

**DIVERSITY BRANDING:
A FIVE-COUNTRY COMPARISON OF CORPORATE WEBSITES**

ABSTRACT

In the quest to attract talent, organizations must articulate the benefits of having a diverse workforce. By communicating the attractiveness of the workplace, a company increases its exposure to the environment as an employer of choice. In this paper, we conduct a comparative and thematic cross-cultural examination of corporate communication in form of diversity statements. We examine how organizations use diversity statements to attract talent, and discuss how the two strategic areas of diversity and employer branding can be linked in the concept of diversity branding. We examine the websites of 75 major companies in five different countries (France, Germany, Spain, the UK and the United States). Cross-cultural differences and similarities are discussed. We also conclude that the discourse of inclusion is gradually penetrating websites and that branding inclusion can be beneficial in the quest to be an employer of choice.

Keywords:

Diversity; inclusion; branding; cross-cultural comparison

INTRODUCTION

In the journey of attracting talent, companies espouse the benefits of having a diverse workforce and diversity-related practices (Casper, Wayne, & Manegold, 2013; Williamson et al., 2008). Diversity refers to the degree to which a workgroup or organization is heterogeneous with respect to personal and functional attributes (Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999), thus representing a possibility for companies to brand themselves as an employer of choice (Pfeffer, 1998). *Diversity branding* is meant to attract employees, including women and minorities, and to potentially profit from having a diverse workforce and increase their talent pools (Ng & Burke, 2005). At the political level, the European Commission encourages employers to voluntarily put Diversity Management more firmly on their strategic business agendas, as diversity statements can promote the firm as a “diversity-driven employer” and a “great place to work” to attract diverse candidates (Edwards & Kelan, 2011). Meanwhile, in the United States and Canada diversity-related legislation has been in place for decades (Özbilgin, Jonsen, & Tatli, 2015; Mor Barak, 2013).

Employer branding is a central performance discourse for HR (Lane, 2016; Martin, Beaumont, Doig, & Pate, 2005) and employer attractiveness is a key outcome of employer branding (Backhaus & Tikoo 2004; Berthon, Erwing, & Hah, 2005). Employer branding is defined as “the package of functional, economic and psychological benefits provided by employment and identified with the employing company” (Ambler & Barrow, 1996: 187). A number of authors have noted other aspects and definitions of employer branding (e.g., Lane, 2016; Martin et al., 2005; Moroko & Uncles, 2008), yet most definitions of corporate branding aim at conveying a desirable image to the outside as well as to the internal organization (e.g., Kowalczyk & Pawlish, 2002; Schultz & De Chernatony, 2002). Many definitions also emphasize a working environment that shows potential for development, rewards and a sense of belonging. In other words, employer branding suggests differentiation

of a firm's characteristics as an employer from those of its competitors (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004), e.g. by fostering an inclusive environment where people feel valued and well treated.

The goal of this paper is to investigate and compare the way companies disclose diversity statements on websites to attract talent. Noticeably, a recent special issue of Human Resource Management pointed to relevant perspectives that will also guide our examination, such as institutional theory (Theodorakopoulos & Budhwar, 2015); inclusion (Mitchell et al., 2015); gender diversity (Kakabadse et al., 2015). As research states, talent attraction is a key driver for diversity management (Konrad, 2003), but to what extent do companies use diversity statements in the quest of attracting people? In order to investigate how critical diversity (and inclusion) is for companies with strong global employer brands, we *first* consider the literature on diversity and employer branding. Second, we detail our data collection of 75 companies' diversity statements in five different countries (France, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, and The United States). Third, we examine how companies brand and value diversity and people of difference on their websites. Finally, we report the contributions and limitations of this study.

Diversity, Inclusion and Employer Branding

Defining Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity management is an increasingly well researched subject (e.g., Bell, 2011; Richard, Roh, & Pieper, 2013; Roberson, 2013; see also Human Resource Management, special issue 2015) including performance effects (e.g. Catalyst, 2004; Nielsen & Nielsen, 2013) and other important factors motivating diversity and its management (Jones, King, Nelson, Geller, & Bowes-Sperry, 2013; Jonsen, Tatli, Özbilgin, & Bell, 2013). Workforce diversity - if approached in a way that maximizes inclusion and minimizes resistance (Dass & Parker, 1999) - presents organizations with opportunities to create and communicate change

that nourishes the positive human potential of their employees (Stevens Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008).

Diversity is presented, by some, as a business opportunity for companies to create value and develop a competitive advantage (Dass & Parker, 1999; Roberson, 2013; Thomas & Ely, 1996), primarily based on the resourced-based view of the firm (Barney, 1991). Konrad (2003) proposed four major arguments for the business case for diversity: First, the war for talents requires an increasingly diverse pool of workers; second, a diverse workforce can better understand and anticipate diverse customer needs and thus lead to an increased market share; third, diversity leads to a greater range of perspectives, which fosters innovation and problem solving through greater creativity; last, given the importance of cultural diversity and changing demographics, diversity management is the only right thing to do. By revealing the business case in online statements, companies increase acceptance of the value of diversity, and help promote diversity management and sometimes as a corporate strategy (Singh & Point, 2004).

There are clear similarities between the ways in which inclusion is being conceived as conceptually distinct from managing diversity, and the way in which managing diversity has been portrayed as distinct from equality (Oswick & Noon, 2014). Inclusion is the degree to which an employee perceives that he or she is an esteemed member of the work group through experiencing treatment that satisfies his or her needs for belongingness and uniqueness (Shore et al. 2009). And so, whereas diversity focuses on individual differences (as a count), inclusion aims at increasing participation and commitment of all employees (see Roberson, 2006). This author also noted that practitioners' definitions of diversity tend to focus on differences and the demographic composition of groups or the organization, while definitions of inclusion focus on organizational objectives to increase participation of all employees and to leverage diversity effects in the organization.

While previous research rarely distinguished between diversity management and inclusion, Oswick (2010) shows that in recent years a discourse around ‘inclusion’ has been widely adopted by practitioners (especially in the North America) and has in fact become more ‘popular’ than the diversity discourse. Therefore, we can expect the inclusion discourse to continue to grow even further in popularity, as well as the rhetorical distancing from diversity, in parallel to a relative decline in the diversity discourse (Oswick & Noon, 2014; see also Ferdman & Deane, 2014; Roberson, 2006).

Employer Branding as Diversity Branding?

A brand is a name, symbol, sign, term, or combinations, designed to identify the services and good from an organization and to differentiate them from those of competitors (according to the American Marketing Association). Companies are increasingly aware of the necessity to address recent business trends that require them to integrate a workforce from all sorts of backgrounds, and therefore the branding of diversity and inclusion play a vital role in the communications strategy. The idea of employer branding relies on the fact that the organization’s employer brand is presented with potential that current employees are attracted to. If the company reflects the targeted employees, the latter is more likely to be attracted to this company. The attraction is argued to lead to an affinity, which motivates both current and potential employees to link themselves to the organization (Edwards, 2009), and thus the communication may help organization expand its potential talent pool.

Given that a strong employer image has a positive influence on perceived employer attractiveness (Cascio, 2014; Gatewood, Gowan, & Lautenschlager, 1993; Sehgal & Malati, 2013), companies seek to create an image of employers of choice that makes people want to work for them (Pfeffer, 1998). For instance, companies often seek to portray themselves attractive places to work for both men and women and for people from all ethnic backgrounds (Guerrier & Wilson, 2011), as well as for millennials (Ng, Schweitzer, &

Lyons). Therefore, such communication will help support organizations' employee recruitment efforts, such as attraction of talents with different backgrounds (Gröschl, 2011; Williamson et al., 2008). Current trends of socio-demographic changes, internationalization, higher mobility of employees and a scarcity of "knowledge workers", who are likely to evaluate companies including their image and external appearance, make employer branding more important than ever in the war for talent. Rather than just talking about employer branding it might be useful to talk about diversity branding as an activity that organizations engage in to show multiple stakeholders that they are diverse employers.

Noticeably, it has been questioned if employer branding and diversity are compatible concepts at all (Edwards & Kelan 2011). On the one hand, diversity is implemented in order to support individuality and bring out the best of groups by encouraging differences in background, thinking, etc. (e.g., Dass & Parker, 1999; Bell, 2011). On the other hand, employer branding fosters a coherent brand which possibly discourages employee lateral thinking and encourages a homogenous workforce or at least exerts some pressure on employees to conform (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004). This apparent contradiction is often not explored and it is presumed that as long as websites show and emphasize a range of diverse people, that this will function as enough of a pull to attract diverse talent.

Diversity Branding through Websites

In general, diversity cues on recruitment websites influence the way job seekers process website information (Walker, Feild, Bernerth, & Becton, 2012), and thus analyzing websites to understand how diversity is communicated is a well-established process (e.g. Heres & Benschop, 2010; Point & Singh, 2003, 2004) which can be used to show how diversity branding takes shape. This is also in line with recent cross-cultural research on espoused values and underpinned by the importance of values articulation on corporate websites (Bourne & Jenkins, 2013; Jonsen, Galunic, Weeks, & Braga, 2015). Given that diversity

policy is often framed and justified using the language of the business case (Guerrier and Wilson, 2011; Heres & Benschop, 2010), corporate websites highlight this trend across a range of indicators, including better performance, added stakeholder value, enhanced corporate reputation and a better environment (Jonsen et al., 2015; Singh & Point, 2004). The literature also emphasizes the importance of choice of words, like avoiding the term “minority” (Edmondson et al, 2009) or hostile labels (e.g. ‘anti-discrimination’) to foster the most positive aspects of diversity (Kirby & Harter, 2003; Singh & Point, 2004, 2006). The location of the on-line statements sometimes indicate the intended audience and source of legitimacy (Singh & Point, 2009).

The Point & Singh’s (2003) comparison across eight countries highlights a divergence in the dimensions of diversity as constructed by European companies on their corporate websites. UK companies are promoting diversity the most on their websites, covering a broad range of diversity strands (Point & Singh, 2003; Guerrier & Wilson, 2011). On the contrary, diversity statements seem to be less developed on Dutch companies’ websites (Heres & Benschop, 2010). Another example is that diversity as competitive advantage discourse is most strongly used in top UK companies, with gender and ethnic diversity most often explicitly addressed. In contrast, the discourse of diversity used in Germany and France is seldom explicitly related to gender and ethnicity, but to cultural and international diversity (Singh & Point, 2006). Thus, companies seem to craft their message to fit the norms of the country where they want to communicate and they tailor their messages to fit the typical candidates they are trying to attract (Caligiuri, Colakoglu, Cerdin, & Kim, 2010).

From “diversity branding” to “inclusion branding”

For Edwards and Kelan (2011), moving from diversity to inclusion is particularly important in a branding strategy. So far, it has mainly been explored how the diversity brand is communicated, but less research exists on whether inclusion branding is done in a similar

way. This might be due to the fact that inclusion is historically a more recent phenomenon. Inclusion *should* address that employees are not only diverse but actually work well together and are thus included. Nevertheless, it could be seen as important for organizations to not only stress that they are attracting diverse employees but that those employees are welcomed in the organization. For this to happen, they not only need to communicate their diversity brand but also their inclusion brand (Edwards & Kelan 2011).

This raises the question to what extent organizations use diversity branding and are even moving from diversity to inclusion branding. In other words, if “diversity branding” highlights what the organization really does and is in terms of diversity, “inclusion branding” promotes an environment and a corporate culture where all employees feel valued and included whatever their differences. However, as highlighted by Oswick & Noon (2014), diversity and inclusion remains co-dependent, diversity being “considered as a necessary precursor to inclusion, while inclusion is the required antecedent of diversity” (p. 26). In this vein, branding diversity can be seen as a precursor to inclusion branding: Companies seek to highlight what they are actually doing, in terms of diversity, before emphasizing how the environment and the corporate culture integrate and benefit from differences.

Research Question(s)

The goal of this paper is to make a comparative and thematic cross-cultural examination of (under-studied) diversity practices, more specifically: How do companies use diversity statements in their quest for attracting talent? We also examine how the two strategic areas of diversity and employer branding can be linked together in order to develop the concept of *diversity branding*. Moreover, whereas diversity management aims to make use of differences, employer branding tries to encompass those differences within the brand. Given the fact that inclusion has risen to ‘prominence’ in some parts of the world and within the research literature, we explore the extent to which diversity branding include inclusion?

Finally, we examine what (espoused) motivational perspectives are linked to the diversity branding and we present thoughts on how diversity branding and inclusion branding differ.

METHODOLOGY

Official company documents, such as the corporate website, provide solid cues for current and future staff and managers of the organization regarding “what is important around here”, and electronic storefronts, such as websites, are considered a solid image building tool for transmitting impressions and influencing visitors and stakeholder (Connolly-Ahern & Broadway, 2007). Corporate websites are thus considered important data sources and a valuable tool for public relations and effective website communication can provide sustainable competitive advantages in talent recruitment (e.g. Gröschl, 2011; Williamson, King, Lepak, & Sarma, 2010).

The official websites of 75 major companies – see Table 1 – in five different countries (France, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States of America) were explored. The lead researcher was proficient in all of the four languages of the included countries, which proved to be helpful for the collection of documents and the coding of websites. These countries were carefully selected according to their cultural differences and to the way diversity has developed for the last decade. Germany belongs to the Germanic ‘model’, while France and Spain belong to the Latin European ‘model’; The UK and US are part of the Anglo-Saxon ‘model’ (Ronen, & Shenkar, 1985). The dissemination and diffusion of diversity in these countries are also specific to socio-historical power discrepancies of each cultural context, since the concept of diversity has no universal fixed meaning but is contextual, contested and temporal (Tatli et al., 2012).

National contexts

France: In France, questions of equality for women, immigrants and minority ethnic groups are at the forefront of French diversity debates (Klarsfeld, Ng, & Tatli, 2012). Diversity is often understood and debated in political and organizational discourses in terms of gender and cultural differences (Point & Singh, 2003). The fact that, historically, diversity has spread simultaneously with mandatory anti-discrimination initiatives launched in the early 2000's (Klarsfeld, 2009) encouraged us to include this country in our sample. Also, most management concerns and many voluntary or mandatory initiatives use both terms of 'diversity' and 'discrimination' simultaneously, "as if they were two sides of the same coin" (p. 366).

Germany: Unlike France, diversity management seems to have nothing to do with anti-discrimination in Germany (Stringfellow, 2012). Diversity management in German-speaking countries did not take off until the mid-2000 (Süß and Kleiner, 2007) when terms such as 'valuing diversity' and diversity management have increasingly appeared in the debate, as the government attempts to bend the meaning of diversity management towards integration and immigration policies (Tatli, Vassilopoulou, Ariss, & Özbilgin., 2012). Since then, diversity management has mainly been implemented in large companies operating in Germany. The starting point for diversity management in Germany lies in the discussion of equal opportunities for men and women in work life (Süß & Kleiner, 2007). Also, like in France, the concept of diversity management is not only applied to the employment sphere but involves broader issues of social integration, particularly concerning ethnicity and race (Tatli et al., 2012).

Spain: In Spain, diversity is managed alongside of the different dynamics already existing: the processes of recognition of religious and national diversity (Zapata-Barrero, 2010). Historically the country's population comprises people from different linguistic, religious and international groups. Zapata-Barrero (2010) points out multinationalism as an historical

dimension of diversity inherent to the identity of Spain. However, immigration flows constitute the new element of diversity in the local population. Therefore, Zapata-Barrero (2010: 396) emphasizes four main types of diversity, three old ones (linguistic, religious, multinational) and one new challenge (immigration) that interact with each other. The ‘Practical philosophy’ (Zapata-Barrero, 2010) to diversity management, which refers to a way of managing diversity with a close link to the question of immigration (i.e. practical questions generated by the immigration context) makes this country interesting to investigate for our research purpose, in a country where diversity management has been guided by anticipation and proactive policies in this country (Zapata-Barrero, 2010).

The United Kingdom: Since the 1990s, diversity management in the UK has become an increasingly popular approach to the multiple differences within the workforce (Tatli et al., 2012). The labor market has also become increasingly diverse with rising participation of women and ethnic minorities in the workforce and an ageing population (Klarsfeld, Ng & Tatli, 2012). The business-case arguments and the emphasis on voluntary action, particularly for the private sector, have predominated (Tatli, 2011). In other words, in the UK, the meaning of diversity management is bent and shrunk to a set of performance-driven business outcomes (Tatli, 2011, Tatli et al., 2012) which makes this an interesting country to take into consideration for our purpose. However, the discursive break from equal opportunities is not followed by a shift in the practice (Tatli, 2011).

The United States: Given the fact that the concept of diversity management originated in the US, where the concept of managing diversity has been very popular from the early 1990s (Özbilgin et al., 2015), we also included this country in our sample. In the US, there is more emphasis on diversity management as an overall strategic direction for the organization (Lorbiecki & Jack, 2000). Diversity Management tried to encompass words like pluralism, cultural diversity, intercultural education, and multiculturalism (Thomas, 1990).

Insert Table 1 About Here

Whenever available, the international diversity statement in English was preferred over statements in the local language. It seems appropriate to opt for the statements in English since almost all of these companies either have their main page in English, or they offer an option to view their website and its content in English. Only in one case from our sample, there was no relevant statement found in English and therefore the Spanish version of the website was used. Besides, the overall impression was that the English statements did not differ essentially from their local language equivalents and could therefore be used without the risk of distorting the results and with the advantage of better comparisons.

The statements were found on the official corporate websites or official career web pages of the companies under investigation. To assure that no statement was missed, the research included searching through the web pages with the help of search engines; either those integrated into the webpage or other search engines such as Google and Bing. For the search, key terms like ‘diversity’, ‘diverse’, ‘equal opportunity’, ‘inclusion’, ‘differences’, ‘values’, ‘equality’ etc. were used and generally provided sufficient results. Overall, 110 websites, files and documents from websites, and other related materials were downloaded, converted and stored in PDF format for documentation and further evaluation. A few companies also presented video messages in their diversity segments. However, these were neither transcribed nor included in the coding, because a review revealed they mostly restated what was already written on the corresponding webpage.

To define and dimensionalize diversity – labeling the dimensions of diversity (see Point & Singh, 2003) – the content analysis included a coding of diversity statements. After examining a set of different diversity statements prior to the actual research and drawing on earlier research by Point & Singh (2003), a pre-defined list was established and later adapted for this specific context. All segments of text were imported into NVivo and coded

accordingly (coding tree available from authors). New codes emerged from the data and were added to the tree model.

FINDINGS

More than 110 statements (from 75 companies in our sample) were found on the corporate online presence, with all companies mentioning at least a few words about the diversity of its employees. Reading through the statements revealed that there are many different facets of presenting a diversity statement. It proved to be common to include a list of the dimensions in which people differ but according to which they “*will not be discriminated against: Age, Disability, Gender, Gender Reassignment, Marital and Civil Partnership status, Pregnancy & maternity, Race, Religion or belief or absence of religion or belief*”; 63 companies (84%) present at least a list or an enumeration similar to the one above. Some lists focused on the generally best known dimensions, while other companies provide quite extensive lists. Beyond listing these dimensions, 73% of the companies go well beyond a definition solely based on a record of dimensions and describe in their own words what the meaning of diversity is to their company.

Concerning where the information was presented within the website, almost a third were from so-called ‘about-sites’ where companies present themselves to a rather broad audience of stakeholders. Another third could be found on career-sites or HR sub-pages which addressed employment with the firm. Speaking to both internal employees as well as potential recruits, this indicates that diversity statements are directly involved in the process of approaching talents. Finally, the biggest share of statements was located under corporate social responsibility or corporate value sections for 28 companies (37.3% of our sample).

The two target groups as expected are employees (61 of the statements) and potential recruits (59). Less common were customers (21), others (17) and suppliers (14 – not considering any statements on supplier diversity which are not part of the analysis).

Diversity statements to attract talent

Danone's following statement published on its website reflects a representative view on what many companies write about the way they see diversity. On the one hand, there is the respect for differences granted by the company and its environment, but on the other hand, with the help of adequate management, diversity will eventually serve business goals in different ways.

“Diversity must manifest itself in balance, representativeness, respect and even confrontation... We must be able to evaluate it, measure it, and nurture it. The company must promote diversity as an opportunity everywhere; a source of performance and team agility rather than a regulatory requirement” Danone (France).

Most companies (88%) name competitive advantages which they expect to be at least in part dependent on a diverse workforce. The most frequently mentioned is to better address a corporation's diverse customer base.

“We have to understand and connect with our customers and communities. That means having a diverse group of associates who can represent all people” Walmart (USA)

Problem-solving, creativity, and innovation was reflected in 50% of the statements. By integrating diversity, corporations hope to profit from the below-surface differences in perspectives, characters, and experiences.

“Diversity improves competitiveness by enlarging the potential for ideas and innovation. Diverse teams addressing problems from varied perspectives will be more productive and achieve better solutions.” Siemens (Germany)

“Our global workforce possesses a unique set of experiences and abilities that are critical to our success. And their passion for innovation helps us maintain our role as a technology leader. We must therefore respect the viewpoints of all our people” Intel (USA)

A quarter of all companies state that their environment of inclusion and accepting diversity will eventually help each individual to develop to its fullest potential.

“IBM has embraced diversity, and it gives opportunities for IBMers and our clients to achieve their full potential” IBM (USA)

Other arguments are of more general nature and use productivity and efficiency gains as reasons (such benefits were mentioned on 17% of the pages). Other benefits were found but not coded separately, due to their scarce appearance; they include flexibility, dynamism, sustainability, mutual learning, and cohesion.

The above examples illustrate that not only the differences themselves are supposed to foster creativity. The inclusion and tolerance of differences through diversity management is expected to overcome barriers to innovation and creativity.

The shortage of skilled workers is a central argument to engage in diversity yet the issue seems to be more crucial for some companies than for others.

“Considering the increasing shortage of skilled workers [...] a workforce with a good mix of ages and cultures is becoming more and more important, as is appropriate representation of women within the company, in leadership positions and in young talent programmes” BMW (Germany)

The metaphor most commonly used is that of a pool of talents from which a company recruits that can be increased by hiring from a more diverse range of candidates.

“Diversity [...] gives us access to a broader pool of talented employees, and enables us to benefit from the enhanced innovative and problem-solving abilities that are demonstrably associated with a high cultural diversity within the company” Bayer (Germany)

“We believe strongly that by promoting diversity and above all inclusion Diageo will benefit in many ways. Not only does it give us access to the widest possible talent pool but it also means that we can better reflect and understand our diverse consumer base and it allows us to tap into multiple perspectives” Diageo (UK)

Even if in some cases the shortage apparently is less pressing, the underlying commonality among the statements is that it is still important to ‘stick out’ as a distinctive employer and to be open to all kinds of talents, concluding that diversity and inclusion can help tackle these threats.

“The world’s workforce is more diverse than ever before, due to global business operations. The average age of workers is rising, and the number of women in the workforce continues to increase. As employee value propositions and societal expectations continue to change, Shell’s success depends on our ability to attract, motivate, and retain this increasingly diverse pool of talent” Shell (UK)

Promoting the organization as an employer of choice

Through their diversity statements, many firms use rather subtle ways to improve their image. Especially, references to a positive corporate culture and the objective of being an employer of choice seemed to correspond to the intention of any diversity branding strategy. Diversity and inclusion are part of the communication of the organizational culture.

Compared to their European counterparts, German companies are more likely to embed diversity statements in corporate culture and values. Interestingly, 63 companies provide practical examples of how diversity is implemented in their corporate culture. These can take

the form of support groups for minorities, career options for women, generational learning programs and awareness raising events to foster mutual understanding and many more.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Table 2 highlights the diversity statements we found combined with perspectives for managing differences. As noted in the literature, French and Spanish companies are more likely to base their diversity statements on anti-discrimination perspectives (Klarsfeld, 2009; Zapata-Barrero, 2010). Apart from US websites, the term ‘*equal opportunity*’ is included in two thirds (at least) of the diversity statements. This reinforces the idea exposed in the literature that diversity is not always distinguished from other paradigm such as “equal opportunity” (Lorbiecki & Jack, 2000). 20% of the pages also made direct references to fairness. ‘*Inclusion*’ and ‘*acceptance*’ were found in half of the statements, mainly disclosed by Anglo-Saxon companies. Indeed, a big share of typically US and UK companies add inclusion to the title or at least mention it at the same level as diversity. For instance, at Shell (UK) “*inclusion means creating a working culture where differences are valued [...] where people feel involved, respected and connected – where the richness of ideas, backgrounds and perspectives are leveraged to create business value.*” Also Sanofi (France) defines inclusion as “*successfully activate the attributes that each one of us possesses*”. Confirming previous research, this highlights the trend to use inclusion statements to shift away from diversity, as diversity tends to shift from equality in the past (Oswick & Noon, 2014).

We also found numerous examples where diversity is claimed to make a company ‘a better place to work’. Particularly the following example by Orange coincides with how the literature describes the process of employer branding (Backhaus & Tikoo 2004; Berthon et al., 2005): Values lived within the company are communicated to future employees with the diversity statements who will then integrate those values in their working life thereby reinforcing the corporate brand.

“Diversity within the Group is key to help make us a preferred employer and attract new talents. We intend to make equal opportunities a trademark of its social policy from the recruitment stage and throughout its employees’ working lives” Orange (France)

“Our diversity is reflective of the global marketplace and is integral to our corporate character. Simply put, it’s what we do together that sets us apart” IBM (USA)

The coding of statements with regards to explicit declarations on improving one’s own reputation and image as an employer brand produced rather sparse results even though there were some references. Ten corporations stated that diversity should help them improve their image and reputation amongst potential and current employees.

“To change the image of the Group’s businesses, raise interest among young women, and thereby make it easier to recruit more female employees” GDF (France).

Dimensionalizing diversity for branding purposes

The dimensions that companies use to define diversity can be categorized according to two main categories presented in the literature review. These include on the one hand readily detectable and visible differences, and on the other hand deep-level-dimensions (see Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). While the surface-level diversity dimensions most of the time were clearly defined in websites, the list of below surface dimensions was quite extensive and therefore was again organized into subgroups as seen in Table 3. However, excluding geographic differences such as nationality and culture, surface level and below surface level dimensions have been mentioned equally often.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Branding gender diversity

Overall and among all dimensions, the most often stated issue is *gender* (93%). It is mentioned by 70 out of the 75 websites in our sample (and generally is also included in the

shortest of the statements). Gender statements are often used to state objectives of increasing the share of women in the workforce and management, or to promote gender equality.

“We are dedicated to increasing the number of women in managing positions to 25%”,

Munich RE (Germany)

“Promote gender parity in all roles within the Group and especially in technical roles [...] ensuring equal pay”, Orange (France).

Except for Spain, all companies mention gender in their diversity statements. This is perhaps surprising because the issue of gender equality has risen up the Spanish political agenda. Yet, this lower rate for Spanish companies might be explained by the employment rate of women which is lower in Spain than the EU average as well as the working part-time for women (European Commission, 2012). The European commission highlights that part-time, horizontal as well as vertical segregations, may hurt access to the talent pool. Moreover, there is no evidence for spillover between governmental/political gender diversity and that in commercial organizations.

Branding disability

Physical ability, handicaps, or simply disability is the second most frequently listed dimension among visible differences. 65% of all companies mention it and often name concrete measures to promote awareness as well as the inclusion of people with disabilities. French companies disclose more statements than any other country in our sample, presumably because disability employment is a legal issue: large companies must hire 6% of disabled workers, if not they are financially penalized by having to pay a contribution fee to a specific organization. Indeed, most French companies report action plans for the disabled given that the financial threat for not complying with rules governing disability is high when companies do not reach the desired quota of 6% (Klarsfeld, 2009). Therefore, “a fine of about €5000 per worker (or €15,000 if no disabled person is employed at all) is levied for missing

the 6 percent ‘quota’ for disabled workers, unless a firm undertakes a program to hire disabled workers” (Klarsfeld, Ng & Tatli, 2012: 315). A similar process is in place in Germany.

Website statements are mostly about being a responsible employer who does not differentiate based on physical abilities. For instance, Lloyd Bank (UK) describes in its website

“society not disability creates barriers for disabled people”

Initiatives to raise awareness through trainings or special programs are other concrete examples that firms present to underline their commitment. Volkswagen (Germany) has a ‘Work2Work’ program to reintegrate persons with altered abilities from accidents or illnesses. In some companies the issue of disability is also extended beyond own personnel: Iberdrola (Spain) mentions a program to integrate workers from families with close family members suffering from disability.

Branding Age

With demographic changes impacting the workforce composition, generation issues and age are also among the most often mentioned dimensions. Germany, which is heavily affected by low birth rates and a shrinking workforce, integrates this issue in its diversity statements with almost all companies disclosing such statements. The workforce structure in German companies shows differences from other countries, mainly based on the demographic development and the increasing significance of older employees (Süß & Kleiner, 2007, 2008). Contrary to this, young people have been particularly affected by high unemployment (Stringfellow, 2012). Therefore, a specific discourse on aging can bring companies to highlight employment opportunities for people from different generations. According to Bayer (Germany), these demographic changes *“involve opportunities and risks”*. The mix of generations is acknowledged as an added value in most statements.

“Young employees can benefit from the experience and knowledge of their older colleagues” Henkel (Germany)

“We harness the talent of our youngest employees and see the rest of our employees’ experience as added value” Repsol (Spain)

Even if the ‘graying workforce’ workforce is the United States (and Baby Boomers retiring) is recognized as a key change in the future (Hedge, Borman, & Lammlein, 2006), the age dimension seems of less importance for US companies, with only a third of the companies listing it.

Branding ethnicity and race

Ethnicity and race, including analogous notions of minorities, are most likely to be cited by US (67%) and UK (87%) companies. Although the history of colonialism, and feminist and race equality movements are important in understanding the context of the regulation of diversity in the UK, recent cases put the issue of race and ethnicity at the forefront of the diversity debate (Tatli et al., 2012); it is then common to list corporate associations and networks for minorities which help integrate a diverse range of ethnicities and races. BP, for example, presents employee networks to foster its diversity objectives for a wide range of minorities such as employees of Asian and African descent. Lloyd Bank, aside from offering support groups for ethnic minorities, also offers an ethnic minority mentoring program. Both the notions of “race” and “ethnicity” may be less used in other European countries because it resonates strongly with the term ‘Rasse’ used by Nazism to define racial superiority and inferiority.

Branding color and physical appearance

The other two visible dimensions included in the coding, people of color (appearing 7 times, mainly in Anglo-Saxon websites) and physical appearance, are, seemingly, of less importance. Reporting about visible minorities is less adopted among French companies than

reporting on the other dimensions of diversity that we examined, presumably because counting ethnic diversity is prohibited by French law, and gives way to employers taking considerable precautions (Klarsfeld, 2009). Therefore, it is illegal to distinguish, in a way, between people according to specific traits such as color, since this is deemed inconsistent with the republican model, which insists on the undifferentiated status of all citizens (Tatli et al., 2012).

Branding nationality, country of origin and culture

Nationality or country of origin and culture are dimensions that affect international and global companies, and business in general (Schneider, Barsoux & Stahl, 2014).

Consequently, it does not come as a surprise, that at least one of these geographically bounded dimensions is mentioned on more than 90% of the pages. Yet, even though nationality is integrated in more than half of the statements, it is rarely defined and usually either solely included in a list of dimensions or presented with figures on the internationality of the firm and its employees

“A German company with an international team: In 2011, over 70 percent of senior managers at Linde were from countries other than Germany, representing over 40 different nations in total”, Linde (Germany)

Nationality is less emphasized on US websites than on the European sites. This could stem from the open labor market within the European Union in which companies also try to address global workers, which could then in turn help them to better address their multinational customer bases. However, culture is a term with various meanings, sometimes interchangeably used with geographic references such as nationality, country of origin and also local origin.

Our results also reinforce that there is no discourse on identity or on multiculturalism in Spain (Zapata-Barrero, 2010). Furthermore, the word “multiculturalism” is rarely used. This

might explain why so few Spanish companies mention cultural diversity on their websites.

On the contrary, Spanish companies are the one disclosing the most about language. In Spain, language differences (as well as religion) seem to be promoted and affect most of the policies on diversity in Spain (Zapata-Barrero, 2010).

Branding knowledge, education, professional skills and experience

Diversity in knowledge, education, professional skills and experience are not mentioned as often as those of more visible differences. About a quarter to a third of the companies explicitly search for diversity in experience, skill and general background. Education as a dimension is only mentioned in 9% of the cases. Nevertheless, at least one of the four dimensions is included in 50% of companies' definitions of diversity and 33% even name at least two of them (mostly German, UK, and US companies). One of the reasons could be that many of the visible dimensions are listed in commitments to not discriminate based on such dimensions. One would not expect companies to state that there will be no discrimination based on experience, skill, and education i.e. based on merit. Therefore, these dimensions are only mentioned when a company is actively promoting them.

“To master these [challenges], we rely on our employees and their different skills, levels of experience and perspectives. We put together highly diverse teams that complement each other across our entire workforce.” E-ON (Germany)

Branding social classes, parental status, sexual orientation and family status

The family situation category covers other topics such as social classes, parental status, sexual orientation and also family status as such. More common are references to be inclusive irrespective of parental status and family status, except in the United States. French companies in particular address intentions to integrate working parents into their business. One explanation could be the proactive approach from a political side: For example, L'Oreal, BNP, and Total among others are signatories to the French Corporate Parenthood Charter

which states its mission to facilitate the balance between family and career. Other approaches are, for example: Flexible working hours for the ‘improvement of the compatibility of family life and work’ (Deutsche Bank) and continued annual salary increases despite maternity leave. Looking at both, the family status and parental status taken together, roughly one third of all companies integrate such considerations into their online presence.

Sexual orientation is the most frequently quoted dimension in the family situation category and key single aspect in which Anglo-Saxon companies were found to be inclusive to sexual orientation respectively to LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender) groups. Yet, few companies give examples on how their promise of not discriminating is further implemented in daily life. One example is Lloyds Bank (UK), underlining their commitment to sexual diversity with the promise of entitlements, policies, and benefits for employees in same sex relations equal to their heterosexual colleagues. Other concrete initiatives generally are employee networks, or groups to foster understanding and tolerance (which could potentially include recruitment from career fairs with a LGBT background).

Branding religion, different perspectives, points-of-views, thinking types, and personalities

Opinions & beliefs statements are rarely disclosed in websites, where different perspectives, points-of-views, thinking types, and personalities are related to the business case:

“Diversity is valued because it is about diverse perspectives and approaches brought by employees from diverse backgrounds, which is crucial to our business results” Allianz (France)

Religion – also part of this subgroup – sticks out with the most references in the subgroup, presumably because it is more considered as the basis for discrimination and is thus included in lists with dimensions which will not be discriminated upon. HSBC Holdings (United

Kingdom) is one of the few companies presenting an example of how religious diversity in their workforce helps their business by serving customers:

“looking for financial products compliant with their religious beliefs”.

Finally, two original dimensions were not included in the above results; due to their scarcity: “military status” and “smoking habits”. Almost half of the US companies include military experience, veteran support and the like in their diversity statements. Another exceptional item was found in British American Tobacco’s statement, guaranteeing to not hire or promote based on differences in smoking habits.

DISCUSSIONS

The concept of diversity, as disclosed in corporate websites, has been widely explored for over a decade (Edmondson et al., 2009; Guerrier & Wilson, 2011; Heres & Benschop, 2010; Kirby & Harter, 2003; Point & Singh, 2003; Singh & Point, 2004, 2006, 2009; Theodorakopoulos & Budhwar, 2015; Uysal, 2013; Williamson et al., 2008). Yet, to our knowledge, no study has explored diversity in the light of employer branding. We acknowledge that branding *per se* is rooted in the marketing discipline (e.g. Ambler & Barrow, 1996; Moroko & Uncles, 2008), and that other terms and frameworks from organizational theory, sociology and psychology are equally relevant, e.g. ‘impression management’ (Avery & McKay, 2006).

We have coded and organized diversity statements according to functional and dimensional characteristics, which may serve as guidance and inspiration for the diversity branding discourse in organizations. We have thus, in parts, responded to calls from scholars (e.g. Williamson et al., 2008; 2010) that more insights are needed in terms of how diversity practices are justified and espoused by employers (potential and actual). Importantly, and adding to existing research, we offered a cross-cultural comparison drawing a sample from 75

companies in five different countries. This provides a unique comparative overview of what corporations mention in different countries, vis-a-vis diversity broken down into: visible differences; geographical differences; education and professional background; family situation; opinions and beliefs.

This way companies can benefit from the findings and suggestions of this paper in their strategic hiring process and talent management, perhaps with one caveat in mind: There is a risk related to espoused values, that institutional behavior (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991), mimetic forces in particular, reduce the variance between company statements and create similar use of buzz-words across countries, companies and industries. A great deal of similarities across nations was indeed noticeable, nevertheless, and we can thus not dismiss the labelling of diversity branding as a “global business rooted in business systems that have only little geographical presence.” This fits the recommendations of McKinsey & Co to take a global view on talent, in order to win the talent war even in local markets (Pettigrew & Srinivasan, 2012). However, “copy-cattig” may not take place in all sectors, e.g. companies in the hospitality sector are more reluctant to display the business case of diversity on-line (Gröschl, 2011), and firms may be exposed to different sets of institutional logics and practices over time. While the common terminology used in part reflects the increased homogeneity of diversity and inclusion discourses globally, it also potentially restricts local definitions of inclusion. This is problematic because some terms do not work well in certain language or are connoted differently. For instance the German version of inclusion (inklusion) generally refers to disability but not to how diverse individuals work together.

Implications for theory

The documentation of a relative lack of variance across countries constitutes our *first* contribution. Similar to a multicultural approach to diversity which emphasizes the benefits of a diverse workforce and recognize employee differences (Stevens et al. 2008), the

diversity concept is well dimensionalized in corporate websites (Point & Singh, 2003). The fact that France, Germany and Spain are three countries where diversity charters operate, can explain why so many dimensions are now included in diversity statements across countries. Although institutional arrangements differ across countries (Vassilopoulou et al., 2013) and different responses to this could lead to competitive advantages, our data indicates that institutional isomorphism (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991), including as mimetic behavior, trumps differentiation. Our *second* contribution suggests that diversity statements have two sides. On the one hand, the statements depict what makes people different and unique through a variety of dimensions. On the other hand, the statements encourage an inclusion perspective where diversity leads to successful management. This dual approach can help to solve the dilemmatic web-site discourse of sameness as well as difference, a diversity fallacy noted by Guerrier & Wilson (2011).

A *third* contribution of this paper is a comparison with similar studies performed one decade ago. Compared with previous work by Point & Singh (2003), substantially more statements were found on the corporate websites. Diversity and inclusion has become mainstream. Moreover, *all* companies mention at least a few words about diversity of their employees. In the early 2000s, only half of the European companies included the term diversity in their websites (Point & Singh, 2003). This clearly shows that over the years diversity has become an issue that websites address. Gender is the dimension being the most widely discussed at present compared to one decade ago (see Singh & Point, 2006). Age and disability are also nowadays widely mentioned, compared to previous work (e.g. Point & Singh, 2003). This can be partly explained by all the specific gender equality policies that have been developed across Europe in the past years. In addition, this might be explained by the fact that gender is relative uncontroversial in Western societies and, unlike some other dimensions of diversity, data on gender can be easily collected in all locations.

Fourth contribution: Previous analysis underlined that diversity is primarily depicted as a competitive advantage, and occasionally as a corporate social responsibility, but rarely as a corporate value (Uysal, 2013). In this study we found that diversity statements rather serve the CSR strategy of the company, supporting Heres & Benschop's (2010) findings. The fact that diversity is often put under the rubric of CSR does not come as a surprise. Both fields are structured similarly. It rather confirms the literature which considers CSR as one aspect of employer attractiveness and diversity is one of the values adding to the image of a responsible company (Edwards & Kelan 2011). In line with Heres & Benschop's (2010) suggestions, the business case arguments for diversity are increasingly supplemented by social and ethical justifications (see Jones et al., 2013; Jonsen et al., 2013).

Further thoughts

In order to avoid the risk of becoming an eternal 'poor cousin' to CSR (or other areas), diversity and its management can and should increasingly stand on its own feet in the move towards the inclusion of inclusion. The field needs to develop its own agenda rather than emulating and being subsumed under CSR. As the field matures, and based on our literature review and findings, we propose that in the context of human resources diversity branding can be best used to attract a wide range of talent by 'pushing' awareness about diversity in the organization, whereas inclusion branding can be particularly beneficial in order to become an employer of choice (see figure 1).

Insert Figure 1 About Here

This new way of thinking, our *fifth* contribution, is conceptually similar to classic push/pull strategies; insofar, the diversity branding helps to put a stick in the ground for stakeholders (including potential employees) to show an organization's commitment to diversity, as opposed to inclusion branding that may increasingly help to 'pull in' talent for whom an inclusive culture matters, and thus become the employer of choice. In other words,

companies need to be on the radar of potential employees (talent) to enter the selection process in the first place, and diversity branding seems ideal for that. In our analysis, Spanish and French companies were more likely to favor a push strategy by branding diversity. On the opposite, US and UK companies were more likely to favor a pull strategy by focusing on inclusion branding. In order to progress in the selection process and be chosen by potential candidates as an organization to work for, there is a need to show commitment to inclusion in the culture (and a key values) of the organization. In this light, our sample shows that companies in Latin regions may need to give more strategic importance to website branding, vis-a-vis their Anglo-Saxon counterparts IF they wish to use electronic tolls, such as websites, to become the employer of choice (thus, we must emphasize that the positions of the countries in figure 1 does not represent “good” or “bad”). Importantly, in figure 1 we consider inclusion as an evolution of diversity, in regards to branding strategies, activities and ‘maturity’ of the organization, and the employer of choice an evolution of attracting talent.

Implications for practice

Our *sixth* contribution relates to the descriptive part of this paper, namely a country comparison as a timely documentation of how diversity is espoused and branded by practitioners. This can guide global organizations with regards to “what is done” in different countries, whether they play catch-up or try or differentiate themselves from competitors. It can also (we hope) inspire organizations to ‘up their game’ with regards to inclusion and become more explicit about it, in order to become the employer of choice – which in particular may appeal to Millennials who increasingly expect diversity and inclusion from their employers (Kelan, 2012; Ng et al., 2010). There might also be other areas where this comparison can help organizations prepare for the future. For example, although American corporations have been leading the way in terms of diversity and inclusion practices, we can observe areas such as parental status, family status and social class (albeit sample is small)

where European organizations have, we reckon, more experience and therefore espouse it in order to gain competitive advantages.

Seventh, the diversity branding strategy seems to concern the way to attract talent and the way to be depicted as an employer of choice. To brand diversity, however, companies need a clear working definition of diversity which can be presented in corporate statements, in order to serve as a framework for strategic planning and common expectations (Baetz & Bark 1996). Consistent with Heres & Benschop's (2010) results, companies tend to define diversity in broad terms. It is no surprise that most companies highlight their own definition of diversity applied to the context of their own business. Companies should pay close attention to the language used in their corporate communications (Edmondson et al. 2009), and consider how diversity branding might help them to move from the differences point of view to an inclusive perspective (see also Martin et al., 2005; Williamson et al., 2008).

Finally, our *eighth* contribution is an exploration of espoused diversity vis-a-vis inclusion. Seen through the lenses of an inclusion perspective (Shore et al., 2009), our results highlight that some companies display an open and tolerant corporate culture with the objective of becoming an employer of choice. In other words, aspirations written into diversity statements to be an employer of choice, as well as presentations of certificates and awards, further support the conclusion that diversity statements are a means of employer branding and a communication channel to internal as well as external recruits. These types of discourses also encourage the expected shift from diversity towards inclusion (Mitchell et al., 2015; Oswick & Noon, 2014; Theodorakopoulos & Budhwar, 2015), a shift that should promote a great work environment (e.g. to attract talents), yet, globally speaking, corporate websites still seem to focus significantly more on diversity aspects than inclusion.

Limitations and future research

As a limitation to this research, the small amount of 15 companies per country is not sufficient to support testing of hypothetical differences between the countries, thus we have not done so. Bigger samples should be used to support (or disconfirm) our findings. Moreover, these kinds of statements are formulated by companies (or their agencies), deconstructed in the research process and reconstructed through the researcher's interpretation influenced through his interest and background. Due to the size of the firms, empirical results will not necessarily provide a realistic representation of the overall business sector of a country. However, these big international companies are at the forefront in the fight for a broad spectrum of the best talents. It is likely, that in many areas they even compete for the same pool of talent on a global scale and therefore should be a good and comprehensive source of information.

Furthermore, it is possible that different *cultures* ascribe different meanings to otherwise identically labelled espoused values (Jonsen et al., 2015). For example, *integrity* may mean something different in Spain than in the United Kingdom. We do envision matching our findings and observations against the value orientations of the countries, to the extent there are plausible correlations and to 'adjust' for and differences when possible. Nevertheless, even within organizations the employees can interpret values differently. Cha & Edmondson (2006) introduced the notion of 'expanded values' in the sense that individuals translate the sent values (in this case by the CEO) into something "more abstract and ideological, encompassing a broader net of meanings" (p. 64).

Importantly, we have not dealt with any potential "values gaps" between what companies say and what they do, and thus authenticity (see also Cording et al., 2014). We must critically acknowledge that 'the reality is not necessarily that of appearance' in the context of diversity management (Schwabenland and Tomlinson, 2015: 1930) and that the perceptions of the people involved, minorities in particular, may vary widely between people and groups, vis-a-

vis what is publically communicated. How included those diverse individuals feel is rarely addressed in research (Edwards & Kelan 2011) and the diversity climate rarely measured (McKay & Avery, 2015). It is also rarely explored if potential employees feel attracted by those diversity and inclusion statements (see Ng et al., 2010).

Future research should also examine the territory between ‘true intension’ and pure ‘impression management.’ When about a third of the German, French, and US corporations have more ‘idealistic’ connotations describing it as their responsibility towards society to include all types of people (which leads to promote inclusion, Oswick, 2001), this shift from diversity to inclusion might constitute only a change in language rather than any material change in diversity management practices (Ferdman & Deane, 2014; Robertson, 2006), as organizations bow to normative pressures and political correctness (Goncalo et al., 2015).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 4(3): 185-206.
- Avery, D. R. & McKay, P. F. (2006). Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 59: 157–187.
- Avery, D. R., Volpone, S. D., Stewart, R. W., Luksyte, A., Hernandez, M., McKay, P. F., & Hebl, M. R. (2013). Examining the Draw of Diversity: How Diversity Climate Perceptions Affect Job-Pursuit Intentions. *Human Resource Management*, 52(2), 175-193
- Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career development international*, 9(5): 501-517.
- Baetz, M. C., & Bart, C. K. (1996). Developing mission statements which work. *Long Range Planning*, 29(4): 526-533.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bell, M. (2011). *Diversity in organizations*. Cengage Learning.
- Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International journal of advertising*, 24(2): 151-172.
- Bourne, H., & Jenkins, M. (2013). Organizational values: A dynamic perspective. *Organization Studies*, 34(4): 495-514.
- Caligiuri, P., Colakoglu, S., Cerdin, J. L., & Kim, M. S. (2010). Examining cross-cultural and individual differences in predicting employer reputation as a driver of employer attraction. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 10(2): 137-151.
- Casper, W. J., Wayne, J. H., & Manegold, J. G. (2013). Who Will We Recruit? Targeting Deep- and Surface-Level Diversity with Human Resource Policy Advertising. *Human Resource Management*, 52(3), 311-332.
- Catalyst. (2004). The bottom line.
http://www.catalyst.org/system/files/The_Bottom_Line_Connecting_Corporate_Performance_and_Gender_Diversity.pdf
- Cha, S. E., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). When values backfire: Leadership, attribution, and disenchantment in a values-driven organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(1), 57-78.
- Connolly-Ahern, C. & Broadway, S. (2007). The importance of appearing competent: An analysis of corporate impression management strategies on the world wide web. *Public Relations Review*, 33(3): 343–345.
- Cording, M., Harrison, J. S., Hoskisson, R. E., & Jonsen, K. (2014). Walking the talk: A multistakeholder exploration of organizational authenticity, employee productivity, and post-merger performance. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(1), 38-56.
- Dass, P., & Parker, B. (1999). Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From resistance to learning. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 13(2): 68-80.
- Edmondson, V. C., Gupte, G., Draman, R. H., & Oliver, N. (2009). Focusing on communication strategy to enhance diversity climates. *Journal of Communication Management*, 13(1): 6-20.

- Edwards, M., & Kelan, E. (2011). Employer branding and diversity: foes or friends? In Brannan, M. J., Parsons, E., & Priola, V. (Eds.). *Branded lives: the production and consumption of meaning at work*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, chapter 10.
- Elsbach, K. D., Sutton, R. I., & Principe, K. E. (1998). Averting expected challenges through anticipatory impression management: A study of hospital billing. *Organization Science*, 9: 68–86.
- European Commission. (2012). *The current situation of gender equality in Spain – Country Profile*, report, <http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/epo_campaign/130911_country-profile_spain.pdf>
- Ferdman, B. M. & Deane, B. (2014), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Professional Practice Series for the Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology (SIOP).
- Gatewood, R. D., Gowan, M. A., & Lautenschlager, G. J. (1993). Corporate image, recruitment image and initial job choice decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(2): 414-427.
- Goncalo, J. A., Chatman, J., Duguid, M., & Kennedy, J. A. (2015). Creativity from constraint? How political correctness influences creativity in mixed-sex work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(1): 1-30.
- Gröschl, S. (2011). Diversity management strategies of global hotel groups: a corporate web site based exploration. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(2): 224-240.
- Guerrier, Y., & Wilson, C. (2011). Representing diversity on UK company web sites. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 30(3): 183-195.
- Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., & Bell, M. P. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface-and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1): 96-107.
- Hedge, J. W., Borman, W. C., & Lammlein, S. E. (2006). The aging workforce: Realities, myths, and implications for organizations. *American Psychological Association*.
- Heres, L., & Benschop, Y. (2010). Taming diversity: an exploratory study on the travel of a management fashion. *Equality, diversity and inclusion: an international journal*, 29(5): 436-457.
- Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 741-763.
- Jones, K. P., King, E. B., Nelson, J., Geller, D. S., & Bowes-Sperry, L. (2013). Beyond the business case: An ethical perspective of diversity training. *Human Resource Management*, 52(1), 55-74.
- Jonsen, K., Galunic, C., Weeks, J., & Braga, T. (2015). Evaluating espoused values: Does articulating values pay off? *European Management Journal*, doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2015.03.005.
- Jonsen, K., Tatli, A., Özbilgin, M. and Bell, M.P. (2013). The tragedy of the (un)commons: Reframing workforce diversity, *Human Relations*, 66(2): 271-294.
- Kakabadse, N. K., Figueira, C., Nicolopoulou, K., Hong Yang, J., Kakabadse, A. P., & Özbilgin, M. F. (2015). Gender Diversity and Board Performance: Women's Experiences and Perspectives. *Human Resource Management*, 54(2), 265-281.
- Kelan, E. (2012). *Rising Stars: Developing Millennial Women as Leaders*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kirby, E. L. & Harter, M. (2003). Speaking the language of the bottom-line: The metaphor of managing diversity, *Journal of Business Communication*, 40: 28-49.
- Klarsfeld, A. (2009). The diffusion of diversity management: The case of France. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 25(4): 363-373.
- Klarsfeld, A., Ng, E., & Tatli, A. (2012). Social regulation and diversity management: A comparative study of France, Canada and the UK. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 18(4): 309-327.
- Konrad, A. (2003). Defining the domain of workplace diversity scholarship. *Group and Organization Management*, 28(1): 4-17.
- Kowalczyk, S. J., & Pawlish, M. J. (2002). Corporate branding through external perception of organizational culture. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 5(2-3).
- Lane, P. (2016). Human Resources Marketing and Recruiting: Essentials of Employer Branding. *Handbook of Human Resources Management*, 23-52.
- Lorbiecki, A., & Jack, G. (2000). Critical turns in the evolution of diversity management. *British Journal of Management*, 11(s1): 17-31.
- Martin, G., Beaumont, P., Doig, R., & Pate, J. (2005). Branding: A New Performance Discourse for HR? *European Management Journal*, 23(1), 76-88.
- McKay, P. F., & Avery, D. R. (2015). Diversity Climate in Organizations: Current Wisdom and Domains of Uncertainty. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources*, 33, 191–233.
- Mitchell, R., Boyle, B., Parker, V., Giles, M., Chiang, V., & Joyce, P. (2015). Managing Inclusiveness and Diversity in Teams: How Leader Inclusiveness Affects Performance through Status and Team Identity. *Human Resource Management*, 54(2), 217-239.
- Mor Barak, M. E. (2013). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications: Los Angeles, United States.
- Moroko, L., & Uncles, M. D. (2008). Characteristics of successful employer brands. *The Journal of Brand Management*, 16(3), 160-175.
- Ng, E. S., & Burke, R. J. (2005). Person–organization Fit and The War for Talent: Does Diversity Management Make a Difference? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(7): 1195-1210.
- Ng, E., Schweitzer, L., & Lyons, S. (2010). New Generation, Great Expectations: A Field Study of the Millennial Generation. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 25(2), 281-292
- Nielsen, B.B. & Nielsen, S. (2013). Top Management Team Nationality Diversity and Firm Performance: A Multilevel Study, *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(3): 373-382.
- Oswick, C. (2010). The social construction of diversity, equality and inclusion: an exploration of academic and public discourses. In G. Healy, G. Kirton & M. Noon (eds), *Equality, Inequalities and Diversity: Contemporary Challenges and Strategies*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp.18–36.
- Oswick, C., & Noon, M. (2014). Discourses of diversity, equality and inclusion: trenchant formulations or transient fashions? *British Journal of Management*, 25(1): 23-39.
- Özbilgin, M., Tatli, A. & Jonsen, K. 2015. *Global Diversity Management* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan: London, United Kingdom.
- Pettigrew, M. & Srinivasan, R. (2012). Winning the talent war in local markets by staying global. *Perspectives on Global Organizations*, 67-72: McKinsey & Co.
- Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The Human Equation*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

- Point, S., & Singh, V. (2003). Defining and Dimensionalising Diversity: Evidence from Corporate Websites across Europe. *European Management Journal*, 21(6): 750-761.
- Powell, W. W. & DiMaggio, P. (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Rao, A., Schmidt, S., & Murray, L. (1995). Upward impression management: Goals, influence strategies, and consequences. *Human Relations*, 48(2): 147-167.
- Richard, O. C., Roh, H., & Pieper, J. R. (2013). The Link Between Diversity and Equality Management Practice Bundles and Racial Diversity in the Managerial Ranks: Does Firm Size Matter? *Human Resource Management*, 52(2), 215-242.
- Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion in Organizations. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(2): 212-236.
- Roberson, Q. M. (Ed.) (2013). *The Oxford handbook of diversity and work*. Oxford, United Kingdom. Oxford University Press.
- Ronen, S., & Shenkar, O. (1985). Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A review and synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3): 435-454.
- Schwabenland, C., & Tomlinson, F. (2015). Shadows and light: Diversity management as phantasmagoria. *Human Relations*, 68(12): 1913-1936.
- Schneider, S., Barsoux, J.-L. & Stahl, G. K. (2014). *Managing across cultures* (3rd ed.). London: Pearson Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Schultz, M., & De Chernatony, L. (2002). The challenges of corporate branding. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 5(2/3): 105-113.
- Sehgal, K., & Malati, N. (2013). Employer Branding: A Potent Organizational Tool for Enhancing Competitive Advantage. *IUP Journal of Brand Management*, 10(1), 51.
- Shore, L. M., B. Chung, M. Dean, K. Ehrhart, D. Jung, A. Randel & G. Singh (2009). Diversity in organizations: where are we now and where are we going? *Human Resource Management Review*, 19: 117–133.
- Singh, V., & Point, S. (2009). Diversity statements for leveraging organizational legitimacy. *Management international/Gestión Internacional/International Management*, 13(2): 23-34.
- Singh, V., & Point, S. (2006). (Re)presentations of gender and ethnicity in diversity statements on European company websites. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 68(4): 363-379.
- Singh, V., & Point, S. (2004). Strategic responses by European companies to the diversity challenge: An online comparison. *Long Range Planning*, 37(4): 295-318.
- Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Jonsen, K., & Voigt, A. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(4): 690-709.
- Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the Benefits of Diversity All-Inclusive Multiculturalism and Positive Organizational Change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(1): 116-133.
- Stringfellow, E. (2012). Trade unions and discourses of diversity management: A comparison of Sweden and Germany. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 21: 39-56
- Süß, S., & Kleiner, M. (2007). Diversity management in Germany: dissemination and design of the concept. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(11): 1934-1953.

- Tatli, A. (2011). A multi-layered exploration of the diversity management field: diversity discourses, practices and practitioners in the UK. *British Journal of Management*, 22(2): 238-253.
- Tatli, A., Vassilopoulou, J., Al Ariss, A., & Özbilgin, M. (2012). The role of regulatory and temporal context in the construction of diversity discourses: The case of the UK, France and Germany. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 18(4): 293-308.
- Theodorakopoulos, N., & Budhwar, P. (2015). Guest Editors' Introduction: Diversity and Inclusion in Different Work Settings: Emerging Patterns, Challenges, and Research Agenda. *Human Resource Management*, 54(2), 177-197.
- Thomas, R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, 2(2): 107-117.
- Uysal, N. (2013). Shifting the paradigm: diversity communication on corporate web sites. *Public Relations Journal*, 7(2): 213-236.
- Walker, H. J., Feild, H. S., Bernerth, J. B., & Becton, J. B. (2012). Diversity cues on recruitment websites: Investigating the effects on job seekers' information processing. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1): 214-224.
- Williamson, I. O., Slay, H. S., Shapiro, D. L., & Shivers-Blackwell, S. L. (2008). The effect of explanations on prospective applicants' reactions to firm diversity practices. *Human Resource Management*, 47(2): 311-330.
- Williamson, I. O., King Jr., J. E., Lepak, D., & Sarma, A. (2010). Firm reputation, recruitment web sites, and attracting applicants. *Human Resource Management*, 49(4): 669-687.
- Zapata-Barrero, R. (2010). Dynamics of diversity in Spain, In S. Vertovec & S. Wessendorf (eds.), *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European Discourses, Policies and Practices*, Routledge, chapter 9, 170.

TABLE 1

List 75 Companies Included in Sample and Key Diversity characteristics per country

	France (F)	Germany (D)	Spain (SP)	UK (UK)	US (US)
Cultural cluster	Latin European	Germanic	Latin European	Anglo-Saxon	Anglo-Saxon
Key philosophy	Diversity and discrimination are two sides of the same coin	Diversity has little to do with anti-discrimination	‘Pragmatic practical philosophy’ leads to anticipation and proactive policies	Business-case arguments help diversity to move away from equal opportunities	An overall strategic direction for the organization
Key dimension of diversity	Gender and cultural differences	Equal opportunities for men and women in work life	Linguistic, religion and national diversity	Disability, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, age	Race, multiculturalism
Key target	Women, immigrants and minority ethnic groups	Immigrants	Immigrants	Women and ethnic minorities as well as an ageing population	The ‘melting-pot’
Companies included in our sample	Air Liquide	Allianz	Abertis	AstraZeneca	AT&T
	AXA	BASF	ACS	Barclays	Chevron
	BNP Paribas	Bayer	Amadeus IT Holding	BG Group	Coca-Cola Co
	EDF	BMW	Banco Popular	BHP Billiton	Exxon Mobil
	GDF Suez	Continental	Banco Sabadell	BP	General Electric
	Groupe Danone	Daimler	Banco Santander	British American Tobacco	IBM
	Kering/PPR	Deutsche Bank	BBVA	Diageo	Intel
	L’Oreal	Deutsche Post	Caixabank	GlaxoSmithKline	Johnson & Johnson
	LVMH	Deutsche Telekom	Electrica	HSBC Holdings	JPMorgan Chase
	Orange	E.ON	Ferrovial	Lloyds Banking Group	Merck
	Pernod Ricard	Henkel	Gas Natural	Reckitt Benckiser Group	Microsoft
	Sanofi	Muench Ruckvers	Iberdrola	Rio Tinto	Pfizer
	Schneider Electric	SAP	Inditex	Royal Dutch Shell	Procter&Gamble
	Total	Siemens	Repsol YPF	SABMiller	Verizon Comm
	Vivendi	Volkswagen	Telefónica	Vodafone Group	Wal-Mart Stores

TABLE 2**Proportion of Companies Combining Diversity Statements with Other Paradigms**

	Anti-discrimination /prejudice free	Equal Opportunity	Inclusion	Fairness	Embedding diversity into corporate culture	Be a better place to work
France	67%	73%	27%	20%	40%	60%
Germany	33%	60%	47%	27%	73%	67%
Spain	60%	87%	0%	7%	7%	20%
UK	27%	87%	80%	40%	60%	53%
USA	20%	33%	93%	20%	40%	53%

TABLE 3**Disclosure of each Diversity Dimension per Country**

	D	UK	FR	US	SP	TOTAL
Visible differences						
Gender	100%	100%	100%	93%	73%	93%
Disability	67%	60%	80%	60%	60%	65%
Age	93%	73%	60%	27%	47%	60%
Race/ethnicity	33%	87%	33%	67%	40%	52%
Color	7%	13%	0%	20%	7%	9%
Difference in physical appearance	7%	13%	0%	13%	0%	7%
Geographic differences						
Nationality	80%	53%	60%	40%	60%	59%
Culture	73%	27%	47%	67%	20%	47%
Language	0%	20%	7%	7%	33%	13%
Education & professional background						
Experience	40%	47%	13%	47%	7%	31%
Profession/skills	47%	40%	13%	40%	0%	28%
General background	20%	40%	7%	47%	13%	25%
Education	20%	13%	7%	7%	0%	9%
Family situation						
Sexual orientation	33%	80%	27%	67%	27%	47%
Parental status	27%	27%	40%	7%	20%	24%
Social class/caste	13%	0%	20%	0%	27%	12%
Family status	7%	13%	7%	0%	20%	9%
Opinions & beliefs						
Religion	33%	67%	20%	20%	40%	36%
Perspective/point of view	33%	33%	0%	40%	0%	21%
Thinking types	27%	33%	7%	20%	0%	17%
Political opinion	0%	20%	0%	0%	20%	8%
Personality/character	7%	7%	0%	13%	0%	5%
Union affiliation	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	1%

FIGURE 1

Companies in Countries Moving from Diversity Branding to Inclusion Branding

Allows Them to Capitalize on Their Branding as an Employer of Choice

