes, past experiences and societal expectations to assist in decision making (Derous et al., 2009; Derous et al., 2017; Derous & Ryan, 2012; Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016). The resume screening process is particularly vulnerable to statistical discrimination as the limited information contained in resumes may contain some indication of a candidate's competencies, but will never provide enough information to predict future job performance with precision (Hofhuis et al., 2016). In addition, the time pressures and deadlines HR professionals/hiring managers are typically faced with, make the screening process particularly

vulnerable to biased decision-making based on incomplete information (Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016).

It is important to note that this research is not focussed on the taste-based discrimination of hiring managers/HR professionals. We are interested in diversity in organisations and the processes that may be affecting their diversity goals. One of these processes being biases and stereotypes during resume screening (Himmelstein & Gopalakrishnan, 2017). My position is, that if we do find bias in the behaviour of hiring managers, we are not suggesting that these biases are intentional or originate from a conscious desire to disadvantage minority groups. Rather, we recognise that biases and stereotypes are a product of our cultural backgrounds, repeated observations of events, societal norms and social interactions, which are embedded in our behavioural tendencies (Perry et al., 1994). In order to address the disadvantages faced during selection by those belonging to minority groups, we must first acknowledge these processes that shape our selection preferences, particularly when there is limited information available. We must reflect on why we have those preferences and increase our awareness so that we will stop and question our decisions and have those important, and sometimes confronting, conversations.

Implicit and explicit bias

Although people are often aware of bias and stereotyping in others' behaviour, they may believe they are personally immune (Himmelstein & Gopalakrishnan, 2017). In reality, every person is vulnerable to the effects of biases and stereotypes, and even small biases can have significant effects in employment decisions due to their compounding effects (Martell, Lane, & Emrich, 1996). Further, there are often discrepancies between people's behaviour and their self-reported attitudes (Blommaert et al., 2014). In a relatively new strain of research, the distinction between implicit and explicit bias has been explored in order to understand these discrepancies (Blommaert et al., 2014; Derous et al., 2015; Rooth, 2010; Son Hing et al., 2008). The idea behind this distinction is that a person's attitudes and stereotypical behaviour can operate in an automatic, impulsive, and less conscious process which taps into implicit biases (Stanley, Phelps, & Banaji, 2008) as well as in a more active, deliberate and conscious process which taps into explicit biases (Nosek, 2007; Ranganath, Smith, & Nosek, 2006). Both of these have been supported, with evidence suggesting that they are distinct processes (Rooth, 2010).

Explicit bias has in the past been measured by self-report reflections in response to a series of attitude questions toward a specific social group. In explicit bias research, researchers are faced with two common problems: firstly, social desirability in self-reported responses and secondly, a lack of awareness of personal biases/ attitudes. Implicit bias on the other hand circumvents these problems, with the assumption that the person is unaware of the underlying processes that may influence their behaviour (Rooth, 2010). Measurement tools such as the Implicit Association Test (IAT) have been used to assess the strength of associations between concepts and associations, and studies have found that participant response rates are quicker when stimuli fit their implicit stereotypes (Fazio & Olson, 2003; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998; Rooth, 2010). For example, in Greenwald's (1998) first experiment, participants were overwhelmingly faster at responding when the racial concept of "black" was paired with "unpleasant" evaluations/attributes compared to "pleasant" evaluations/attributes (Fazio & Olson, 2003; Greenwald et al., 1998). Since then, the IAT has been applied to a wide range of other concepts and has been commonly used in both research and training; however, as a measurement tool, some concerns have been expressed about its predictive validity and suitability as a scientific tool. Critics argue that there is no way of guaranteeing that the participants are unaware of their implicit attitudes as measured by the IAT, and that there is a distinction between participants being unaware that their attitudes are being assessed versus participants being unaware that they possess those attitudes (Fazio & Olson, 2003).

There is a body of research studying which type of bias is more prominent during selection decisions; however, findings have been mixed. Some studies have found that explicit bias has no effect on job suitability ratings (Derous et al., 2009), call-back rates (Rooth, 2010), or hiring recommendations (Son Hing et al., 2008), and implicit bias has an effect only in certain contexts, for example: for jobs of low social status and no client contact (Derous et al., 2009), in ambiguous situations when the candidate was not well qualified for the position (Son Hing et al., 2008), or for women in low-demand jobs (Derous et al., 2015). One study found that while only explicit bias influenced job suitability ratings, both implicit and explicit attitudes played a role in the selection of those who they would like to invite for an interview (Blommaert, Tubergen, & Coenders, 2012). The difficulty in making these distinctions lies in the possibility that individuals who appear to not have explicit bias may simply be exerting control over the expression of their beliefs. Using stereotypes to assist in making decisions may risk the label of 'racist' or 'sexist', two very unacceptable terms which individuals may

avoid revealing despite their private views (Harvie et al., 1998). Further, Fazio and Olson (2003) state that a difference between explicit and implicit measures "should not, in and of itself, be taken as evidence that the implicitly measured construct is an unconscious construct" (Fazio & Olsen, 2003, p.302).

When asking which bias reveals "real" attitudes and will influence selection decisions, it is important to consider the context that decisions are being made in and the kinds of people in charge of making those decisions (Fazio & Olson, 2003). For example, tendencies to fall back on implicit or explicit processes may change depending on motivations, opportunities to deliberate, time restraints, attentiveness to the task, deliberateness of behaviour and ambiguity of the situation (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Fazio & Olson, 2003; Son Hing et al., 2008). Based on these reviews and the mixed findings in this area, we continue this discussion referring to bias as an 'umbrella' term encompassing both implicit and explicit bias, recognising that discrimination in the hiring process could be a result of both consciously controlled preferences as well as automatically activated associations (Rooth, 2010).

Diversity-validity dilemma

Research to date has primarily focused on bias and potential for discrimination in the context of selection interviews and psychometric testing (Derous et al., 2009; Guenole et al., 2003; Jackson & Fischer, 2007; Singer & Eder, 1989b). Used properly, interviews are considered one of the most valid tools for predicting future job performance (Gatewood, Field, & Barrick, 2016; Jacques, 1991; Ryan & Tippins, 2004), yet also have the highest risk of becoming a source of potential liability for employers (Gatewood et al., 2016). Although selection interviews have high predictive validity, there are an array of biases and stereotypes that can affect the accuracy of an interviewer's judgements (Gatewood et al., 2016; Jacques, 1991). Despite data highlighting these processes, hiring managers continue to claim that they can trust their "gut instincts" about a person and the "chemistry" felt when deciding who would be best suited for a role (Gatewood et al., 2016; Miles & Sadler-Smith, 2014; Ryan & Tippins, 2004). When looking in the New Zealand context, it was difficult to find any recent literature on the effects of ethnicity on selection interview decisions. One study, from Singer and Eder (1989b), found that Chinese applicants were rated significantly more favourable than comparable Māori applicants across 4 decision dimensions (fit, competence, likeability and self-assurance). This contrasts with more recent research which found that those belonging to Asian ethnic groups were most likely to experience discrimination in New Zealand (Callister,

2007; Statistics New Zealand, 2012) and to be disadvantaged in terms of finding work that matches their skillset (Callister, 2007; Coates & Carr, 2005; Ward & Masgoret, 2007).

Cognitive ability tests are another commonly used selection tool, that measures mental abilities such as logic, reading comprehension, verbal or mathematical reasoning, and perceptual abilities. These tests are the best predictor of job performance; however, they are also most likely to cause adverse impact toward ethnic minorities in selection processes (Guenole et al., 2003; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). In the United States, the use of cognitive ability tests has shown differences in mean test scores between ethnic groups. African American people score approximately one standard deviation lower than White people in quantitative ability, verbal ability and comprehension (Roth, Bevier, Bobko, Switzer, & Tyler, 2001). Asian people have been typically found to score higher than Whites on measures of quantitative ability, but lower on measures of verbal ability and comprehension (Sackett, Schmitt, Ellingson, & Kabin, 2001). In New Zealand, the use of cognitive ability tests in the selection process is greater than in many other countries; however, research on the effects of their use on ethnic minorities in New Zealand has been scarce. Guenole et al. (2003) compared cognitive test scores of NZ European and Māori job candidates. In line with findings from abroad, significant differences in mean test scores emerged for verbal reasoning and numerical business reasoning, with the mean scores for Māori lower than Europeans for both tests. These differences were not found for general numerical reasoning.

The diversity-validity dilemma is well established, particularly concerning the use of psychometric assessments and interviews during selection (Gatewood et al., 2016). This dilemma highlights the challenge that HR professionals are faced with, of simultaneously striving to achieve diversity in the workplace and maintaining the ability to predict future job performance (Gatewood et al., 2016; Ryan & Tippins, 2004). Research so far has suggested that selection methods that work toward one goal (e.g. predictive validity), can work against another goal (e.g. diversity) (Guenole et al., 2003). Because interviews and cognitive ability have received much research attention, there is a range of strategies that HR professionals can adopt to modify their processes, broaden their measures and adjust their criteria to reduce the risk of disparate treatment or adverse impact during selection. Strategies include the use of structured interviews, training of hiring managers, incorporation of non-cognitive related performance measures and score-banding (Gatewood et al., 2016; Guenole et al., 2003; Ryan & Tippins, 2004). However, these may do little to improve diversity within an organisation if

candidates cannot get past the resume screening stage. Much less attention has been given to the role of biases and stereotypes during the screening of resumes and the strategies that can be adopted to counteract these processes (Derous et al., 2009; Derous & Ryan, 2012; Jackson & Fischer, 2007).

CHAPTER 4: RESUMES AND SELECTION PREFERENCES

Resumes are an important source of information when initially screening applicants (Derous et al., 2009). When applying for a job in New Zealand, each candidate will typically submit a resume which contains information such as a personal statement, educational background, qualifications, work experience, skills, and interests. Many resumes do not contain photographs, but they will usually contain a name and contact details of candidates. Resumes allow the organisation to provide an initial screen of applicants, identifying those that appear suitable for an interview, those that do not meet hiring criteria and, usually, a third group to be considered if none in the first group turn out to be suitable. Although not usually considered as a 'tool', resume screening is considered as the first hurdle in the selection process and it determines both the quality and quantity of the applicant pool, as well as all subsequent opportunity for employment (Derous et al., 2017; Jackson & Fischer, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005).

Selection processes and person-job fit

Recruiters focus on two types of performance when making hiring decisions (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Eriksson & Lagerström, 2012; Hofhuis et al., 2016). Firstly, they are concerned with the competence of the candidate to perform their assigned duties. Secondly, they assess the candidate's ability to contribute to the organisational, social and psychological work environment. The final interview shortlist is usually based on a combination of these two assessments (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Hofhuis et al., 2016).

Competence fit

In this study, the task performance component is referred to as a competence ranking (CR), which represents the relative ranking of the candidates based on the selectors' perception of their competence and ability to fulfil the required duties. An assessment of competence will typically consider attributes such as knowledge, skills, abilities and experience which can be usually found in a resume (Bowers et al., 2000; Ericksson & Lagerstrom, 2012).

Candidate experience is a significant factor when it comes to making selection decisions (Hofhuis et al., 2016; Hsiao & Kleiner, 2002). While more experience is generally favoured, it can both positively and negatively impact group performance (Hsiao & Kleiner, 2002; Huckman

& Staats, 2011; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). On one hand, candidates with greater job-related experience are more likely to have the necessary knowledge to perform work tasks and may be faster in establishing interpersonal trust with team members (Hofhuis et al., 2016), while those with less experience may be less likely to express their opinions, more hesitant to seek information from team members, and their views may be given less weight by others (Bowers et al., 2000). On the other hand, candidates with less experience may be more trainable, innovative, and open to new approaches than those with more experience (Hsiao & Kleiner, 2002). Although experienced candidates are generally favoured during selection, this does not guarantee their success (Faraj & Sproull, 2000; Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Despite this, candidate experience level is considered a key criterion in assessing candidates (Hofhuis et al., 2016).

Social fit

The social component in this study is referred to as social fit ranking (SFR), which represents the relative ranking of the candidates based on the selectors' perception of who would fit socially in their team. An assessment of social fit considers non-task related attributes such as cooperation, altruism, perceived integrity, and conscientiousness (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Ericksson & Lagerstrom, 2012; Hofhuis et al., 2016). Unlike competence assessments where job-related attributes such as knowledge, skills, abilities and tenure can be found in the resume, attributes related to social fit are not as readily observable (Bowers et al., 2000; Ericksson & Lagerstrom, 2012). For this reason, assessments of social fit may be based on perceived similarity between the recruiter and the candidate (Goldberg, 2005; Hofhuis et al., 2016), in line with SAT. When assessing the social fit of a candidate, job-related attributes are less salient during selection decisions (Webber & Donahue, 2001). Because of the unobservable nature of social fit attributes on most resumes, cues such as gender and ethnicity may act as proxy indicators for recruiters, regardless of how valid this may be (Eriksson & Lagerström, 2012).

Names as cues to ethnicity

Names are an important part of an individual's identity and can convey information about the sex, age, and race of a person (Derous et al., 2009; Wilson et al., 2005). Many ethnic groups have distinct names (Wilson et al., 2005). For example, the name "Xiao Li" conveys that the

person is both a female and of Asian ethnicity, compared to the name "Michelle Jones" which conveys the person is female and of White/European ethnicity.

There are two main methods adopted when testing whether names trigger biases and stereotypes during resume screening: field experiments and laboratory experiments. Field experiments involve sending carefully-matched hypothetical resumes to recruiters or employers in real world settings and comparing the call-back rates for each group of candidates (Riach & Rich, 2006; Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016). These field experiments capture the contemporary, subtle preferences that can emerge in selection processes (Colella et al., 2017). The other method is to use fictional candidates and hypothetical job scenarios in an experimental setting, and commonly involves concealing the real focus of the study from participants to minimise social desirability responding (Colella et al., 2017). In both methods, names in the resumes are manipulated while other information is held constant (Hiemstra et al., 2013). In general, the findings are troubling.

Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004) contrasted Anglo-American sounding names with African-American sounding names in 5,000 hypothetical resumes sent out in response to real job advertisements in the United States. Candidates with African American sounding names were 50% less likely to get a call-back for an interview compared to their Anglo-American counterparts. Derous and Ryan (2012) found similar patterns in the Netherlands where the odds of rejection were 4.86 times higher for applicants with Arabic names compared to those with Dutch names. These findings have been repeated all over the world, with differing degrees of discrimination between countries and ethnic groups (Eriksson & Lagerström, 2012; Kaas & Manger, 2012; Skans & Åslund, 2012; Wilson et al., 2005; Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016).

In New Zealand, the same effects have been found when comparing Chinese and Māori named candidates with European/Pakeha named candidates. Wilson et al. (2005) found that candidates with Chinese names (especially those with non-Anglicised names) were significantly less likely to be shortlisted when compared to those with European/Pakeha names, regardless of whether candidates were presented as an immigrant or not. Ward and Masgoret (2007) sent resumes with the names Brian Miller (native-born New Zealand) and Hau-Jie Li (China-born immigrant) to recruiters in 3 major cities in New Zealand. All employment details, content, format and language in resumes were identical. They found that the New Zealand candidate was directly contacted to follow up the selection process 28% of the time, compared

to 9% of the time for the Chinese candidate. Only 3% of the NZ candidates were told there were no job opportunities available and were not added to a database for future opportunities, compared to 27% for the Chinese candidate. For Māori in New Zealand, there was no main effect of ethnicity on applicant ratings compared to Pakeha/European applicants (Jackson & Fischer, 2007)

Similarity-Attraction and Ethnicity

These studies show that irrelevant cues such as ethnic names can influence selection decisions (Jackson & Fischer, 2007). Given that quality, presentation, and qualifications of the candidates were held constant, the research indicates that assessments were driven by factors other than objective differences in applicant characteristics (Wilson et al., 2005). In line with social categorisation processes and Similarity Attraction theory (SAT), the categorising of similar ingroup members ("us") and dissimilar outgroup members ("them") can trigger the formation of stereotypes, biased behaviour, and discriminatory behaviour (Byrne, 1971; Colella et al., 2017 ; Goldberg, 2005; Hofhuis et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2015; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013). These categorisations can represent perceived or actual differences in attitudes and values, concerns about communication issues, past experiences, or on a combination of the above (Wilson et al., 2005; Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016).

Because resumes provide only limited information on applicant attitudes and values, recruiters may use available information such as ethnicity cues for additional information (Arrow, 1973; Zschirnt & Ruedin, 2016). A presumed similarity of attitudes, values and beliefs leading to a greater attraction and more favourable outcomes is predicted by SAT, but creates a serious risk of bias and discrimination (Brooks et al., 2009; Goldberg, 2005; Ployhart & Holtz, 2008; Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Smith, & Paul, 2001). Over time, this can nudge the organisations towards internal homogeneity rather than diversity (Schneider et al., 2001). In the New Zealand context, there is limited research testing the effect of similarity between the recruiter and candidate. One study found that Pakeha raters were more likely to favour Māori candidates of high merit (as shown by the match between applicant attributes and required candidate attributes) over Pakeha candidates of high merit; however, Māori candidates of low merit were at a greater disadvantage compared to Pakeha candidates of low merit (Jackson & Fischer, 2007). Another study found that Asian raters rated both Asian and European/Pakeha candidates similarly, while European/Pakeha raters exhibited rating behavior consistent with SAT (Wilson et al., 2005). In another study, the overall mean preference rankings of HR

professionals for candidates decreased as perceived similarity (based on ways of living, systems of belief, and social status) between the candidate and HR professional decreased; candidates from Asia and the South Pacific were viewed as most dissimilar to New Zealand and were less preferred for a job opening than their counterparts from more culturally similar countries (Coates & Carr, 2005).

Asian and Māori people are the largest ethnic minority groups in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2013), and both groups experience disadvantage in the New Zealand labour market (Statistics New Zealand, 2018). Further, distinguishable surnames may cue stereotypes or biases. In line with existing New Zealand studies (Jackson & Fischer, 2007; Ward & Masgoret, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005), it is expected that candidates with Asian or Māori surnames would be at a greater disadvantage during resume screening than those with Anglicised surnames. Further, levels of experience will be the most salient factor during competence assessments, while ethnic similarity between participant and candidate will be an influence in the social fit selection.

Hypothesis 1: Candidates with Māori and Asian surnames will a) appear less frequently than candidates with Anglicised surnames in participant' top 4 selection preferences for the final interview shortlist and b) receive lower rankings within the top 4 for the final interview shortlist.

Hypothesis 2: a) During assessments of competence, candidates with higher levels of experience will be directly favoured over candidates with lower levels of experience and b) During assessments of social fit, NZ/European participants will select candidates with anglicised surnames more frequently than Māori or Other participants, Māori participants will select candidates with Māori surnames more frequently than NZ/European and Other participants, and Asian participants will select candidates with Asian surnames more frequently than Māori or NZ/European participants.

Names as cues to gender

There is a long history of research on the effects of gender in hiring decisions (Colella et al., 2017 ; Koch et al., 2015). Findings consistently show that women are disadvantaged when applying for leadership/management roles (Colella et al., 2017 ; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Koenig, Mitchell, Eagly, & Ristikari, 2011) or roles in male-dominated industries (Heilman & Caleo, 2018), and do not on average attain the same salaries as their male counterparts (Colella et al., 2017 ; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Much like ethnicity, gender provides a strong basis for social categorisation and produces stereotypes which are activated during processes with limited information such as resume screening (Davison & Burke, 2000; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Gender triggers pre-conceptions regarding what women and men *are* like (referred to as descriptive beliefs), and often create expectations of what females and males *should* be like (referred to as prescriptive beliefs) (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Koenig et al., 2011). Gendered expectations form a backdrop to social interaction, act as a form of social standard, and colour the judgments made about people in workplace contexts (Goldberg, 2005; Wood & Eagly, 2010). For example, when a woman is successful in a male-dominated role, she is typically perceived as unfeminine (Kaiser & Wallace, 2016), is less liked (Elsesser & Lever, 2011), and is more likely to be penalised during performance evaluations (Heilman & Chen, 2005; Kaiser & Wallace, 2016).

The origin of gender stereotypes is complex but can be attributed to a combination of gendered social roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002), historical gender-based discriminatory practices, and an era of research that "was discriminatory in itself" (Colella et al., 2017 p. 2). As a result, gender stereotypes have become deeply embedded in society and have proved resistant to change despite decades of social progress (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Booth & Leigh, 2010; Moss-Racusin, Dovidio, Brescoll, & Graham, 2012). They remain evident in pay structures and promotions which reflect a traditional, rather than contemporary, valuation of skills and performance (Walby & Olsen, 2002). In addition, women are typically found in lower status occupations, with restricted opportunities for career development and training (Davison & Burke, 2000; Jawahar & Mattson, 2005; Statistics New Zealand, 2015; Walby & Olsen, 2002). Gender stereotypes can lead to discrimination during resume screening which, as women assume a larger role in the labour force, has implications for the design and effectiveness of work teams (Bowers et al., 2000; Cole et al., 2004; Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Perry et al., 1994).

Gender stereotypes and lack of fit

In contrast to the well-documented relationship of ethnic similarity between the hiring manager/recruiter and candidate, SAT as an explanation for the influence of gender cues in hiring decisions has not provided similar insights. In line with SAT, some researchers have suggested that an increase in female hiring managers would increase the hiring and promotion of women (Bagues & Esteve-Volart, 2010; Perry et al., 1994); however there is little evidence for this (Colella et al., 2017). Research has produced mixed findings of the relationship between the gender of hiring managers and their selection decisions. Women hiring managers may actually show a preference for selecting male managers (Bagues & Esteve-Volart, 2010; Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Davison & Burke, 2000), while mens' hiring behaviour may favour women (Goldberg, 2005), or may not actually differ based on gender of the candidate (Cole et al., 2004), and often there are no differences between the gender of the hiring manager and their selection decisions (Booth & Leigh, 2010; Carlsson, 2011; Harvie et al., 1998; Moss-Racusin et al., 2012).

The Lack of Fit model proposed by Heilman (1983) and Heilman and Caleo (2018), proposes that the disadvantages faced by women in the labour force are a result of a mismatch between the attributes that women are perceived to possess, and the attributes seen as necessary to be successful in male-dominated positions. This mismatch forms the basis of negative expectations about women's performance, and biases hiring decisions (Cole et al., 2004; Heilman & Caleo, 2018; King, Madera, Hebl, Knight, & Mendoza, 2006; Koch et al., 2015; Koenig et al., 2011). In a meta-analytic review, Koch et al. (2015) found that stereotypes relating to gender fell into two categories: communal and agentic. Communal stereotypes associate women with traits such as dependence, nurturance, emotional expression, and communality, while agentic stereotypes associate men with traits such as assertiveness, confidence, independence, and competitiveness.

Alongside these assumptions, certain occupations and industries are commonly accepted as being female-dominated or male-dominated (Statistics New Zealand, 2015). For example, occupations in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) industries are considered male-dominated (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; Statistics New Zealand, 2015). When women apply for roles such as engineers (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Riach & Rich, 2006) or technicians (Weichselbaumber, 2004), they are disadvantaged when compared to male applicants (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012). If an occupation is female or male dominated, the

image of a successful worker in that role is likely to match the assumed attributes of the gender that typically occupies it (Koch et al., 2015).

Based on the Lack of Fit Model, it appears that women would have greater success when the gender of the candidate matches the gendered job attributes (i.e. a qualified woman applying for a female-dominated job) (Booth & Leigh, 2010; Heilman & Caleo, 2018). There is some evidence for this: Davison and Burke (2000) found that women received higher ratings than men for selection into female-dominated jobs, regardless of the sex of the rater, and that men were more successful when applying for 'male' jobs. In an Australian study, a man wishing to work as a waiter would need to submit 31% more applications to receive the same number of call-backs as a woman, and for a data-entry position he would need to submit 74% more (Booth & Leigh, 2010). Similar findings have emerged in accounting (Riach & Rich, 2006), secretarial work (Riach & Rich, 2006; Weichselbaumber, 2004), and pre-school teachers (Colella et al., 2017).

Gender stereotypes also apply to leadership roles. In a global overview of women in management, it was stated that "probably the single most important hurdle for women in management in all industrialised countries is the persistent stereotype that associates management with being a male" (Berthoin Antal & Izraeli, 1993, p. 63). The 'think manager think male' bias described by Schein in the early 1970s, is based on the perception that attributes associated with managerial success are more likely to belong to males than females (Sauers et al., 2002; Schein, 2001). When selecting applicants for a managerial position, the perception of task competence is an important consideration for hiring managers and there is evidence that men are generally viewed as being more competent than women (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Elsesser & Lever, 2011; Heilman & Caleo, 2018). Despite no actual differences in competence of men and women in male and female dominated occupations (Elsesser & Lever, 2011), women may need to perform at a higher level than men in order to receive the same judgement of competence (Sauers et al., 2002; Schein, 2001). Women applying for leadership roles in male-dominated occupations experience even greater disadvantage. For example, women applying for a science laboratory manager position were rated as less competent (by both male and female raters) than equally qualified males, and were offered lower starting salaries and less career mentoring (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012). This hurdle experienced by women has been named the "glass ceiling"- a subtle yet solid barrier that blocks women from higher management positions (Sauers et al., 2002).

The 'think manager think male' bias continues to exist globally (Sauers et al., 2002; Schein, 2001); however, the increase of women in managerial roles has shifted the degree of association between gender and managerial attributes. For example, in New Zealand, both men and women considered the attributes required for managerial success to strongly resemble those associated with males; however, New Zealand males also associated female attributes with managerial success – a result not shared amongst other countries (Sauers et al., 2002; Schein, 2001). In a meta-analysis of over 40 studies involving the 'think manager, think male' paradigm, Koenig et al. (2011) states that there has been progress in the increasing associations between women and leadership attributes, while associations with males and leadership remain unchanged. The preference for female managers has been found to be greater when individuals currently report to a female manager or have worked with women managers before (Elsesser & Lever, 2011). (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013)

In New Zealand, almost 50% of women and men work in occupations in which 70% or more of the workers are the same gender as them (New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 2008). Women are clustered in occupations such as clerical workers, nursing and midwifery, primary and early childhood teaching, personal care work and social work (Statistics New Zealand, 2015). In male dominated industries such as mathematical and engineering sciences, women make up only 21%, while in manual occupations including skilled trades women make up only 1% of all workers (Statistics New Zealand, 2015). In relation to management roles, women are almost as likely as men to be a manager, but these roles are clustered in female-dominated industries such as education (69% women managers) and health and community services (77% women managers) (Statistics New Zealand, 2015).

With this context in mind, it is predicted that female candidates applying for a female-dominated role (such as an administrator) will be perceived as more competent than equally qualified male candidates. In relation to management roles, the preference for male or female managers will be largely influenced by whether or not the candidate is applying for a role in a female or male-dominated occupation. Based on the gender segregation of the New Zealand labour force and the lack of fit theory, it is expected that women will experience some form of positive bias for managerial roles when perceived as 'fitting' the gendered occupation.

Hypothesis 3 – Candidates with female names applying for an administrator role will a) be selected more frequently in the top 4 selections for competence assessments compared to their equally qualified candidates with male names and b) receive higher average rankings within the top 4 for competence assessments.

Hypothesis 4 - a) Candidates with female names will be selected more frequently in top 4 selections during the competence assessment for the team leader role in divisions which women predominate (Customer operations)
b) Candidates with male names will be selected more frequently in top 4 selections during the competence assessment for the team leader role in divisions which men predominate (Production and Business Solutions).

CHAPTER 5: PERCEIVED DIVERSITY OUTCOMES

There are two main reasons why organisations choose to prioritise diversity: 1) to achieve positive outcomes such as creativity and innovation and 2) to comply with laws and regulations against discrimination. However, positive outcomes do not automatically result from diverse workgroups (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). Further, despite legislation restricting the use of demographic variables in employment decisions, research suggests that gender and ethnicity cues are used when reviewing resumes. The inconsistent findings regarding the relationship between diversity and performance have called for the exploration of moderator variables such as diversity beliefs and perceived diversity outcomes (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013).

Diversity beliefs

Diversity is a topic that can elicit a broad range of emotional, cognitive and behavioural responses. Those who do not support diverse workgroups may react by expressing prejudicial attitudes, viewing diversity initiatives as unfair, refusing to cooperate with members of a particular group, or viewing diversity as a threat to the outcomes of the organisation and/or themselves (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001). These behaviours can affect the organisations' ability to retain and realise the potential of diverse workgroups even if they are successful in hiring diverse candidates (Kossek & Zonia, 1993). In contrast, those who support diverse workgroups may respond by embracing individual differences, utilising diversity as a source of learning and creativity, interacting with people from all groups, and viewing diversity as an opportunity for growth and improved organisational outcomes (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001).

Not surprisingly, ethnic majority and ethnic minority individuals differ in whether they believe that diversity is valued by others, and this influences the likelihood of positive intergroup contact. Tropp and Bianchi (2006) found that majority group members believed that they valued diversity to the same extent as minority group members, while minority group members felt they valued diversity more than majority group members. The perceived attitudes of majority group members are a strong predictor of minority group members' sense of belonging and interest in intergroup contact (Hofhuis et al., 2015; Tropp & Bianchi, 2006).

Differences in gender have also been found, with women more likely to value diversity than men (Hofhuis et al., 2015; Hostager & De Meuse, 2008).

Perceived Diversity Outcomes

Diverse workgroups are more likely to result in positive outcomes when team members believe in the value of diversity (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001; Van Knippenberg, Haslam, & Platow, 2007) and when the organisational climate supports diversity (Cox, 1991; Gelfand, Nishii, Raver, & Schneider, 2005; Kossek et al., 2005; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013). Positive views of diversity can enhance a workgroup's ability to benefit from the presence of differing viewpoints, leading to increased creativity and innovation (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001; Homan et al., 2008; Nakui et al., 2011; Van Knippenberg et al., 2013). When group members respond positively to diversity initiatives, are more comfortable with intergroup interactions, and find diverse workgroups to be more attractive than those who do not view diversity positively (Hofhuis et al., 2015; Nakui et al., 2011; Van Knippenberg et al., 2007), diversity was positively related to group identification (Van Knippenberg et al., 2007), performance (Homan, Van Knippenberg, Van Kleef, & De Dreu, 2007), quality of ideas (Nakui et al., 2011).

In contrast, when individuals do not have positive views of diversity, this can lead to perceptions that some groups are receiving preferential treatment unrelated to performance outcomes, or that minority groups are using unfair tactics to achieve workplace advantages (Brief & Barsky, 2000; Hofhuis et al., 2016; Kossek et al., 2005). Further, if pro-diversity efforts are dominated by white men in leadership positions, they may be seen as 'cosmetic diversity activities' (Kossek & Zonia, 1993) and will actually reinforce negative intergroup processes and continue to result in an underrepresentation of minority groups in the workplace. Important considerations, such as the support of employees, has been identified as a key determinant of the success of diversity initiatives (Wentling, 2004).

Perceived diversity outcomes (PDO) are relevant to recruitment and selection in workplace settings. In New Zealand, a study which surveyed 100 employers regarding their attitude toward hiring and managing new migrants found that despite being aware of skill shortages, employers were reluctant to employ those from different cultural backgrounds. The reasons provided were related to the perceived challenge of managing diverse work-groups and the different working styles, language barriers, cultural misunderstandings and attitudinal

33

differences (Houkamau & Boxall, 2011; Podsiadlowski, 2007). Hofhuis et al. (2016) found that while minority candidates received lower assessment ratings when they showed greater expression of their cultural background, this negative effect was moderated by whether or not the recruiter belonged to the positive or negative perceived diversity outcomes group in the experiment. In other words, recruiters who perceive diversity to lead to negative outcomes may view cultural diversity as something to be avoided, resulting in lower assessment ratings of minority candidates. In contrast, those who perceive diversity as a source of productivity for the organisation may welcome diversity in the organisation and give higher assessment ratings to minority candidates even if they choose to express their cultural backgrounds. This was the case for both social ratings and task-performance ratings (although only for those candidates who had higher experience).

With perceptions playing a major role in the way we interpret, process, and enact information (Groggins et al., 2013), this study focuses on how perceived diversity outcomes can influence selection preferences. Our study proposes that organisations must evaluate how people perceive diversity before implementing diversity initiatives. Based on the existing literature around perceptions of diversity, it is expected that disadvantage of under-represented candidates during the selection process may be reduced if recruiters see the positive benefits of diversity. Those who view greater benefits of diversity will be more likely to actively seek out and value diverse workforces independent of feeling the need to comply with employment legislation (Hofhuis et al., 2016).

Hypothesis 5 – Participant PDO scores will be related to participants' preference for diversity in overall selection decisions as follows:

a) High PDO scores for benefits of diversity will be negatively related to preference for homogeneity in selection decisions

b) High PDO scores for threats of diversity will be positively related to preference for homogeneity in selection decisions

c) High PDO score for gender diversity will be positively related to preference for homogeneity in selection decisions

CHAPTER 6: METHOD

Participating organisation

The participating organisation is a New Zealand company which provides a range of household services to its customers. The industry is characterised by a highly competitive market subject to ongoing technological, structural, environmental and regulatory changes. The organisation's long-standing reputation in the industry has been a result of their continual innovation in their products and business strategies, which has allowed them to maintain their competitive advantage.

The organisation is made up of five divisions: Business Solutions, Corporate, Customer Operations, Production, and Markets, which vary in the representation of men and women currently in leadership roles. With some divisions being largely male-dominated with 68% (business solutions) and 90% (production) male managers, others are largely female-dominated with 70% (customer operations) female managers. The organisation did not have data on the ethnicity demographics of the organisation.

Currently, the organisation has over 800 full time equivalent employees working throughout New Zealand. Their selection decisions are made by a decentralised recruitment team who are the team leaders in each of their divisions. These hiring managers have full authority when making selection decisions and are involved in the shortlisting, interviewing and hiring of new staff. The human resources function is available to advise and provide resources when required. It is important to note that none of the hiring managers receive official selection training from the organisation.

Due to the highly competitive nature of the industry, the organisation has identified that diverse ways of thinking are particularly important in order to keep up with the continual changes and advances which characterise the industry. The organisation has expressed its commitment to incorporate diversity objectives into the strategic plan and was interested in the current research in order to assist planning for upcoming change initiatives. Representatives from the organisation were involved during all stages of planning the current

research, with regular interaction during the development of the survey. To protect the identity of the organisation, it will be referred to as "Organisation X".

Survey design

This study aims to contribute to the limited New Zealand research available on gender, ethnicity, and experience cues during resume screening. As this research should be treated as a starting point for future research, it is not concerned with the multiplicative effect of gender and ethnicity or the double jeopardy involved in belonging to two minority groups (Derous et al., 2009; Derous et al., 2015). For this reason, gender and ethnicity are treated separately for clarity; however, the experience levels of the candidates will be considered in combination with gender and ethnicity variables.

Following the previous research of Hofhuis et al. (2016), a survey was designed to identify preferences based on gender, ethnicity, and level of experience in Organisation X, and whether the perceived diversity outcomes of staff are related to the assessment and selection of candidates. However, this study differs from theirs in a few ways. Firstly, their study was primarily concerned with cultural diversity, but based on the literature suggesting that women also experience disadvantage in resume screening, a separate measure of perceived gender diversity outcomes has been included in our study. Secondly, their study used participants recruited through informal networks, involved deception, and required one hour of their time. In order to recruit voluntary participants in a real workplace setting, the task in this study has been adapted to be user and time friendly, and increased transparency to reduce risk for Organisation X. Finally, their study involved the manipulation of participants' perceived diversity outcomes. This study is an exploratory study and is interested in the existing perceptions of staff employed at Organisation X and whether or not this has an influence on their selection preferences.

The data were collected by means of an online survey hosted by Qualtrics, a secure online survey hosting site. The survey was a cross-sectional self-report survey. In order to minimise any risk of harm to the organisation and staff, the survey was designed to contain no "right" or "wrong" answers. Participation was anonymous and voluntary.

Procedure

Pilot Study

To test the functionality of the survey, a pilot study was conducted on 13 individuals (4 males, 9 females) who were known to the researcher. Mean age was 36, ranging from 21 to 57 years of age. Mean time taken to complete the survey was 20 minutes, ranging from 10 to 30 minutes. Feedback from the pilot study revealed that participants found it difficult to complete the ranking exercise, felt that it was very confronting, and that they would have liked more information. However, despite this feedback, 77% of participants were still able to complete the survey and provide valuable insights into their reasoning around their selection preferences.

With the feedback from the pilot study being taken into consideration, the survey was modified in order to provide greater emphasis on the voluntary nature of the survey and the participants' ability to stop at any time or leave out any questions they did not feel comfortable answering. Questions were simplified to reduce completion time and risk of 'over thinking', and the instructions were altered in order to provide guidance on how to approach the questions. Pilot study feedback was shared with Organisation X and the modified survey was shared with the organisations' representatives before it was decided to proceed with the survey.

The final version of the online survey was made up of two major sections. The first section was designed to look at whether or not there were any preferences amongst participants when selecting staff to work in their organisation. The second section was designed to determine their perceived diversity outcomes associated with both gender and cultural diversity.

Final survey

Prior to beginning the survey, participants were instructed not to overthink their responses while answering, and to choose based on their first reactions. It was stressed that all answers were anonymous and that there were no right or wrong answers. It was decided to not specifically mention the words 'cultural or gender diversity' despite the nature of the study

appearing relatively obvious once the survey began. Participant consent was attained by asking participants to indicate if they had read and understood all information provided.

The first section presented each participant with a summarised job description for either a fictional 'administration' or a 'team leader' role. Each role provided six broad key requirements of a successful candidate, with the intention of keeping requirements broad to allow the participants to apply these roles to their specific division, team, or a past experience. Although the job descriptions were for fictional roles, the simplified descriptions were based on actual job descriptions for those roles within Organisation X.

Next, each participant was presented with 12 fictional candidates, presented in random order, who were all of similar age, had the same qualifications, and worked in similar jobs at present, but varied in their gender, ethnicity and level of experience. Participants were instructed to imagine that the list of 12 candidates were applying for the job, and to help shortlist the candidates for an interview. They were asked to select and rank the top 4 and bottom 4 candidates in order of preference based on who they thought would be the most likely to be competent for the job, who would fit well socially in the team, and who they would like to shortlist for an interview. After the final shortlist, participants were given the opportunity to explain briefly why they shortlisted those candidates. The second section asked participants to indicate their level of agreement on a range of statements relating to cultural and gender diversity. Finally, the last page of the survey asked for the participants' demographic data and gave them the opportunity to receive a copy of the research findings and/or to enter the draw for a chance to win one of five $50 Pressy Cards for completing the survey (see Appendix B for a full copy of the survey).

Participants

All staff in the organisation were invited to participate in the study. Participants were recruited via email sent by an internal HR manager. The email contained information which showed the organisations support for the research and encouraged participation both verbally and by way of incentive (chance to win one of five $50 Pressy Card vouchers). The email invited staff to participate in an online survey which would take roughly 15 minutes to complete and could be completed at any time during an eight-day period. In the debrief, staff were explicitly told that it was part of a research project concerned with the factors which people in New Zealand

organisations think are important when selecting staff and were made aware that this study was seeking their personal opinions based on past observations and experiences in the workplace. All responses would be anonymous, and only summarised data, which would not risk identification of individuals, would be reported back to the organisation.

Table 1
Participant demographics

	Number	**%**
Gender		
Male	74	31.8%
Female	113	48.5%
Unspecified	46	19.7%
Ethnicity		
European	147	63.1%
Maori	7	3.0%
Asian	1	0.4%
New Zealander	13	5.6%
Other	13	5.6%
European/Maori	5	2.1%
Unspecified	47	20.2%
Age		
Under 25	12	5.2%
25 – 35	66	28.3%
36 – 45	49	21.0%
46 +	60	25.8%
Unspecified	46	19.7%
Division		
Corporate	29	12.4%
Business Solutions	24	10.3%
Customer Operations	73	31.3%
Production	28	12.0%
Markets	30	12.9%
Unspecified	49	21.0%

In total, 376 staff responded to the survey. After conducting a missing data analysis, those participants who did not complete the selection exercise in the survey were removed. This left 233 responses which were suitable for analysis. One hundred and nineteen had been given the Team Leader job description and candidates, and one hundred and fourteen had been given the Administrator description and candidates. As shown in Table 1, nearly half of the sample were female (48.5%) and were mostly aged between 25-35 (28.3%) years and 46+ (25.8%). A large majority of participants identified as European (63.1%) with very few from other ethnicities. For the purposes of maintaining anonymity, the ethnicity of participants have been grouped into four broader categories: European/New Zealander (68.7%), Māori/European Māori (5.2%), Other (6%), Not Specified (20.2%). Table 1 shows the ethnicity categories prior to being grouped. The Customer Operations division provided over a third of participant response.

Ethics

The current study was peer reviewed and assessed as low risk by the researchers and registered using a Low Risk Protocol with the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (appendix A).

Measures

Job type

Two roles have been chosen which are typically present in most organisations and differ by gender representation based on existing New Zealand gender segregation statistics; an administrator, and a team leader role (Statistics New Zealand, 2015). The administrator role was chosen as the typically female-dominated role. In contrast, the team leader role does not represent a typically male-dominated role, rather it is a role that can be male, or female dominated depending on the industry. Each participant was presented with either the administration role or the team leader role to base their assessments on once the survey link was clicked. Figure 1 shows the role descriptions provided to participants.

Team Leader

The successful candidate in this role will be required to:

- drive and implement key strategies that support your team's key functioning and goals

- have a strong alignment with the organisation's values

- have high motivation and ability to perform

- show excellent written and verbal communication skills

- effectively lead a team

- be responsible for team engagement, staff development, coaching and mentoring.

Administrator

The successful candidate in this role will be required to:

- support and coordinate the key functioning requirements of the team

- actively support the organisation's strategies and goals

- have excellent written and verbal communication skills

- manage and plan their workload independently in order to meet deadlines

- deliver, encourage and be able to receive open and honest feedback

Figure 1. Job descriptions of each role provided to participants at the beginning of the survey.

Ethnicity, Gender and Experience cues

The three within-subject variables resulted in 12 different candidates available for selection. In a 2x3x3 mixed-factor design, the candidates varied in their gender (male or female), ethnicity (NZ/European, Māori or Asian), and amount of experience (low or high). Table 2 shows the resulting 12 hypothetical candidates presented to each participant.

Table 2

Combination of ethnicity, gender, and experience variables producing 12 fictional candidates for selection

Ethnicity	Gender	Experience	Candidates
	Male	High	Daniel Brown
New Zealand/	Male	Low	Michael Smith
European	Female	High	Jessica Taylor
	Female	Low	Sarah Williams
	Male	High	Wiremu Hamuera
Māori	Male	Low	Tama Ropata
	Female	High	Aroha Henare
	Female	Low	Marama Kingi
	Male	High	David Zhang
Asian	Male	Low	Kevin Wang
	Female	High	Jenny Li
	Female	Low	Amy Liu

Gender and ethnicity of the candidates could be distinguished from their surnames. The names were chosen based on popular names from the three ethnicities from the years 1978-1988 in order to represent similar aged candidates (Department of Internal Affairs, 2014, 2017; Harvard University, 2009). Prior research has indicated that there is a greater disadvantage for candidates who are perceived as immigrants (Coates & Carr, 2005; Wilson et al., 2005), so Anglicised first names were used for the Asian candidates in this study. This avoids suggesting immigration status as a variable, supporting the assumption that candidates could have been born in NZ.

Experience was varied via a short sentence next to each candidate name. Highly experienced team leaders had 36 months experience; low experienced team leaders had 24 months. Due to the typically lower experience required for an administrator compared to a team leader, high and low experienced administrator candidates had 24 and 12 months, respectively. Participants in both the administrator and team leader groups were provided with identically

named candidates, with only the level of experience differing between the groups. Examples are shown in Figure 2.

Team Leader
Sarah Williams: 24 months experience in a team leader role.
Wiremu Hamuera: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Administrator
Sarah Williams: 12 months experience in an administration role.
Wiremu Hamuera: 24 months experience in an administration role.

Figure 2. Examples of candidate descriptions for each job type.

To minimise time required to complete the survey, from feedback in the pilot study, no further information was provided for each candidate, but it is recognised that real-life hiring decisions are made with more information.

Selection preferences

Out of the twelve candidates presented, each participant was asked to rank their four most preferred and four least preferred candidates. This provided two forms of data: selection/not selection of each candidate into a top or bottom four group, and ranking within the groups for those candidates that were selected.

The ranking exercise was repeated three times: once for competence ranking (CR), once for social fit ranking (SFR), and once for the final interview shortlist (IS). CR and SFR reflect the two types of anticipated performance that recruiters focus on when making selection decisions – the potential for the candidate to perform his/her assigned duties, as well as the candidates' broader contribution to the workplace environment. The interview shortlist is typically a combination of these assessments and represents the candidates chosen to progress to the next selection stage (Hofhuis et al., 2016). Rankings rather than rating scales were used in order to reflect what real selectors typically do in practice (Coates & Carr, 2005).

The following instructions were provided:

For Competence Ranking (CR): *"From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 **most** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer most of all) and the 4 **least** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer least of all) based on who you think is most likely to be **competent for the job**."*

For Social Fit Ranking (SFR): *"From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 **most** preferred candidates where 1= the candidate you would prefer most of all) and the 4 **least** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer least of all) based on who you think is most likely to be **expect to fit well socially** within the organisation."*

*For Interview Shortlist (*IS): *"From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 candidates you would like to **shortlist for an interview** (where 1= the candidate you would prefer most of all)"*

This was followed by *"Please explain briefly why you shortlisted these candidates for an interview."*

Perceived diversity outcomes

Perceived diversity outcomes (PDO) were measured using two scales. Cultural diversity was measured with the Benefits and Threats of Diversity Scale (BTDS) developed by Hofhuis et al. (2015) and gender diversity was measured using a sliding scale adapted from Van Knippenberg et al. (2007).

Benefits of diversity were measured using a 20 item scale (Hofhuis et al., 2015). Scale anchors were 1 = completely disagree and 5 = completely agree. Principal component analysis (PCA) identified 5 factors, each comprising 4 items, accounting for a total of 69.61% of the variance. The factors were as follows: factor 1 was Understanding Groups (e.g. "helps us to better understand new developments in society", α=.82), factor 2 was Creative Potential (e.g. "makes us better at solving complex problems", α=.87), factor 3 was Image of Social Responsibility (e.g. "is good for our image towards the outside world", α=.84), factor 4 was Job Market (e.g. "leads us to having more choices when recruiting and selecting new people", α=.77), and factor 5 was Social Environment (e.g. "has a positive effect on the work atmosphere", α=.84).

Five benefits subscales were computed using the mean scores of the items relating to each factor identified; subscale scores ranged from 1-5.

Threats of diversity were measured using a 16 item scale (Hofhuis et al., 2015). Scale anchors were 1 = completely disagree and 5 = completely agree. Principal component analysis (PCA) identified 4 factors, each comprising 4 items, accounting for a total of 74.2% of the variance. The factors were as follows: factor 1 was Realistic Threat (e.g. "leads to fewer career opportunities for other people", $\alpha=.87$), factor 2 was Symbolic Threat (4 items, e.g. "forces employees to adjust to a different culture", $\alpha=.77$), factor 3 was Intergroup Anxiety (e.g. "makes it more difficult for colleagues to understand each other", $\alpha=.89$), and factor 4 was productivity loss (e.g. "makes our work processes run less smoothly", $\alpha=.89$). Four threats subscales were computed using the mean scores of the items relating to each factor identified; subscale scores ranged from 1-5.

Through discussion and review with Organisation X, some wording in the scale was adapted in order to suit the language used in their organisation. We replaced the words 'minority,' 'majority,' and 'personnel,' with 'people.'

Gender Diversity was measured on a sliding scale from Van Knippenberg et al. (2007). Participants were asked to indicate their position on the scale in response to the question "A team like ours performs better if it consists of…". Scale anchors were 0 = more women than men, 5 = roughly equal number of women and men, 10 = less women than men. This was coded so that <5 = preferences for women, 5 = equal preferences, and >5 = preference for men.

Data Analysis

Preliminary analysis

Before the testing of hypotheses, we tested whether or not there were differences in the perceived diversity outcomes of participants based on their gender, ethnicity, age, and division. Bivariate relationships were tested using correlation, and demographic differences were tested by using ANOVA and t-tests.

Selection Preferences

Participants were asked to select their top and bottom four candidates out of the list of twelve candidates and to rank each of them in order of preference, for each assessment type (competence, social fit, and interview shortlist).

For each participant, the number of times they chose a female or male candidate, a New Zealand/European, Māori, or Asian candidate, and a high or low experienced candidate was computed. This gave each participant 7 new variables for each assessment type (competence, social fit, and interview shortlist), totalling 21 new variables per participant. Each variable had a range of 0-4. Given the large number of variables needed for analysis, and the relatively limited sample size, this process was not repeated for the number of times candidates were chosen for the bottom four placements.

Next, the mean rank for each candidate when they were selected within the top four was computed. Ranks ranged from 1-4 and resulted in little variance once averaged, which did not allow us to meaningfully analyse average rankings. Accordingly, we did not proceed with analysing the ranks data.

T-tests and one-way ANOVA were used to compare selections of candidate attributes in relation to participant gender, ethnicity, and division. Chi-square analysis was used to explore if there were any associations between the administrator and team leader roles. Continuous variables were analysed using bivariate correlation.

Preference for homogeneity

To assess participant preferences overall, a preference for homogeneity score was computed as follows:

$$PrefHomogeneity = PrefMale + PrefAnglo$$

Where:

PrefMale = number of times a male candidate was selected minus the number of times a female candidate was selected

PrefAnglo = number of times a candidate with an anglicised surname was selected minus the number of times a candidate with a non-anglicised surname was selected

A preference for male candidates and candidates with anglicised surnames was chosen to represent an overall preference for homogeneity because these attributes are typically well represented in the workplace, compared to women and ethnic minority candidates (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Colella et al., 2017 ; Statistics New Zealand, 2018). Accordingly, it is expected that participants who prefer homogeneity will be more likely to select male candidates and those with non-Anglicised surnames than participants who prefer diversity. Scores ranged from -3 to 4, with higher scores representing a greater preference for homogeneity (non-diversity).

Regression analysis was used to analyse the effect of participant PDO scores on their preference for homogeneity scores.

Qualitative data

Qualitative data collected were beyond the scope of this research and are not reported due to time and space requirements.

CHAPTER 7: RESULTS

Participant Demographics and Perceived Diversity Outcomes

Women reported more perceived benefits of diversity in terms of creative potential, job market and social environment, but not for understanding diverse groups in society or image of social responsibility. Men generally reported more threats of diversity, except for productivity losses. In relation to gender diversity, men were more likely than women to have a preference for equal numbers of men and women in workgroups ($t(175)=2.41$, $p<.05$) (Table 3).

Table 3
T-test Results Comparing Differences in Mean Scores on Perceived Diversity Outcome Subscales between Male and Female Participants

Perceived Diversity Outcomes	Male	Female	
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	
Benefits (range 1-5) [†]			
Understanding Diverse Groups in Society	3.78 (0.78)	3.97 (0.64)	$t(183)=-1.86$, n.s.
Creative Potential	3.44 (0.92)	3.86 (0.79)	$t(183)=-3.39$***
Image of Social Responsibility	3.63 (0.71)	3.67 (0.76)	$t(184)=-0.35$, n.s.
Job Market	3.04 (0.83)	3.33 (0.76)	$t(184)=-2.44$**
Social Environment	3.52 (0.80)	3.89 (0.65)	$t(184)=-3.47$***
Threats (range 1-5) [†]			
Realistic Threat	2.44 (0.93)	2.06 (0.78)	$t(183)=3.01$**
Symbolic Threat	3.08 (0.73)	2.70 (0.81)	$t(183)=3.18$**
Intergroup Anxiety	2.66 (0.89)	2.33 (0.78)	$t(183)=2.63$**
Productivity Loss	2.15 (0.87)	1.93 (0.69)	$t(183)=1.90$, n.s.
Gender Diversity (range 0-10) [†]	5.02 (1.9)	4.42 (1.47)	$t(175)=2.41$*

Note. * = $p<.05$; ** = $p<.01$; *** = $p<.001$.

[†] For Benefits and Threats subscales, higher scores represent greater agreement with items on the scales. For Gender diversity, scores 0-4 = preference for women, 5 = equal representation of men and women, 6-10 = preference for men.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the relationship of participant ethnicity to PDO scores. The only significant difference found was on the "Understanding Diverse Groups in Society" item on the benefits scale (Table 4). Post hoc comparisons using the LSD test indicated that the largest differences were between European/NZ participants and Other participants (*Mdiff* = 0.48, *SE*= 0.19), and Māori/European Māori participants and Other participants (*Mdiff* = 0.84, *SE*= 0.27). This suggests that participants belonging to the 'Other' ethnicity group generally showed less agreement with the 'Understanding Diverse Groups in Society' sub-scale on the benefits scale compared to European/NZ and Māori/European Māori participants.

One-way ANOVA was conducted to compare mean scores of participants from each division and found significant differences across 2 out of 5 benefits subscales, all threats subscales, and the gender diversity scale (Table 5). Post Hoc comparisons using the LSD test indicated that differences were particularly present between participants from the production division and other divisions. Compared to all other divisions, those working in the production division reported less agreement on the benefits subscales, greater agreement on the threat subscales, and a greater preference for working with male candidates.

The only significant relationship with age was with the benefits sub-scale: 'image of social responsibility' (r=-.15, n=186, p<.05). Older participants were less likely to perceive diversity as being beneficial for the organisations' image of social responsibility (Table 6, pg.52).

Table 4

ANOVA Results Comparing Differences in Mean Scores on Perceived Diversity Outcome Subscales between Participant Ethnicity Groups

Perceived Diversity Outcomes	European/NZ	Māori/	Other	
	M (SD)	European Māori	*M (SD)*	
		M (SD)		
Benefits (range 1-5) [†]				
Understanding Diverse Groups in Society	3.91 (0.65)	4.27 (0.63)	3.43 (1.08)	*F*(2,181)=5.01**
Creative Potential	3.66 (0.83)	4.15 (0.73)	3.66 (1.27)	*F*(2,181)=1.85, n.s.
Image of Social Responsibility	3.66 (0.73)	3.5 (0.81)	3.68 (0.80)	*F*(2,181)=0.27, n.s.
Job Market	3.22 (0.81)	3.38 (0.59)	3.00 (0.77)	*F*(2,181)=0.74, n.s.
Social Environment	3.72 (0.73)	3.81(0.77)	3.98 (0.76)	*F*(2,181)=.85, n.s.
Threats (range 1-5) [†]				
Realistic Threat	2.21 (0.78)	2.37 (0.84)	2.05 (1.09)	*F*(2,181)=0.45, n.s.
Symbolic Threat	2.85 (0.78)	2.98 (0.63)	2.75 (1.09)	*F*(2,181)=0.26, n.s.
Intergroup Anxiety	2.48 (0.84)	2.46 (0.68)	2.34 (1.04)	*F*(2,181)=0.17, n.s.
Productivity Loss	2.03 (0.77)	2.10 (0.93)	1.80 (0.71)	*F*(2,181)=0.64, n.s.
Gender Diversity Scale (range 0-10) [†]	4.68 (1.68)	3.80 (1.81)	5.07(1.50)	*F*(2,173)=1.72, n.s.

Note. * = *p*<.05; ** = *p*<.01; *** = *p*<.001.

[†] For Benefits and Threats subscales, higher scores represent greater agreement with items on the scales. For Gender diversity, scores 0-4 = preference for women, 5 = equal representation of men and women, 6-10 = preference for men.

Table 5

ANOVA Results Comparing Differences in Mean Scores on Perceived Diversity Outcomes Subscales between Participant Divisions

	Corporate M (SD)	Business Solutions M (SD)	Customer Operations M (SD)	Production M (SD)	Markets M (SD)	
PDO Scales						
Benefits (range 1-5) [†]						
Understanding Diverse Groups in Society	3.83 (0.65)	4.07 (0.70)	3.95 (0.66)	3.63 (0.70)	4.00 (0.66)	$F(4,177)= 1.88$, n.s.
Creative Potential	3.91 (0.74)	3.94 (0.93)	3.73 (0.79)	3.24 (0.72)	3.67 (0.97)	$F(4,177)= 3.18*$
Image of Social Responsibility	3.54 (0.71)	3.64 (0.70)	3.81 (0.69)	3.46 (0.88)	3.56 (0.75)	$F(4,178)= 1.55$, n.s.
Job Market	3.25 (0.66)	3.28 (0.84)	3.39 (0.80)	2.96 (0.74)	2.95 (0.86)	$F(4,178)= 2.54*$
Social Environment	3.89 (0.60)	3.75 (0.76)	3.84 (0.64)	3.39 (0.84)	3.73 (0.86)	$F(4,178)= 2.24$, n.s.
Threats (range 1-5) [†]						
Realistic Threat	2.07 (0.76)	2.33 (0.92)	2.08 (0.75)	2.69 (1.03)	2.14 (0.86)	$F(4,177)= 3.05*$
Symbolic Threat	2.94 (0.87)	2.95 (0.61)	2.70 (0.82)	3.27 (0.70)	2.65 (0.78)	$F(4,177)= 3.46**$
Intergroup Anxiety	2.54 (0.83)	2.52 (0.62)	2.34 (0.80)	2.93 (1.01)	2.23 (0.80)	$F(4,177)= 3.37**$
Productivity Loss	2.03 (0.62)	1.95 (0.84)	1.93 (0.68)	2.47 (0.90)	1.86 (0.81)	$F(4,177)= 3.21**$
Gender Diversity Scale (range 0-10) [†]	3.89 (1.78)	4.77 (0.92)	4.46 (1.5)	6.04 (1.87)	4.48 (1.70)	$F(4,169)=7.05***$

Note. $* = p<.05$; $** = p<.01$; $*** = p<.001$.

[†] For benefits and threats scales, higher scores represent greater agreement with items on the scales. For Gender diversity, scores 0-4 = preference for women, 5 = equal representation of men and women, 6-10 = preference for men

Table 6

Pearson Correlations Table Showing Relationship between Participant Age and Perceived Diversity Outcome Subscales

Subscales	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Age	-	-.02	-.08	-.15*	.05	-.06	-.11	-.12	-.02	-.03	.08
2. Benefits: Understanding diverse groups in society		-	.62**	.40**	.31**	.47**	.13	.07	-.12	-.20**	-.17*
3. Benefits: Creative potential			-	.38**	.44**	.60**	-.15*	.03	-.13	-.22*	-.07
4. Benefits: Image of social responsibility				-	.31**	.45**	-.07	.07	.01	-.05	-.10
5. Benefits: Job market					-	.40**	.06	.19**	.06	.06	-.11
6. Benefits: Social environment						-	-.25**	-.01	-.29**	-.40**	-.18*
7. Threats: Realistic threat							-	.50**	.58**	.64**	.15*
8. Threats: Symbolic threat								-	.60**	.52**	.03
9. Threats: Intergroup anxiety									-	.71**	.14
10. Threats: Productivity loss										-	.09
11. Gender Diversity											-

Note. * = *p*<.05; ** = *p*<.01

Hypothesis Testing

Ethnicity cues and resume screening

Hypothesis 1 predicted that candidates with Māori and Asian surnames would appear less frequently in final interview shortlists than candidates with Anglicised surnames. First, a chi-square analysis was conducted, comparing the data from the team leader role with the administrator role to determine if there were any associations between these two roles and the ethnicity of the candidate. No significant association was found (chi-square =.03, p>.05), so the two roles have been combined in order to increase the sample size for the analysis of hypothesis 1.

Using a one-sample t-test, the average number of times participants chose a candidate with a Māori or Asian surname in their top 4 selection choices, was compared to a candidate with an Anglicised surname. Overall, the mean number of times Māori candidates (M=1.11, SD=.89) were selected was lower than the mean number of times European candidates (M=1.24, SD=.97) were selected (t(232)=-2.27, p<.05), and the mean number of times Asian candidates (M=.79, SD=.81) were selected was lower than European candidates (t (232)=-8.40, p<.001). When comparing the two minority ethnicity groups, Māori candidates were selected more often than Asian candidates (t(232)=-5.957, p<.001). This provides support for hypothesis 1.

In the hypothetical applicant pool containing an equal percentage of European, Māori and Asian applicants, if there was no bias, then all ethnicity groups would be represented equally in an interview shortlist of four. In our sample, 73.5% of participants chose a European candidate in their top four at least once, 68.3% of participants chose a Māori candidate in their top four at least once, and 58.8% of participants chose an Asian candidate in their top four at least once. Overall, the average number of times a Māori and Asian candidate was selected in the top four was lower than that of a European candidate despite having the same number of qualified candidates in the applicant pool.

Competence and Social Fit assessments

Hypothesis 2a predicted that candidates with higher levels of experience would be directly favoured over candidates with lower levels of experience during the competence assessment. This was tested using the number of times more experienced candidates were chosen in the

top four versus the number of times less experienced candidates were chosen in the top four during the competence assessment. Again, no differences were found between administrator and team leader roles (chi-square =0.01, *p*>.05), so the groups were combined.

Candidates with higher levels of experience (*M*=3.32, *SD*=1.22) were selected significantly more often than those with low (*M*=.46, *SD*=.92) levels of experience (*t*(232)=-47.49, *p*<.001) (Table 7). Hypothesis 2a was supported. Further analyses found that this difference was also apparent during social fit assessments (*t*(232)=-25.05, *p*<.001) and interview shortlisting (*t*(232)=-33.99, *p*<.001).

Table 7
Mean Number of Times a Candidate with High or Low Experience Group was Chosen in the Top Four during the Three Assessment Types

| | High experience | Low experience | |
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	
Competence	3.32 (1.22)	0.46 (0.92)	*t*(232)=-47.49**
Social Fit	2.47 (1.58)	0.74 (1.06)	*t*(232)=-25.05**
Interview shortlist	2.63 (1.65)	0.51 (0.95)	*t*(232)=-33.99**

Note. * = *p*<.05; ** = *p*<.01

Hypothesis 2b predicted that during assessments of social fit, NZ/European participants would select candidates with anglicised surnames more frequently than Māori or Other participants would; Māori participants would select candidates with Māori surnames more frequently than NZ/European and Other participants would; and Asian participants would select candidates with Asian surnames more frequently than Māori or NZ/European participants would. As testing Hypothesis 2a had found experience to be such a strong factor when making selection decisions, each experience group were analysed separately, but the administration and team leader roles remained combined.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the average number of times participants from each ethnicity group chose a candidate from each ethnicity group. For experienced candidates, both NZ/European and Māori participants were more likely to choose a candidate with an anglicised surname than a participant in the 'Other' ethnicity group for assessments of social fit (*F*(2,183)= 3.488, *p*<.05). For low experience candidates, participants belonging to the 'Other' ethnicity were more likely to choose a candidate with a Māori and Asian surname compared to European and Māori participants (Table 8). Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

54

The same relationships were found for the competence assessment (Table 9) and interview shortlist (Table 10).

Table 8
ANOVA Results Comparing Mean Number of Times Participants from Each Ethnicity Group Selected a Candidate from each Ethnic Group in the Top Four in the Social Fit Assessment

	Participant ethnicity			
	NZ/European *M (SD)*	Māori/Māori European *M (SD)*	Other *M (SD)*	
Candidate ethnicity				
High experience				
NZ/European	1.15 (0.76)	0.83 (0.72)	0.64 (0.93)	$F(2,183)= 3.49*$
Māori	1.08 (0.78)	1.33 (0.89)	0.78 (0.80)	$F(2,183)= 1.58$, n.s.
Asian	0.63 (0.71)	0.58 (0.67)	0.50 (0.65)	$F(2,183) = 0.24$, n.s.
Low experience				
NZ/European	0.53 (0.77)	0.17 (0.39)	0.43 (0.65)	$F(2,183)= 1.36$, n.s.
Māori	0.14 (0.38)	0.25 (0.62)	0.57 (0.76)	$F(2,183)= 6.58**$
Asian	0.13 (0.35)	0.17 (0.39)	0.50 (0.76)	$F(2,183) = 5.78**$

Note. $* = p<.05$; $** = p<.01$

Table 9

ANOVA Results Comparing Mean Number of Times Participants from Each Ethnicity Group Chose a candidate from Each Ethnic Group for their Top Four in the Competence Assessment

	Participant ethnicity			
	NZ/European *M (SD)*	Māori/Māori European *M (SD)*	Other *M (SD)*	
Candidate ethnicity				
High experience				
NZ/European	1.33 (0.71)	1.17 (0.72)	0.64 (0.75)	$F(2,183)= 6.08$**
Māori	1.23 (0.77)	1.50 (0.80)	1.00 (0.88)	$F(2,183)=1.33$, n.s.
Asian	0.82 (0.70)	0.75 (0.62)	0.50 (0.65)	$F(2,183) = 1.39$, n.s.
Low experience				
NZ/European	0.26 (0.57)	0.17 (0.39)	0.57 (0.85)	$F(2,183)= 2.05$, n.s.
Māori	0.05 (0.25)	0.08 (0.29)	0.35 (0.63)	$F(2,183)= 7.07$***
Asian	0.09 (0.31)	0.00 (0.00)	0.36 (0.50)	$F(2,183) = 5.07$**

Note. * = $p<.05$; ** = $p<.01$; *** = $p<.001$.

Table 10

ANOVA Results Comparing Mean Number of Times Participants from Each Ethnicity Group Chose a Candidate from Each Ethnic Group for their Top Four in an Interview Shortlist

	Participant ethnicity			
	NZ/European *M (SD)*	Māori/Māori European *M (SD)*	Other *M (SD)*	
Candidate ethnicity				
High experience				
NZ/European	1.24 (0.76)	0.83 (0.72)	0.64 (0.84)	$F(2,183)= 5.26$**
Māori	1.16 (0.78)	1.08 (0.90)	0.93 (0.83)	$F(2,183)= 0.56$, n.s.
Asian	0.76 (0.69)	0.58 (0.51)	0.57 (0.78)	$F(2,183) = 0.77$, n.s.
Low experience				
NZ/European	0.28 (0.57)	0.17 (0.39)	0.29 (0.47)	$F(2,183)= 0.24$, n.s.
Māori	0.08 (0.27)	0.33 (0.65)	0.50 (0.65)	$F(2,183)= 11.56$***
Asian	0.15 (0.43)	0.00 (0.00)	0.50 (0.76)	$F(2,183) = 4.75$**

Note. * = $p<.05$; ** = $p<.01$; *** = $p<.001$.

For hypothesis 3, it was predicted that women would appear more frequently than men in the top 4 selections for competence assessments for an administrator role. This analysis used the subgroup of participants who saw the administrator job description and candidates. Each participant's scores for the number of times they chose a highly experienced woman, a low experienced woman, a highly experienced man, and a low experienced man for the role were the basis of this analysis. The mean number of times men were selected (M=0.12, SD=0.48) was significantly lower than the mean number of times women were selected (M=0.23, SD=0.55), but only for low experience candidates for the administration role (Table 11). There was no difference in the selection of male and female candidates of high levels of experience. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

For the team leader role, women candidates with more experience (M=1.79, SD=0.75) were selected more often than men candidates with more experience (M=1.66, SD=0.63) (Table 11). This finding was unexpected and will be discussed in Discussion.

Additional analysis compared whether male and female participants showed a preference for male or female candidates but found no significant differences for either role (Table 12).

Table 11
T-test Results Comparing Mean Number of Times Participants Chose Women or Men Candidates in the Top Four for a Competence Assessment

	Candidate gender		
	Women	**Men**	
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	
Administration			
High Experience	1.67 (0.88)	1.52 (0.84)	t(113)=-1.89, n.s.
Low Experience	0.23 (0.55)	0.12 (0.48)	t(113)=-2.52**
Team Leader			
High Experience	1.79 (0.75)	1.66 (0.63)	t(118)=-2.33*
Low Experience	0.30 (0.60)	0.25 (0.54)	t(118)=-1.02, n.s.

Note. * = p<.05; ** = p<.01; *** = p<.001.

Table 12

T-test Results Showing the Effect of Participant Gender on Selection Choices of Male and Female Candidates for Competence Assessment

	Participant Gender		
	Male	Female	
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	
Candidate gender			
Administration role			
Male	1.26 (0.74)	1.25 (0.77)	$t(93)=0.04$, n.s.
Female	1.97 (0.92)	1.85 (0.94)	$t(93)=0.61$, n.s.
Team leader role			
Male	2.00 (0.61)	1.81 (0.48)	$t(90)=1.66$, n.s.
Female	2.00 (0.61)	2.19 (0.48)	$t(90)=1.66$, n.s.

Note. * = $p<.05$; ** = $p<.01$; *** = $p<.001$.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that participants' division would be related to the selection of male and female candidates for a competence assessment for a prospective team leader. This analysis used the subgroup of participants who saw the team leader job description and candidates. Each participants' scores for the number of times they chose a highly experienced woman, a low experienced woman, a highly experienced man, and a low experienced man for the role were the basis of this analysis, alongside which division the participant belonged to at Organisation X. No significant relationships were found (Table 13). Hypothesis 4 was not supported. Less experienced candidates were not generally nominated into the top 4 choices for any division.

Table 13

ANOVA Results Comparing Mean Selection Rates of Participants from Each Division for the Team Leader Role

	Participant Division					
	Corporate M (SD)	Business Solutions and Tech M (SD)	Customer Operations M (SD)	Production M (SD)	Markets M (SD)	
High Experience						
Female	1.91 (0.70)	2.13 (0.35)	1.74 (0.66)	1.44 (0.78)	1.94 (0.71)	$F(4,90)= 2.02$, n.s.
Male	1.72 (0.65)	1.88 (0.35)	1.66 (0.68)	1.72 (0.67)	1.47 (0.70)	$F(4,90)= 0.66$, n.s.
Low Experience						
Female	0.27 (0.65)	0.00 (0.00)	0.34 (0.64)	0.39 (0.61)	0.42 (0.77)	$F(4,90)= 0.70$, n.s.
Male	0.09 (0.31)	0.00 (0.00)	0.26 (0.56)	0.44 (0.51)	0.16 (0.50)	$F(4,90)= 1.66$, n.s.

Note. * = $p<.05$; ** = $p<.01$; *** = $p<.001$.

Perceived diversity outcomes

Hypothesis 5 predicted that participants' PDO score would be related to their preference for homogeneity (non-diversity). Table 14 shows the bivariate correlations between benefit and threat subscales, gender diversity, and preference for homogeneity. At the bivariate level, preference for homogeneity correlated positively with all threat subscales but not with any of the benefits subscales or the gender diversity scale.

As there were differences in perceived benefits and threats by participant gender and division (see Tables 3 and 5 earlier), regression analyses were run with participant gender and division as control variables. Participant gender predicted unique variance across both regressions, with men showing a higher preference for homogeneity at work than women. One benefits subscale predicted unique variance in preferences for homogeneity: higher agreement with the benefit of 'understanding diverse groups in society' was related to lower preferences for homogeneity at work. None of the other benefits subscales were significant (Table 15). For threats, none of the subscales predicted preference for homogeneity (Table 16).

The relationship between preferences for gender diversity (a self-report variable) and preference for homogeneity (a computed variable from actual selection choices) was also explored with participant gender and division as control variables. A greater preference for homogeneity was related to preferring more men than women in workgroups (Table 17). Unlike earlier regressions, participant gender was not a significant predictor in this analysis. There was only very limited support for Hypothesis 5.

Additional analysis examined whether preference for homogeneity varied by ethnicity (Table 18), no differences were found ($F(2,183)= 1.619$, $p>.05.$).

Table 14

Pearson Correlation Table Showing the Relationship between Perceived Diversity Outcomes Subscales and Participants' Preference for Homogeneity Scores

Subscales	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Benefits: Understanding diverse groups in society	-										
2. Benefits: Creative potential	.62**	-									
3. Benefits: Image of social responsibility	.40**	.38**	-								
4. Benefits: Job market	.31**	.44**	.31**	-							
5. Benefits: Social environment	.47**	.60**	.45**	.40**	-						
6. Threats: Realistic threat	-.13	-.15*	-.07	.06	.25**	-					
7. Threats: Symbolic threat	.07	.03	.07	.19**	-.02	.50**	-				
8. Threats: Intergroup anxiety	-.12	-.13	.01	.06	-.29**	.58**	.60**	-			
9. Threats: Productivity loss	-.20**	-.22**	-.05	.06	-.40**	.64**	.52**	.72**	-		
10. Gender diversity	-.17*	-.13	-.07	-.09	-.11	.18*	.01	.09	.04	-	
11. Preference for Homogeneity	-.14	-.08	.07	.06	-.09	.15*	.16*	.23**	.22**	.08	-

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

Table 15

Regression of Preference for Homogeneity on Division, Gender, and Perceived Benefits of Diversity

	B	SE B	Beta
Participant division	.17	.13	.13
Participant gender	-.70	.34	-.22*
Benefits: Understanding diverse groups in society	-1.00	.29	-.42*
Benefits: Creative potential	-.04	.26	-.02
Benefits: Image of social responsibility	.19	.24	.09
Benefits: Job market	.42	.23	.21
Benefits: Social environment	.10	.30	.05
R	.47		
R²	.22		
AdjR²	.15		
F (7,82)		3.29**	

Note. * = *p*<.05; ** = *p*<.01; *** = *p*<.001.

Table 16

Regression of Preference for Homogeneity on Division, Gender, and Perceived Threats of Diversity

	B	SE B	Beta
Participant division	.09	.13	.07
Participant gender	-.67	.33	-.21*
Threats: Realistic threat	-.13	.26	-.07
Threats: Symbolic threat	-.10	.26	-.07
Threats: Intergroup anxiety	.29	.31	.16
Threats: Productivity loss	.45	.35	.23
R	.40		
R²	.17		
AdjR²	.11		
F (6,83)		2.73*	

Note. * = *p*<.05; ** = *p*<.01; *** = *p*<.001.

Table 17

Regression of Preference for Homogeneity on Division, Gender, and Preference for Gender Homogeneity

	B	*SE B*	*Beta*
Participant division	.06	.13	.05
Participant gender	-59	.34	-.18
Preference for gender diversity	.25	.08	.33**
R	.44		
R²	.19		
AdjR²	.16		
F (3,84)		6.69***	

Note. * = *p*<.05; ** = *p*<.01; *** = *p*<.001.

Table 18

ANOVA Results Showing Differences in Participant Preference for Homogeneity Scores

	Preference for homogeneity † *M (SD)*	
Participant ethnicity		
NZ/European	0.15 (1.52)	*F*(2,183)=1.62, n.s.
Māori	-0.64 (1.43)	
Other	-0.01 (0.83)	

† Scores ranged from -3 to 4, with higher scores representing a greater preference for homogeneity (non-diversity).

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION

This study explored the processes involved during resume screening that may be preventing organisations from successfully achieving positive outcomes of diversity in the workplace. Participants at Organisation X were invited to complete an online survey which was designed to identify their perceptions of benefits and threats of diversity, and selection preferences based on gender, ethnicity, and level of experience of a set of hypothetical candidates.

The finding that candidates with anglicised surnames were preferred over candidates with Māori and Asian surnames is consistent with previous New Zealand research (Singer & Eder, 1989a; Ward & Masgoret, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005; Wilson & Parker, 2007). Given that the Asian candidates possessed the same qualifications and were presented the same as the NZ/European and Māori candidates, the results suggest that selection decisions may be partly driven by negative stereotypes and biases associated with the categorisation of candidates by ethnicity cues, rather than any objective differences in candidate characteristics. This supports the argument that stereotypes and biases are used to supplement the information provided in resumes, particularly when information is limited or when all candidates are similarly qualified for the role (Hofhuis et al., 2016; King et al., 2006).

An outcome termed the "ethnic penalty" describes reduced job outcomes for applicants of ethnic minorities (Wilson & Parker, 2007). The notably large disadvantage for candidates with Asian surnames can be understood in a broader historical context, where since the late 19th century, Asian people have been disadvantaged in New Zealand (Pearson, 2005). Even today, Asian candidates may face the most discrimination in New Zealand, and skilled workers often find it difficult to obtain work that matches their skillset (Callister, 2007; Statistics New Zealand, 2012; Ward & Masgoret, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005). It is also possible that candidates with Asian surnames were particularly disadvantaged because the roles chosen in this study (administrator and team leader) did not match the stereotyped roles that Asian candidates are typically favoured for, such as finance or information technology (Berdahl & Min, 2012; King et al., 2006; Lee et al., 2015; Wilson & Parker, 2007).

Candidate experience was a significant factor during selection. This indicates that although there may be a disadvantage for ethnic minority candidates during resume screening, they may be less disadvantaged when compared to a majority group member of lower experience. Given limited information, level of experience appears to be the first selection criterion, ahead of cues such as ethnicity and gender.

Some support was found for the Similarity Attraction Theory (SAT), in terms of similarity between the participant and candidates in terms of ethnicity. Perceived similarity between recruiter and candidate can trigger more interpersonal attraction and increase the chance of receiving a favourable assessment (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Goldberg, 2005; Hofhuis et al., 2016). However, similar to Wilson et al. (2005) and Goldberg (2005), this relationship was only evident for NZ/European participants. The Māori and Other participants in this study did not show a preference for candidates of similar ethnicity, which may be due to sample size. SAT was not supported for gender, consistent with the findings of Booth and Leigh (2010) and Carlsson (2011).

Although women were selected more than men for an administrator role amongst the low experience candidates, this finding was out-weighted by the importance placed on experience. Candidates with low experience were rarely selected in the top four. Overall, these results do not support the Lack of Fit Model or previous research which demonstrates an advantage for women when applying for traditionally female-dominated roles (e.g., (Davison & Burke, 2000; Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Riach & Rich, 2006; Weichselbaumber, 2004). It is possible that the gendered occupational segregation characterising the New Zealand labour market may reflect the candidate pool that applies for those roles, rather than a preference for men over women (Statistics New Zealand, 2015).

Interestingly, the participants in our study favoured the perceived competence of women as candidates for a team leader role, regardless the division the participant belonged to. It is possible that the increased presence of female managers in New Zealand has reduced negative stereotypes around women as leaders and contributed to a societal shift in gendered stereotypes. In addition, with the societal emphasis on gender pay parity, representation of women on leadership boards/committees, and empowerment of women, it is likely that women may experience positive discrimination which directly acts to oppose the stereotypes

that traditionally have prevented them from achieving these positions in specific industries. Alternatively, due to the transparency of the current study, in combination with the recent women in leadership initiatives run at Organisation X, it is plausible that participants consciously chose women for the team leader.

Male participants perceived greater threats and less benefits from diversity than female participants, and were more likely to prefer homogeneity (male, Anglicised surnames) when selecting candidates. Gender differences in perceived diversity outcomes are well-established in the literature (Hofhuis et al., 2015; Hostager & De Meuse, 2008; Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Strauss et al., 2003). Within a work context, men have traditionally been less discriminated against than women. Given that diversity initiatives aim to redistribute power and rewards across different groups, men are most likely to be the group that will be most negatively affected by diversity, which may contribute to them perceiving fewer benefits and more threats than women (Kossek & Zonia, 1993). In addition, women have been traditionally viewed as being members of a minority group, which may cause them to identify more strongly with other minority groups and react more positively to diversity (Hostager & De Meuse, 2008).

Limitations and Future Research

Based on the findings of this study, there are some suggestions for researchers wishing to extend this study. First, while we aimed to randomise the order of candidates within the list, this resulted in an unintentional lower placement of the candidates with Asian surnames. Future studies need to be mindful of the placement of all candidate names in a list. Secondly, the sample size for non-European participants was very small in comparison to the NZ/European group. Future research should aim for larger samples from these ethnicity groups to explore differences further. Third, the ranking exercise did not provide useable information for the analyses. Due to time and practicality constraints, participants were asked to select only their top and bottom 4 candidates out of the 12 presented, and to rank within those groups. To use a ranking task in workplace settings, participants need to have ample time, a smaller candidate pool, or the number of tasks need to be reduced (e.g. overall job suitability as opposed to separate competence, social fit, and interview shortlist assessments). For samples and settings similar to our study, it may be more effective to use rating scales as opposed to ranking (Jackson & Fischer, 2007; Wilson et al., 2005; Wilson & Parker, 2007). Fourth, the inclusion of a typically male-dominated job such as engineering could provide a

comparison with the administration role to determine if the glass escalator effect is present (Harvie et al., 1998). Finally, further research could analyse the effect of participant industry/division on ethnicity cues. This research only anticipated the participants' division to influence gender selection choices for the team leader role, but the findings indicate that ethnicity cues may be more prone to stereotypes than gender cues.

Future research could look at qualitative research examining participants' reasoning for their selection choices, to explore if participants are able/willing to recognise and understand their own biases. Given the sensitivity of these issues, particularly in the context of hiring, social desirability is a serious consideration. The use of gender and ethnicity-based stereotypes can result in the user being negatively labelled as "sexist" or "racist" so while some may hold stereotypical views, the impact of social norms nudges them to actively reduce their public endorsement of them (Harvie et al., 1998). Some New Zealand studies have circumvented this by asking participants to answer from the perspective of another person (e.g. from the applicant (Harvie et al., 1998), or another HR professional (Coates & Carr, 2005) and found that this approach was effective in revealing actual gender and ethnicity-based beliefs.

Participants' perceptions of the benefits and threats of diversity were related to selection preferences. Future research could be conducted which groups participants based on their existing PDOs to see if those who perceive more positive PDOs show less disadvantage toward minority candidates. Given the complex nature of diversity attributes and outcomes, main effects approaches have reached their limits and moderating variables are being used to explain the when and why of diversity (Van Knippenberg et al., 2007).

The use of hypothetical candidates and a hypothetical job screening scenario limited the generalisability of findings. Further, the sample was not restricted to only include those actually tasked with hiring within the organisation, so the results do not reflect any actual barriers that applicants to Organisation X might face. There was intentionally little information provided regarding each candidate to reduce the time required from participants, and to avoid introducing confounding variables such as age, inferred class distinctions, university attended, and presentation of resume, which can influence selection (Derous & Decoster, 2017; Hiemstra et al., 2013). As a result, the selection task did not reflect a realistic hiring scenario. Future research could replicate a realistic hiring situation by providing full versions of resumes and job descriptions, and examining how the combination of ethnicity, gender, and experience

affects selection decisions. However, the sample may need to be restricted to HR professionals as opposed to participants organisation-wide.

The survey did not replicate the likely pool of real-world applicants. It is not expected that Māori and Asian applicants would make up two thirds of the total applicants for these roles, nor would it be realistic to expect equal distributions of men and women applicants for both roles. However, considering the differences between these hypothetical applicants, any real-world effects are likely to be magnified as they represent a much smaller proportion of the applicant pool in reality.

This research highlights the challenges that are present when conducting research using workplace samples. In order to further this field of research, provide tangible foundations and strategies for organisations, and improve employment outcomes for women and ethnic minority groups in New Zealand, I encourage researchers to move beyond student samples and design research which is practical and relevant for New Zealand organisations.

Implications for businesses

To the best of my knowledge, this study is the first in New Zealand to use hypothetical hiring scenarios with a broad workplace sample, to explore the effect of biases and stereotypes on selection decisions. The most important implication of these findings is that gender and ethnicity are used in initial resume screening, suggesting that biases and stereotypes may still drive workplace decision-making. Due to progress in the empowerment of women and increased opportunities for ethnic minorities, a common perception is that gender and ethnicity-based discrimination is a thing of the past (Harvie et al., 1998; Kossek et al., 2005; Son Hing et al., 2008). This research suggests that biases and stereotypes still exist, although in subtler forms.

Recruiters and hiring managers need to be aware of the processes that can influence selection decisions during resume screening, as this has significant implications (Wilson & Parker, 2007). At an individual level, selection biases lower the likelihood of being offered a job despite having the required qualifications; particularly for ethnic minority candidates. At an organisational level, organisations limit their access to broad pools of talent with a range of

beneficial knowledge, skills, and insights (Hofhuis et al., 2015). At a societal level, these biases can distort labour markets and reduce the efficiencies of sourcing appropriate labour and distributing relevant skills (Wilson & Parker, 2007). While there are no simple rules or solutions to managing diversity, some areas to look at based on the findings of this study have been provided.

Anonymous resume screening

The first step organisations may consider is a critical analysis of current selection and recruitment procedures, selection criteria, selection tools, and accessibility of job opportunities (Shen et al., 2009). The removal of candidates' names from resumes could avoid gender or ethnicity cues triggering social categorisation based on candidate name. This strategy has shown some improvement in outcomes for women and ethnic minorities (Aslund & Skans, 2012), but organisations must ensure that barriers are not simply being moved to later stages such as the interview, training and development, or promotion (Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Kossek et al., 2005). Further, organisations need to ensure that gender and ethnicity cues are not sought through other means such as social media, or other information in the resume (Black & Johnson, 2012; Heilman & Caleo, 2018).

Broaden the criteria for a successful candidate

Candidates' level of experience carries a large weighting when assessing job suitability. The challenge for organisations is to shape selection and recruitment processes so that new employees are selected on the basis of both their level of competence and their broader contribution to the workplace (Hofhuis et al., 2016; Ryan & Tippins, 2004). Recognising the importance of broad range of behaviours will increase the range of successful applicants and assist organisations in creating a pro-diversity climate.

Suggestions for job seekers

As New Zealand becomes increasingly diverse, individuals' names may not match established gender associations or ethnicity stereotypes. Surnames do not always reflect ethnicity, cultural identity, or linguistic skills. Candidates whose surnames may trigger established biases may need other ways to get their foot in the door, as reporting qualifications and experience may

not be enough to counteract the effects of social categorisation. Proactive approaches such as phoning recruiters, or arranging face-to-face meetings to discuss the job may need to be adopted.

Training

Many initiatives for training, retaining and promoting women and minorities have not been successful (Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Hostager & De Meuse, 2002; Kossek et al., 2005; Noon, 2018). In particular, those aimed at reducing stereotypes and biases have resulted in virtually no benefit, and often created worse outcomes (Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Hostager & De Meuse, 2002; Kalev et al., 2006). Alternatively, perceptions of the threats and benefits of diversity can be manipulated even by simple tasks prior to a selection exercise and have been found to influence selection decisions (Hofhuis et al., 2016). Taken in combination with the findings from the present study, organisations should focus training initiatives on the real threats and benefits of diversity for workgroups in order to provide a realistic view of diversity. Existing differences in perceptions of diversity should be incorporated into training to ensure that the content is tailored for each organisation, division, team, or individual, while also working in line with the overall organisational strategy (Hostager & De Meuse, 2008; Shen et al., 2009).

Conclusion

The current research is based on the premise that biases and stereotypes are a naturally occurring cognitive process, which are a product of our cultural backgrounds, repeated observations of events, societal norms, and social interactions. During selection processes such as resume screening where information and time are limited, these processes are likely to support decision-making in order to fill in gaps and make a timely decision. The ethnic disadvantage found in this research supports behaviour as predicted by Similarity Attraction theory, however similar results were not found to confidently support gender role stereotypes as predicted by the Lack of Fit theory. There is evidence to suggest that perceptions of diversity are related to selection decisions, and this may be a productive strategy for organisations to adopt in training initiatives. Further research is required in order to further define these relationships, but I hope that this research provides a platform for other New Zealand researchers to build upon, and that organisations will use these findings to review their selection processes and inform future training.

REFERENCES

Antwi-Boasiako, K. B. (2008). The Dilemma of Hiring Minorities and Conservative Resistance: The Diversity Game. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 35*(3), 225-231.

Appel-Meulenbroek, R., Groenen, P., & Janssen, I. (2011). An end-user's perspective on activity-based office concepts. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate, 13*(2), 122-135.

Arrow, K. J. (1973). The Theory of Discrimination. In O. Ashonfelter & A. Rees (Eds.), *Discrimination in Labour Markets*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Aslund, O., & Skans, O. (2012). Do Anonymous Job Application Procedures Level the Playing Field? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 65*(1), 82-107.

Avery, D. R., & McKay, P. F. (2006). Target Practice: An Organizational Impression Management Approach To Attracting Minority And Female Job Applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1), 157-187. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00807.x

Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., Wilson, D. C., & Tonidandel, S. (2007). Unequal attendance: The relationships between race, organizational diversity cues, and absenteeism. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 875-902.

Bagues, M. F., & Esteve-Volart, B. (2010). Can Gender Parity Break the Glass Ceiling? Evidence from a Repeated Randomized Experiment. *The Review of Economic Studies, 77*(4), 1301-1328.

Becker, G. (1957). *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Berdahl, J. L., & Min, J. A. (2012). Prescriptive stereotypes and workplace consequences for East Asians in North America. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18*(2), 141-152.

Berthoin Antal, A., & Izraeli, D. N. (1993). A global comparison of women in management: Women managers in their homelands and as expatriates. In E. Fagenson (Ed.), *Women in management: Trends, issues, and challenges in managerial diversity* (pp. 52-96). Newbury Park: CA: Sage.

Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination. *The American Economic Review, 94*(4), 991-1013.

Biernat, M., & Fuegen, K. (2001). Shifting Standards and the Evaluation of Competence: Complexity in Gender-Based Judgment and Decision Making. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 707.

Black, S. L., & Johnson, A. F. (2012). Employer's Use of Social Networking Sites in the Selection Process. *The Journal of Social Media in Society, 1*(1), 7-28.

Blommaert, L., Coenders, M., & Tubergen, F. (2014). Ethnic Discrimination in Recruitment and Decision Makers' Features: Evidence from Laboratory Experiment and Survey Data using a Student Sample. *Social Indicators Research, 116*(3), 731-754. doi:10.1007/s11205-013-0329-4

Blommaert, L., Tubergen, F., & Coenders, M. (2012). Implicit and explicit interethnic atttudes and ethnic discrimination in hiring. *Social Science Research, 41*, 61-73.

Booth, A., & Leigh, A. (2010). Do employers discriminate by gender? A field experiment in female-dominated occupations. *Economics Letters, 107*, 236-238.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 99-109. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3

Bowers, C. A., Pharmer, J. A., & Salas, E. (2000). When member homogeneity is needed in work teams - A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research, 31*, 305-327.

Brief, A., & Barsky, A. (2000). Establishing a climate for diversity: The inhibition of prejudiced reactions in the workplace. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management, 19*, 91-129.

Brooks, M. E., Guidroz, A. M., & Chakrabarti, M. (2009). Distinction bias in applicant reactions to using diversity information in selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 17*(4), 377-390. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00480.x

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.

Callister, P. (2007). *Special Measures to Reduce Ethnic Disadvantage in New Zealand: An Examination of Their Role* (B. Hill Ed.). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies

Carlsson, M. (2011). Does Hiring Discrimination Cause Gender Segregation in the Swedish Labor Market? *Feminist Economics, 17*(3), 71-201.

Carrell, M. R., Mann, E. E., & Sigler, T. H. (2006). Defining Workforce Diversity Programs And Practices In Organizations: A Longitudinal Study. *Labor Law Journal, 57*(1), 5-12.

Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. J. (2001). The Influence of Demographic Heterogeneity on the Emergence and Consequences of Cooperative Norms in Work Teams. *The Academy of Management Journal, 44*(5), 956-974.

Coates, K., & Carr, S. (2005). Skilled immigrants and selection bias: A theory-based field study from New Zealand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 577-599.

Cole, M. S., Field, H. S., & Giles, W. F. (2004). Interaction of Recruiter and Applicant Gender in Resume Evalaution: A Field Study. *Sex Roles, 51*(9/10), 597-608.

Colella, A., Hebi, M., & King, E. (2017). One Hundred Years of Discrimination Research in Journal of Applied Psychology: A Sobering Synopsis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000084

Cook, M. (2009). Minorities, fairness and the law. In *Personnel selection: Adding value through people* (5 ed., pp. 250-282). Chichester:John Wiley & Sons

Cox, T. (1991). The multicultural organisation. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*, 34-47.

Davison, H. K., & Burke, M. J. (2000). Sex Discrimination in Simulation Employment Contexts: A Meta-analytic Investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*, 225-248.

De Meuse, K. P., & Hostager, T. J. (2001). Developing an instrument for measuring attitudes toward and perceptions of workplace diversity: An initial report. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*(1), 33-51. doi:10.1002/1532-1096(200101/02)12:1<33::AID-HRDQ4>3.0.CO;2-P

Department of Internal Affairs. (2014, 14/08/2014). Top Twenty New Zealand Surnames. Retrieved 15 November 2018

Department of Internal Affairs. (2017). Most Popular Male and Female First Names. *Top 100 boys' and girls' names from 1954 to 2017.* Retrieved 15 November 2018

Derous, E., & Decoster, J. (2017). Implicit Age Cues in Resumes: Subtle Effects on Hiring Discrimination. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1-15.

Derous, E., Nguyen, H.-H., & Ryan, A. M. (2009). Hiring Discrimination Against Arab Minorities: Interactions Between Prejudice and Job Characteristics. *Human Performance, 22*(4), 297-320. doi:10.1080/08959280903120261

Derous, E., Pepermans, R., & Ryan, A. M. (2017). Ethnic Discrimination during resume screening: Interactive effects of applicants' ethnic salience with job context. *Human Relations, 70*(7), 860-882.

Derous, E., & Ryan, A. M. (2012). Documenting the Adverse Impact of Resume Screening: Degree of ethnic identification matters. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 20*(464-474).

Derous, E., Ryan, A. M., & Serlie, A. W. (2015). Double Jeopardy upon resume screening: when achmed is less employable than aisha *Personnel Psychology, 68, 659-696*.

Diversity Works NZ. (2018). *New Zealand Diversity Survey*.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573-598.

Ellison, S. F., & Mullin, W. P. (2014). Diversity, Social Goods Provision, and Performance in the Firm *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy, 23*(2), 465-481.

Elsesser, K. M., & Lever, J. (2011). Does gender bias against female leaders persist? Quantitative and qualitative data from a large-scale survey. *Human Relations, 64*(12), 1555-1578.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: the effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*(2), 229-273. doi:10.2307/2667087

Employment Relations Act 2000.

Ericksson, S., & Lagerstrom, J. (2012). Detecting discrimination in the hiring process: evidence from an Internet-based search channel. *Empirical Economics, 43*, 537-563.

Eriksson, S., & Lagerström, J. (2012). Detecting discrimination in the hiring process: evidence from an Internet-based search channel. *Empirical Economics, 43*(2), 537-563.

Faraj, S., & Sproull, L. (2000). Coordinating expertise in software development teams. *Management Sci., 46*(12), 1554-1568.

Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54,297-327.

Gatewood, R. D., Field, H. S., & Barrick, M. (2016). The Selection Interview In *Human Resource Selection* (8 ed., pp. 433-483). OH:Thomson/South-Western: Mason.

Gelfand, M. J., Nishii, L. H., Raver, J. L., & Schneider, B. (2005). Discrimination in organizations: An organization-level systems perspective. . In R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases* (pp. 89-116). Mahwah: NJ: Erlbaum.

Goldberg, C. B. (2005). Relational demography and similarity-attraction in interview assessments and subsequent offer decisions - Are we missing something? *Group and Organization Management, 30*(6), 597-624. doi:10.1177/1059601104267661

Goldin, C., & Rouse, C. (2000). Orchestrating Impartiality: The Impact of 'Blind' Auditions on Female Musicians. *American Economic Review, 90*, 715-741.

Gonzalez, J. A., & Denisi, A. S. (2009). Cross-Level Effects of Demography and Diversity Climate on Organizational Attachment and Firm Effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(1), 21-40. doi:10.1002/job.498

Greenwald, A., McGhee, D., & Schwartz, J. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1464-1480.

Groggins, A., Ryan, A. M., Guillaume, Y. R. F., Dawson, J. F., Woods, S. A., Sacramento, C. A., & West, M. A. (2013). Embracing uniqueness: The underpinnings of a positive climate for diversity. *Getting diversity at work to work*, 264-282.

Guenole, N., Taylor, P. J., & Englert, P. (2003). Ethnic group differences in cognitive ability test scores within a New Zealand applicant sample. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 32*(1), 49-54.

Guest, D. (2004). Flexible employment contracts, the psychological contract and employee outcomes: an analysis and review of the evidence. *International Journal Of Management Reviews, 5-6*(1), 1-19.

Guillaume, Y. R. F., Dawson, J. F., Otaye-Ebede, L., Woods, S. A., & West, M. A. (2017). Harnessing demographic differences in organisations: What moderates the effects of workplace diversity? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 38*, 276-303.

Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1199-1228. doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.26586096

Harrison, D. A., Kravitz, D. A., Mayer, D. M., Leslie, L. M., & Levarey, D. (2006). Understanding attitudes toward affirmative action programs in employment: summary and meta-analysis of 35 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1013-1036.

Harvard University. (2009, March 13 2009). Social Sciences Statistics Blog. *English First Names for Chinese Americans* Retrieved 15 November 2018

Harvie, K., Marshall-McCaskey, J., & Johnston, L. (1998). Gender-based biases in occupational hiring decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*(18), 1698-1711. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01341.x

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behaviour, 5*, 269-298.

Heilman, M. E., & Caleo, S. (2018). Combatting gender discrimination: A lack of fit framework. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 21*(5), 725-744.

Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behavior, di erent consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 431-441.

Hiemstra, A. M. F., Derous, E., Serlie, A. W., & Born, M. P. (2013). Ethnicity Effects in Graduates' Resume Content. *Applied Psychology: And International Review, 62*(3), 427 - 453.

Himmelstein, J., & Gopalakrishnan, G. (2017). Tackling Implicit and Explicit Bias Through Games That Teach Workplace Diversity. *Proceedings of the European Conference on Games Based Learning*, 244-252.

Hofhuis, J., van der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2015). Measuring employee perception on the effects of cultural diversity at work: development of the Benefits and Threats of Diversity Scale. *Quality and Quantity, 49*, 177-201.

Hofhuis, J., van der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2016). Dealing with differences: the impact of perceived diversity outcomes on selection and assessment of minority candidates. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(12), 1319-1339.

Homan, A., Van Knippenberg, D., Van Kleef, G., & De Dreu, C. (2007). Bridging Faultlines by Valuing Diversity: Diversity Beliefs, Information Elaboration, and Performance in Diverse Work Groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(5), 1189-1199.

Homan, A. C., Hollenbeck, J. R., Humphrey, S. E., Van Knippenberg, D., Ilgen, D. R., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2008). Facing Differences with an Open Mind: Openness to Experience, Salience of Intragroup Differences, and Performance of Diverse Work Groups. *The Academy of Management Journal, 51*(6), 1204-1222.

Horwitz, S. K., & Horwitz, I. B. (2007). The Effects of Team Diversity on Team Outcomes: A Meta-Analytic Review of Team Demography. *Journal of Management, 33*(6), 987-1015.

Hostager, T. J., & De Meuse, K. P. (2002). Assessing the Complexity of Diversity Perceptions: Breadth, Depth, and Balance. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(2), 189-206.

Hostager, T. J., & De Meuse, K. P. (2008). The effects of a diversity learning experience on positive and negative diversity perceptions. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 23*(3-4), 127-139. doi:10.1007/s10869-008-9085-x

Houkamau, C., & Boxall, P. (2011). The incidence and impacts of diversity management: A survey of New Zealand employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 49*(4), 440-460. doi:10.1177/1038411111422314

Hsiao, F., & Kleiner, B. H. (2002). How to hire employees effectively. *Management Research News, 25*(1), 49-59.

Huckman, R. S., & Staats, B. R. (2011). Fluid Tasks and Fluid Teams: e Impact of Diversity in Experience and Team Familiarity on Team Performance. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management, 13*(3), 310-328.

Human Rights Act 1993.

Human Rights Commission. (2019). Human rights legislation - New Zealand Retrieved 25 March 2019 from https://www.hrc.co.nz/your-rights/human-rights-legislation-new-zealand/

Jackson, B., & Fischer, R. (2007). Biculturalism in Employee Selection or 'Who Should Get the Job'? Perceptions of Maori and Pakeha Job Applicants in a NZ European Student Sample. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 36*(2), 100-108.

Jacques, P. (1991). Legal and ethical issues in psychological assessment. . In C. P. Hansen & K. A. Conrad (Eds.), *A handbook of psychlogical assessment in business* (pp. 313 - 330). New York: Quorum Books.

Jawahar, I. M., & Mattson, J. (2005). Sexism and beeautyism effects in selection as a function of self-monitoring level of decision maker. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 563-537.

Jayne, M. E. A., & Dipboye, R. L. (2004). Leveraging Diversity To Improve Business Performance: Research Findings And Recommendations For Organizations. *Human Resource Management, 43*(4), 409-424.

Jones, D., Pringle, J., & Shepherd, D. (2000). "Managing Diversity" meets Aotearoa/New Zealand *Personnel Review, 29*(3), 364-380.

Kaas, L., & Manger, C. (2012). Ethnic discrimination in Germany's labour market: A field experiment. *German Economic Review, 13*(1), 1-20. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0475.2011.00538.x

Kaiser, R. B., & Wallace, W. T. (2016). Gender bias and substantive differences in leadership behaviour: toward a new narrative. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 68*(1), 72-98.

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *Evaluation de l'efficaité de l'action anti-discriminatoire dans l'entreprise*(4), 589-617.

King, E., Madera, J. M., Hebl, M. R., Knight, J. L., & Mendoza, S. A. (2006). What's in a Name? A Multiracial Investigation of the Role of Occupational Stereotypes in Selection Decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(5), 1145-1159.

Koch, A. J., Sackett, P. R., & D'Mello, S. D. (2015). A Meta-Analysis of Gender Stereotypes and Bias in Experimental Simulations of Employment Decision Making. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(1), 128-161.

Koenig, A. M., Mitchell, A. A., Eagly, A. H., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are Leader Stereotypes Masculine? A Meta-Analysis of Three Research Paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(4), 616-642.

Konrad, A. M., & Linnehan, F. (1995). Race and sex differences in line managers' reactions to equal employment opportunity and affirmative action intervention. *Group and Organization Management, 20*, 409-439.

Kossek, E. E., Lobel, S. A., & Brown, J. (2005). Human Resource Strategies to Manage Workforce Diversity In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J. M. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Diversity* (pp. 54-74). CA: Thousand Oaks

Kossek, E. E., & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field sudy of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 61-81.

Kramer, R. (1991). Intergroup relations and organisational dilemmas: The role of categorisation processes. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organisational behaviour* (Vol. 13, pp. 191-228). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. (2005). Interactions within Groups and Subgroups: The Effects of Demographic Faultlines. *The Academy of Management Journal, 48*(4), 645-659.

Lee, S. Y., Pitesa, M., Insead, S. T., & Pillutla, M. M. (2015). Discrimination in Selection Decisions: Integrating Stereotype Fit and Interdependence Theories. *Academy of Management Journal, 58*(3), 789-812.

Lonsway, K. A. (2003). Tearing down the wall: problems with consistency, validity, and adverse impact of physical agility testing in police selection. *Police Quarterly, 6*(3), 237-277.

Lorenzo, R., & Reeves, M. (2018). How and Where Diversity Drives Financial Performance Retrieved 28 January 2019, from Harvard Business Review

Lorenzo, R., Voigt, N., Tsusaka, M., Krentz, M., & Abouzahr, K. (2018). How Diverse Leadership Teams Boost Innovation.

Martell, R. F., Lane, D. M., & Emrich, C. (1996). Mae-female differences: A computer simulation. *American Psychologist, 51*(2), 157-158. doi:http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.51.2.157

McLean Parks, J., Kidder, D. L., & Gallagher, D. G. (1998). Fitting Square Pegs into round Holes: Mapping the Domain of Contingent Work Arrangements onto the Psychological Contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(1), 697-730.

McLeod, P. L., & Lobel, S. A. (1996). Ethnic diversity and creativity in small groups. *Small Group Research, 27*, 248-265.

McMahon, A. M. (2010). Does Workplace Diversity Matter? A Survey of Empirical Studies on Diversity and Firm Performance, 2000-09. *Journal of Diversity Management, 5*(2), 37-48.

Miles, A., & Sadler-Smith, E. (2014). "With recruitment i always feel i need to listen to my gut": the role of intuition in employee selection. *Personnel Review, 43*(4), 606-627.

Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for Common Threads: Understanding the Multiple Effects of Diversity in Organizational Groups. *The Academy of Management Review, 21*(2), 402-433.

Ministry of Social Development. (2016). The Social Report 2016 - Te purongo oranga tangata. Retrieved 16 March 2019 from http://socialreport.msd.govt.nz/paid-work/unemployment.html

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., & Graham, M. J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109*(41), 16474-16479.

Nakui, T., Paulus, P. B., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2011). The role of attitudes in reactions toward diversity in workgroups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*(10), 2327-2351. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00818.x

New Zealand Council for Educational Research. (2008). *Trading Choices: Young people's career decisions and gender segregation in the trades*. Retrieved 16 March 2019 from https://women.govt.nz/sites/public_files/trading-choices-young-peoples-decisions-and-gender-segregation-in-the-trades.pdf.

Ng, E. S. W., & Sears, G. J. (2010). The effect of adverse impact in selection practices on organizational diversity: A field study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(9), 1454-1471. doi:10.1080/09585192.2010.488448

Noon, M. (2018). Pointless Diversity Training: Unconscious Bias, New Racism and Agency *Work, Employment and Society, 32*(1), 198-209.

Nosek, B. A. (2007). Implicit-explicit relations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*, 65-69.

OECD. (2015). *OECD Economic Surveys: Belgium 2015*. OECD Economic Surveys: Belgium.

Pearson, D. (2005). Citizenship, identity and belonging: addressing the mythologies of the unitary nation state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J. H. Lui, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand Identities: departures and destinations* (pp. 21-37). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.

Perry, E. L., Davis-Blake, A., & Kulik, C. T. (1994). Explaining Gender-Based Selection Decisions: A Synthesis of Contextual and Cognitive Approches. *Academy of Management Review, 19*(4), 786-820.

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2000). *The Knowing-Doing Gap: How Smart Companies Turn Knowledge Into Action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Ployhart, R. E., & Holtz, B. C. (2008). The Diversity–Validity Dilemma: Strategies For Reducing Racioethnic And Sex Subgroup Differences And Adverse Impact In Selection. *Personnel Psychology, 61*(1), 153-172. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00109.x

Podsiadlowski, A. (2007). *Managing culturally diverse workforces: issues of recruitment and selection.* Paper presented at the Pathways, circuits and crossroads: New public good research on population, migration and community dynamics seminar, Wellington, New Zealand

Ragins, B. (2002). Understanding diversified mentoring relationships: Definitions, strategies, and challenges. . In D. Clutterbuck & B. Ragins (Eds.), *Mentoring anddiversity: An international perspective* (pp. 23-31). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinman.

Ranganath, K. A., Smith, C. T., & Nosek, B. A. (2006). Distinguishing automatic and controlled components of attitudes from direct and indirect measurement methods. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 386-396.

Riach, P. A., & Rich, J. (2006). An Experimental Investigation of Sexual Discrimination in Hiring in the English Labor Market. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 6*(2), 1-20.

Richard, O. C. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 164-177. doi:10.2307/1556374

Rooth, D. O. (2010). Automatic associations and discrimination in hiring: Real world evidence. *Labour Economics, 17*(3), 523-534. doi:10.1016/j.labeco.2009.04.005

Roth, P. L., Bevier, C. A., Bobko, P., Switzer, F. S., & Tyler, P. (2001). Ethnic group differences in cognitive ability in employment and educational settings: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 297-330.

Ryan, A. M., & Tippins, N. T. (2004). Attracting and Selecting: What psychological research tells us. *Human Resource Management, 43*(4), 305-318.

Sacco, J. M., & Schmitt, N. (2005). A dynamic multilevel model of demographic diversity and misfit effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 203-231.

Sackett, P. R., Schmitt, N., Ellingson, J. E., & Kabin, M. B. (2001). High-stakes testing in employment, credentialing, and higher education. Prospects in a post-affirmative-action world. *The American psychologist, 56*(4), 302 - 318. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.4.302

Sauers, D. A., Kennedy, J. C., & O'Sullivan, D. O. (2002). Managerial sex role stereotyping: a New Zealand perspective. *Women in Management Review, 17*(7), 342-347.

Schein, V. E. (2001). A Global Look at Psychological Barriers to Women's Progress in Management *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 675-688.

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology: Practical and Theoretical Implications of 85 Years of Research Findings. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*(2), 262-274.

Schneider, B. (1987). The People Make The Place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437-453.

Schneider, B., Smith, D. B., & Paul, M. C. (2001). P-E Fit and the attraction-selection-attrition model of organizational functioning: Introduction and overview. In M. Erez & U. Kleinbeck (Eds.), *Work motivation in the context of a globalizing economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Shaughnessy, B., Braunt, S., Hentschels, T., & Peuss, C. V. (2016). Diverse and just? The role of quota-based selection policies on organizational outcomes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 46*, 880-890.

Shen, J., Chanda, A., Monga, M., & D'Netto, B. (2009). Managing diversity through human resource management: An international perspective and conceptual framework. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 20*(2), 235-251. doi:10.1080/09585190802670516

Singer, M., & Eder, G. S. (1989b). Effects of ethnicity, accent, and job status on selection decisions. *International journal of psychology*(1), 13-34.

Smith, K. G., Smith, K. A., J.D., O., Sims, H. P., O'Bannon, D. P., & Scully, J. A. (1994). Top management team demography and process: The role of social integration and communication. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*, 412-438.

Son Hing, L. S., Chung-Yan, G. A., Hamilton, L. K., & Zanna, M. P. (2008). A Two-Dimensional Model That Employs Explicit and Implicit Attitudes to Characterize Prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(6), 971-987. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.6.971

Spreitzer, G., Cameron, L., & Garrett, L. (2017). Alternative work arrangements: Two images of the new world of work. *Annual Review of Organisational Psychology and Organisational Behaviour, 4*, 473-499.

Stanley, D., Phelps, E. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2008). The neural basis of implicit attitudes. . *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 17*(2), 164-170.

Statistics New Zealand. (2012). *Working together: Racial discrimination in New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/asian-peoples/racial-discrimination-in-nz.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2013). *2013 Census QuickStats about national highlights*. Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/quickstats-about-national-highlights.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2015). *Women at Work: 1991 - 2013*. Wellington, New Zealand Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/Women/women-occupation.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2017, 3 October 2017). Ethnic populations projected to grow across New Zealand. Retrieved 6 February 2019 from

https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/ethnic-populations-projected-to-grow-across-new-zealand

Statistics New Zealand. (2018, 7 February 2019). Labour market statistics: December 2018. Retrieved 6 February 2019 from https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/labour-market-statistics-december-2018-quarter

Strauss, J. P., Connerly, M. L., & Ammermann, P. A. (2003). The "Threat Hypothesis," Personality, and Attitudes Toward Diversity. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 39*(1), 32-52.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1968). The social identity of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology and intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Taylor, P., Keelty, Y., & McDonnell, B. (2002). Evolving Personnel Selection Practices in New Zealand Organisations and Recruitment Firms. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 31*(1), 8-18

Tropp, L. R., & Bianchi, R. A. (2006). Valuing Diversity and Interest in Intergroup Contact. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*(3), 533-551. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00472.x

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organisational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 549-579.

Tsusaka, M., Reeves, M., Hurder, S., & Harnoss, J. (2017, 21 July). Diversity at Work Retrieved 10 February 2019 from https://bcghendersoninstitute.com/diversity-at-work-df670c1254fe

Tziner, A., & Eden, D. (1985). Effects of crew composition on crew performance:Does the whole equal the sum of its parts? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*, 85-93.

Van Knippenberg, D., Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2007). Unity Through Diversity: Value-in-Diversity Beliefs, Work Group Diversity, and Group Identification. . *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 11*(3), 207-222.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work Group Diversity *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 515-541.

Van Knippenberg, D., Van Ginkel, W. P., & Homan, A. C. (2013). Diversity mindsets and the performance of diverse teams. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes : a journal of fundamental research and theory in applied psychology, 121*(2), 183-193.

Varuhas, J., Fursman, L., & Jacobsen, V. (2003). *Work and Family Balance: An Economic View*. New Zealand Treasury. Retrieved from https://treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2018-01/twp03-26.pdf

Walby, S., & Olsen, W. (2002). *The impact of women's position in the labour market on pay and implications for productivity*. London: Women and Equality Unit (DTI).

Ward, C., & Masgoret, A. M. (2007). Immigrant entry into the workforce: A research note from New Zealand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*(4), 525-530. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.03.001

Watson, W. E., Kumar, K., & Michaelson, L. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogenous and diverse task groups. . *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 590-602.

Webber, S. S., & Donahue, L. M. (2001). Impact of highly and less job-related diversity on work group cohesion and performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 27, 141-162.

Weichselbaumber, D. (2004). Is it Sex or Personality? The Impact of Sex-Stereotypes on Discrimination in Applicant Selection. *Eastern Economic Journal, 30*(2), 159-186.

Wentling, R. M. (2004). Factors that assist and barriers that hinder the success of diversity initiatives in multinational corporations. *Human Resource Development International, 7*(2), 165-180.

Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and Diversity in Organisations: A Review of 40 Years of Research. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 20, 77-140

Wilson, M. G., Gahlout, P., Liu, L., & Mouly, S. (2005). A rose by any other name: The effect of ethnicity and name on access to employment. *University of Auckland Business Review,*(Spring 2005), 65-72.

Wilson, M. G., & Parker, P. (2007). The Gap Between Immigration And Employment: A Policy-Capturing Analysis of Ethnicity-Driven Selection Biases. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations, 32*(1), 28-44.

Windscheid, L., Bowes-Sperry, L., Mazei, J., & Morner, M. (2017). The Paradox of Diversity Initiatives: When Organizational Needs Differ from Employee Preferences. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145, 33-48.

Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2010). Gender. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5 ed., Vol. 2, pp. 629-667). New York: Wiley.

Zschirnt, E., & Ruedin, D. (2016). Ethnic discrimination in hiring decisions: a meta-analysis of correspondence tests 1990–2015. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies, 42*(7), 1115-1134. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2015.1133279

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Ethics Approval Notification

HoU Review Group
A/Pro Ross Flett

Ethics Notification Number: 4000020303
Title: Diversity in New Zealand organisations: A Case Study

Thank you for your notification which you have assessed as Low Risk.

Your project has been recorded in our system which is reported in the Annual Report of the Massey University Human Ethics Committee.

The low risk notification for this project is valid for a maximum of three years.

Please note that travel undertaken by students must be approved by the supervisor and the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor and be in accordance with the Policy and Procedures for Course-Related Student Travel Overseas. In addition, the supervisor must advise the University's Insurance Officer.

A reminder to include the following statement on all public documents:

"This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named in this document are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.
If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you want to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Professor Craig Johnson, Director (Research Ethics), email humanethics@massey.ac.nz. "

Please note that if a sponsoring organisation, funding authority or a journal in which you wish to publish require evidence of committee approval (with an approval number), you will have to complete the application form again answering yes to the publication question to provide more information to go before one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. You should also note that such an approval can only be provided prior to the commencement of the research.

You are reminded that staff researchers and supervisors are fully responsible for ensuring that the information in the lowrisk notification has met the requirements and guidelines for submission of a low risk notification.

If you wish to print an official copy of this letter, please login to the RIMS system, and under the Reporting section, View Reports you will find a link to run the LR Report.

Yours sincerely

Professor Craig Johnson
Chair, Human Ethics Chairs' Committee and
Director (Research Ethics)

APPENDIX B: Survey

Note. Depending on which group the participant was in, they were presented with either the team leader description, or the administrator description. Both have been included for your reference.

Selecting staff in New Zealand organisations

Information Sheet

My name is Jess Voon and I am a Masters' student currently completing my thesis at Massey University. My research project is concerned with the factors which people in New Zealand organisations think are important when selecting staff. I am seeking your personal opinions based on past observations and experiences in the workplace and would like to invite you to participate in this study.

What's in it for you?

- An opportunity to contribute to the shaping of current selection processes so that they are efficient in finding the right people to work in your organisation.
- An entry in the draw to win one of five $50 Pressy Cards.

What is involved?

- An online survey which will take roughly 15 minutes to complete.
- Participation is completely voluntary and anonymous; your name will not be linked to your answers.
- If there are questions you do not want to answer, you can leave them out.
- Only summary data will be reported to the organisation concerned, and no information which could identify individuals will be reported.
- Once you have completed the survey, you will be directed to an external, independent web-page, which will provide you with details on how to win a $50 Pressy Card.

If you would like to participate in this study, please click on the "**Next**" button below which will take you to the online survey.

Thank you for your time,
Jess Voon

Contact information

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact myself or my supervisor.

Researcher
Jess Voon
███████████████

Supervisor
Dr Dianne Gardner
School of Psychology
Massey University
Palmerston North New Zealand
+64 6 3569-099 ext 43441
D.H.Gardner@massey.ac.nz

Massey University School of Psychology – Te Kura Hinengaro Tangata
Palmerston North, New Zealand
T +64 6 3569-099 ext 85071 : W psychology.massey.ac.nz

This research project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk.
Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees.
The researchers named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with
someone other than the researchers, please contact Professor Craig Johnson, Director(Research
Ethics),email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

Consent

Respondent Consent

Thank you for participating in this questionnaire.
Your participation implies consent.
You have the right to decline to answer any particular question.

I have read and understood the information sheet for this study and consent to collection of
my responses.
(Please click on the 'Yes' choice if you wish to proceed.)

Yes
No

Selecting staff in New Zealand organisations

Please review the below excerpt from a job description for a Team Leader role in order to answer the questions that follow.

Team Leader

The successful candidate in this role will be required to:

- drive and implement key strategies that support your team's key functioning and goals
- have a strong alignment with the organisation's values
- have high motivation and ability to perform
- show excellent written and verbal communication skills
- effectively lead a team
- be responsible for team engagement, staff development, coaching and mentoring.

On the next page are 12 fictional candidates. Please imagine that they are all applying for this type of job in your division and you have been asked to help shortlist the candidates for an interview.

Please rank the 4 most preferred candidates and the 4 least preferred candidates by dragging and dropping each of their names into the boxes in the opposite column. You will be asked to do this twice, each time with the same candidates, but thinking about different ways that they might fit with your workgroup.

When answering, please go off your first reaction and do not 'overthink' your responses. It is also important to keep in mind that **there are no "right" or "wrong" answers**.

Please note: once you start the survey, you will not be able to go back once you click "Next".

[TEAM LEADER DESCRIPTION]

Part 1: Competence

All of the fictional candidates presented below are of a similar age, have the same qualifications and are working in similar jobs at present.

From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 **most** preferred candidates (where 1=the candidate you would prefer most of all) and the 4 **least** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer least of all) based on who you think is most likely to be **competent for the job**.

Just drag and drop four of the names into each of the ranking boxes and then move them to rank according to preference.

Items

Sarah Williams: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Wiremu Hamuera: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Aroha Henare: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Amy Liu: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Jessica Taylor: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Michael Smith: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Jenny Li: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Daniel Brown: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Tama Ropata: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Kevin Wang: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Marama Kingi: 24 months experience in a team leader role

David Zhang: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Most preferred candidates

Least preferred candidates

[TEAM LEADER DESCRIPTION]

Part 2 - Social fit

All of the fictional candidates presented below are of a similar age, have the same qualifications and are working in similar jobs at present.

From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 **most** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer most of all) and the 4 **least** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer least of all) based on who you think is most likely to be **expect to fit well socially** within the organisation.

Just drag and drop four of the names into each of the ranking boxes and then move them to rank according to preference.

Items

Sarah Williams: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Wiremu Hamuera: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Aroha Henare: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Amy Liu: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Jessica Taylor: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Michael Smith: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Jenny Li: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Daniel Brown: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Tama Ropata: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Kevin Wang: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Marama Kingi: 24 months experience in a team leader role

David Zhang: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Most preferred candidates

Least preferred candidates

[TEAM LEADER DESCRIPTION]

Part 3: Interviews

All of the fictional candidates presented below are of a similar age, have the same qualifications and are working in similar jobs at present.

From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 candidates you would like to **shortlist for an interview** (where 1= the candidate you would prefer most of all).

Just drag and drop four of the names into each of the ranking boxes and then move them to rank according to preference.

Items

Sarah Williams: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Wiremu Hamuera: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Aroha Henare: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Amy Liu: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Jessica Taylor: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Michael Smith: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Jenny Li: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Daniel Brown: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

Tama Ropata: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Kevin Wang: 24 months experience in a team leader role.

Marama Kingi: 24 months experience in a team leader role

David Zhang: 36 months experience in a team leader role.

> **Interview shortlist**

Part 3 - Interviews

Please explain briefly why you shortlisted these candidates for an interview.

Selecting staff in New Zealand organisations

Please review the below excerpt from a job description for an Administrator role in order to answer the questions that follow.

Administrator

The successful candidate in this role will be required to:

- support and coordinate the key functioning requirements of the team
- actively support the organisation's strategies and goals
- have excellent written and verbal communication skills
- manage and plan their workload independently in order to meet deadlines
- deliver, encourage and be able to receive open and honest feedback

On the next page are 12 fictional candidates. Please imagine that they are all applying for this type of job in your division and you have been asked to help shortlist the candidates for an interview.

Please rank the 4 most preferred candidates and the 4 least preferred candidates by dragging and dropping each of their names into the boxes in the opposite column. You will be asked to do this twice, each time with the same candidates, but thinking about different ways that they might fit with your workgroup.

When answering, please go off your first reaction and do not 'overthink' your responses. It is also important to keep in mind that **there are no "right" or "wrong" answers**.

Please note: once you start the survey, you will not be able to go back once you click "Next".

[ADMINISTRATOR DESCRIPTION]

Part 1: Competence

All of the fictional candidates presented below are of a similar age, have the same qualifications and are working in similar jobs at present.

From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 **most** preferred candidates (where 1=the candidate you would prefer most of all) and the 4 **least** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer least of all) based on who you think is most likely to be **competent for the job**.

Just drag and drop four of the names into each of the ranking boxes and then move them to rank according to preference.

Items

Sarah Williams: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Wiremu Hamuera: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Aroha Henare: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Amy Liu: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Jessica Taylor: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Michael Smith: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Jenny Li: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Daniel Brown: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Tama Ropata: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Kevin Wang: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Marama Kingi: 12 months experience in an administrator role

David Zhang: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Most preferred candidates

Least preferred candidates

Part 2 - Social fit

All of the fictional candidates presented below are of a similar age, have the same qualifications and are working in similar jobs at present.

From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 **most** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer most of all) and the 4 **least** preferred candidates (where 1= the candidate you would prefer least of all) based on who you think is most likely to be **expect to fit well socially** within the organisation.

Just drag and drop four of the names into each of the ranking boxes and then move them to rank according to preference.

Items

Sarah Williams: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Wiremu Hamuera: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Aroha Henare: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Amy Liu: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Jessica Taylor: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Michael Smith: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Jenny Li: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Daniel Brown: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Tama Ropata: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Kevin Wang: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Marama Kingi: 12 months experience in an administrator role

David Zhang: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Most preferred candidates

Least preferred candidates

[ADMINISTRATOR DESCRIPTION]

Part 3: Interviews

All of the fictional candidates presented below are of a similar age, have the same qualifications and are working in similar jobs at present.

From the list of candidates below, please drag and drop the names of the 4 candidates you would like to **shortlist for an interview** (where 1= the candidate you would prefer most of all).

Just drag and drop four of the names into each of the ranking boxes and then move them to rank according to preference.

Items

Sarah Williams: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Wiremu Hamuera: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Aroha Henare: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Amy Liu: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Jessica Taylor: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Michael Smith: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Jenny Li: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Daniel Brown: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

Tama Ropata: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Kevin Wang: 12 months experience in an administrator role.

Marama Kingi: 12 months experience in an administrator role

David Zhang: 24 months experience in an administrator role.

> **Interview shortlist**

Part 3 - Interviews

Please explain briefly why you shortlisted these candidates for an interview.

[ALL PARTICIPANTS]

Part 4: Your views

Using the scale provided, please indicate your views on each of the following statements.

Cultural diversity…

	Completely disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Completely agree
… enables us to adjust our policies to different groups in society	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… gives us better insight in the needs of different groups in society	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… allows us to reach a larger part of the community with our policy	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… helps us better understand new developments in society	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… makes us better at solving complex problems	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… enables us to come up with more original ideas	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… makes us more innovative	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… leads colleagues to learn more from each other's' knowledge and experience	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… is good for our image towards the outside world	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Cultural diversity…

	Completely disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Completely agree
… makes the outside world look at our department in a more positive way	○	○	○	○	○
… makes all groups in society look at our organization in a more positive way	○	○	○	○	○
… is good for our department's image amongst more groups in society	○	○	○	○	○
… is needed to fill all vacancies in our department	○	○	○	○	○
… is necessary for recruiting enough new people	○	○	○	○	○
… leads us to have more choices when recruiting and selecting new people	○	○	○	○	○
… is necessary for anticipating changes in the job market	○	○	○	○	○
… has a positive effect on the work atmosphere	○	○	○	○	○
… leads to a pleasant work environment	○	○	○	○	○
… is fun	○	○	○	○	○
… makes this an interesting place to work	○	○	○	○	○

Cultural diversity…

	Completely disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Completely agree
… leads to fewer career opportunities for some people	○	○	○	○	○
… diminishes the status of some employees	○	○	○	○	○
… reduces the attention given to the needs of some employees	○	○	○	○	○
… causes some employees to feel less recognized	○	○	○	○	○
… causes friction between colleagues with different norms and values	○	○	○	○	○
… causes the department's culture to change strongly	○	○	○	○	○
… leads to a situation in which some employees are forced to adjust	○	○	○	○	○
… forces employees to adjust to a different culture	○	○	○	○	○
… makes it more difficult for colleagues to understand each other	○	○	○	○	○
… leads to uncomfortable situations	○	○	○	○	○
… makes it hard to judge what others are thinking	○	○	○	○	○

	Completely disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Completely agree
… causes insecurity in interactions with co-workers	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… causes managers to spend more time on individual coaching	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… makes our department difficult to manage	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… makes our work processes run less smoothly	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
… reduces the overall quality of employees	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

A team like ours performs better if it consists of …

… more women than men				… a roughly equal number of women and men				…less women than men	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Demographics

Information that could identify individuals will not be reported in the final summary of results.

How old are you?

- Under 25
- 25-35
- 36-45
- Older than 46

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- **Other**

Which ethnic group do you belong to?

- European
- Asian
- Māori
- Other

Which Division do you work in?

- Corporate
- Business Solutions
- Customer Operations
- Production
- Markets

End

Thank you for completing my survey.
Clicking the Submit button below will lodge your responses and transfer you automatically to another independent form to enter your email address if you would like to enter the draw for a $50 Pressy Card voucher and/or a personal copy of this research study's research findings.

SUBMIT

Selecting staff in New Zealand organisations

Thank you for your answers!

As this is the end of our research, we have a special draw for the participants who answer the entire survey. We will make a random selection using the email addresses of participants wishing to enter the draw, and five winners will each receive a $50 Pressy Card.

This section of the survey is separate from your earlier answers. If you want to go in the draw, remember to give us your email address in the page which follows.

Thank you for your time,

Jess Voon

Contact information

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact myself or my supervisor.

Researcher
Jess Voon
███████████████

Supervisor
Dr Dianne Gardner
School of Psychology
Massey University
Palmerston North New Zealand
+64 6 3569-099 ext. 43441
D.H.Gardner@massey.ac.nz

Massey University School of Psychology – Te Kura Hinengaro Tangata
Palmerston North, New Zealand
T +64 6 3569-099 ext. 85071 : W psychology.massey.ac.nz

This research project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researchers named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researchers, please contact Professor Craig Johnson, Director(Research Ethics),email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

Results

Would you like to receive a summary of the findings of this research project?

- o Yes
- o No

Do you wish to enter the draw for a $50 Pressy Card?

- o Yes
- o No

If you answered 'Yes' to receiving a summary of results OR entering the draw, please provide your email address.

<div style="border:1px solid #3a5a9b; height:40px;"></div>