ANTI-DISCRIMINATION TRAINING AT THE WORKPLACE IN EUROPE: THE APPLICATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL TYPOLOGY

John Wrench

Centre for Diversity and Inclusion
NTNU Social Research
Norwegian University of Science and Technology
NO-7491 Trondheim
Norway

Anti-Discrimination Training at the Workplace in Europe: The Application of an International Typology

John Wrench

The immigrants who came to satisfy the post-war labour shortages in the economies of western Europe usually worked in poorer conditions and for less pay than native European workers. Often they would work in jobs below their levels of experience or qualification, regarding this as a sacrifice they were willing to pay in order to provide better opportunities for their children. Since then post-war labour migrants and their children have generally remained over-represented in long-term unemployment or in poorly paid, insecure and generally undesirable work. Policy discussions generally emphasise supply-side factors in this – immigrants are seen as having a weak command of the local language, or as having a poor educational history and fewer qualifications. Integration policies therefore try to reduce these supply-side disadvantages by encouraging migrants to take language courses, improve their education and attend vocational training courses, as well as courses in the host country's culture and institutions. However, although such approaches can be necessary for newly arrived immigrants and refugees, they are often irrelevant for long-settled migrants and their children. The problems faced by these groups are less easily explained by supply-side arguments. Even with fluency of language and parity in educational attainment, members of minority ethnic groups suffer labour market marginalisation in comparison with their majority national peers. Here, demand–side factors are more important in constraining the employment opportunities of ethnic minorities in Europe (Zegers de Beijl 2000). One of these demand-side factors is 'racial' or ethnic discrimination.

The international convention whose object is to prevent racism and racial discrimination is the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, (ICERD) which was adopted by the UN Assembly on 19 December 1965. The first part of it defines what is meant by racial discrimination:

> 'The term 'racial discrimination' shall mean any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life' (Banton 1994: 39).

More narrowly, racial discrimination in employment can be said to occur when migrants/ethnic minorities are accorded inferior treatment in the labour market or in the workplace relative to nationals/whites, despite being comparably qualified in terms of education, experience or other relevant criteria. Evidence for the operation of such discrimination in European labour markets came from a number of studies during the 1990s. For example, a report commissioned by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin, covering all EU countries, described widespread 'racial' or ethnic discrimination in its direct forms, such as the refusal to employ people simply on the grounds of colour of skin or ethnic background, as well as indirect discrimination, such as restricting employment opportunities to the family of existing workers, or using questionable informal and subjective criteria in recruitment (Wrench 1996). The report also illustrated a general ignorance of the problems of racism and discrimination in employment on the part of many European employers, trade unionists, labour inspectors, and so on.

Partly in response to such evidence, in October 1995 the European Social Partners signed the Joint Declaration on the Prevention of Racial Discrimination and Xenophobia and Promotion of Equal Treatment at the Workplace. This Declaration proposed the compilation of a Compendium of Good Practice on preventing racism and discrimination in employment. National researchers were asked to produce a report covering cases of good practice within their own country, and the Compendium was compiled from these national reports (Wrench 1997). It includes 25 case-studies from the 15 countries of the European Union, encompassing private and public sector companies, trade unions, collective agreements, and other initiatives to combat racism and discrimination in employment. However, it was noticeable that although this Compendium had been stimulated by the growing recognition of the demand-side problem – i.e. racism and discrimination – a large proportion of the 'good practice' initiatives within this nevertheless still reflected a supply-side consciousness, i.e. they were concerned with training immigrants to fit them better for jobs, rather than, for example, addressing institutional discrimination and organisational change (Wrench 2000).

This paper draws on evidence from an international initiative which has attempted to address this recurring imbalance in European policy debates and focus on the operation of demand-side anti-discrimination measures. This is the ILO's programme "Combating discrimination against (im)migrant workers and ethnic minorities in the world of work", a seven year research project which focussed on both national and organisational measures against discrimination and which finished in 1999.

Measures against 'racial' or ethnic discrimination can be classified into six general categories:[1]

1. international standards and programmes (e.g. ICERD)
2. legislative and legal measures (e.g. national anti-discrimination legislation)
3. administrative measures (e.g. contract compliance by local authorities)
4. organisational initiatives (e.g equal opportunities policies)
5. collective action (e.g. trade union initiatives)
6. political / educational action (e.g. public education campaigns)

Probably the most important starting point with regard to measures to combat the demand-side factor of discrimination is the introduction of legislative and legal measures implemented by the legislative and judicial institutions of government (no. 2), which themselves are sometimes stimulated by the existence of international conventions (no.1). Across Europe there is an increasing trend of adopting or strengthening national legislation against racial and ethnic discrimination in employment, and this trend will be further stimulated by the adoption in 2000 by the EU Council of Ministers of the Directives on equal treatment of people irrespective of their race and ethnic background, and on the equal treatment of persons in the labour market. However, this paper will not focus on these national legal devices against discrimination. Instead, it will examine anti-discrimination activities which take place within organisations (no.4). These are policies which are 'voluntarily' adopted by organisations, although in reality they may have been introduced through the pressure of factors such as legislation. More specifically this paper focuses on anti-discrimination training. Amongst the measures which can be adopted within organisations to

---

[1] These categories were elaborated at the ILO High Level Meeting on Achieving Equality in Employment held in Geneva 8-11 March 2000.

counter 'racial' and ethnic discrimination in employment, training is considered to be one of the most important. Anti-discrimination training has been common in the United States for many years, but until recently little has been know about anti-discrimination training and related policies in Europe. This paper[2] first shows how a new typology was created in order to classify, document and understand the range of anti-discrimination training activities which exists in different national contexts. It then sets out the evidence from the ILO programme on the particular approaches to anti-discrimination training in several European countries, and finally discusses the implications of this evidence for the European development of one of the latest organisational policies relevant to combating racism and discrimination at the place of work, diversity management.

The ILO programme
The ILO programme covered several countries of Western Europe[3] in three separate stages of research:

> Stage (i) was the empirical verification of discrimination. The ILO initiated a programme of practice tests or "situation testing", using mock applications for jobs by matched pairs of applicants. The Netherlands carried out the first national study (Bovenkerk et al. 1995), with others following in Germany, Spain, Denmark and Belgium (Goldberg et al. 1995, Colectivo Ioé 1996, Hjarnø and Jensen 1997, Arrijn et al. 1998).

> Stage (ii) was a comparative analysis of national measures against discrimination in employment. This was first carried out with regard to the UK, the Netherlands and Sweden (Zegers de Beijl 1991), with studies following in Germany, Spain, Finland, Denmark and Belgium (Goldberg et al. 1995, Colectivo Ioé 1996, Vuori 1996, Hansen and McClure 1998, Smeesters1999)

> Stage (iii) of the project is the examination of the extent, content and impact of anti-discrimination training and education activities in migrant-receiving countries. This has been done, or is planned, in the Netherlands, the UK, Finland, Spain and Belgium (Abell et al. 1997, Taylor et al. 1997, Vuori 1997, Colectivo Ioé 1997, Castelain-Kinet et al. 1998).

A logical starting point for a programme to combat workplace discrimination is the evidence from stage (i), the programme of 'situation testing' (sometimes known as 'discrimination testing' or 'practice tests'- see Banton 1997). This method utilises two or more testers, one belonging to a majority group and the others to ethnic minority groups, all of whom apply for the same jobs, whether by letter, telephone or in person. The testers are matched for all the criteria which should be normally taken into account by an employer, such as age, qualifications, experience and schooling. If over repeated testing the applicant from the majority background is systematically preferred to the others, then this points to the operation of discrimination according to ethnic background (Bovenkerk 1992: 6-7).

The overall findings for discrimination testing in the various countries were summed up thus:

---

[2] This paper is based on a university working paper (Wrench 1998) which has subsequently been modified to include more recent developments.

[3] The ILO initiative also included Canada and the United States, but in this paper, most discussion is restricted to the European countries.

The project's findings showed discrimination in access to employment to be a phenomenon of considerable and significant importance in all countries covered by the research. Overall net-discrimination rates of up to 35 per cent are not uncommon, meaning that in at least one out of three application procedures migrants/minorities were discriminated against. As a consequence of the rigorous research methodology, the discrimination rates uncovered by the project were assumed to be conservative estimates of what is happening in reality. The research amply demonstrated that migrant and ethnic minority workers face numerous problems in the labour market and that they are in many ways at a disadvantage when compared with members of the majority or dominant population.[4]

The strength and type of legislation against employment discrimination varies tremendously between European countries. There were several comparative analyses of the workings of national anti-discrimination law, and of enforcement agencies, in Europe during the 1990s (Forbes and Mead 1992; Commission of the European Communities 1993, MacEwen 1995; MacEwen 1997). This was also the task of the second stage of the ILO's programme, the analysis of national measures against discrimination in employment. The findings of this stage of the programme pointed to the advantage of civil legislation over penal code provisions in providing redress to victims of unlawful discrimination in employment. Other conclusions were that nationality, colour, religion, 'race' and ethnic origin should be amongst the grounds covered by the civil statute, and that, because of the difficulties in proving discriminatory practices, the burden of proof should be placed on the person against whom the discrimination is alleged, who should be required to show that the disadvantageous treatment was not based on prohibited grounds.[5] The findings also demonstrated the importance of having a specialised institution with powers of mediation and investigation, and the ability to bring cases to court.

Training to counter discrimination
Although national measures, such as anti-discrimination legislation, are necessary, they are not seen to be a sufficient means of combating 'racial' or ethnic discrimination in employment. The effect of such legislation is often that racism becomes more subtle, and that indirect, institutional or unintentional discrimination becomes more important. Therefore, as well as laws against discrimination, there also exists a range of social policy initiatives against racism and discrimination at an organisational level, including equal opportunities programmes.

One component of equal opportunities and anti-discrimination activity is the provision of training for recruiters and selectors on avoiding and countering racial discrimination. Hence the rationale for the third stage of the ILO's project, the aim of which was to document and evaluate in different countries the effectiveness of anti-discrimination training and education activities where such training is imparted to people who have a part to play in access to the labour market. In this sense it is training directed at many of those same types of individuals who would have been involved in the discriminatory practices revealed in previous situation testing, such as personnel and line managers in both the private and public sector who are involved in the recruitment process. It might also cover civil servants and officials in labour exchanges and other agencies which play a placement role for individuals seeking employment, and trade union full-time officials and shop stewards

---

[4] ILO paper produced at the conclusion of the project: *Approaches to Promote Equality: A Compendium of Measures* by P. A Taran, ILO Geneva, September 2000

[5] ILO project Information Bulletin No.4, p.3.

whose activities can also influence whether individuals gain particular jobs, and who may also have an influence on employment careers within an organisation.

As the project was primarily concerned with anti-discrimination training directed at gatekeepers, this exercise did not encompass, for example, training directed at the migrants and ethnic minorities themselves, such as training in the language of the receiving country, or occupational skills training to allow access to jobs for which migrants have insufficient experience. Nor did it cover training for service delivery, such as training for people such as social workers, teachers, staff involved in the allocation of housing, workers in the voluntary sector, and bank staff providing financial services, aimed at enhancing sensitivity or fairness in the delivery of services to ethnic minority clients.

Nevertheless, having restricted the focus to anti-discrimination training, there still exist many different types of training - often working from very different assumptions about the causes of and remedies for racism and discrimination - all of which can be directed towards gatekeepers in the labour market, and all of which would claim to be tackling employment discrimination. The aim of this part of the ILO's initiative was to document and classify the range of anti-discrimination training activity in various countries, and also, if possible, come to some conclusions about whether certain approaches seem to be more useful than others, and in what circumstances.

Training approaches

Before attempting the documentation and classification of anti-discrimination training in different countries it was necessary to have some sort of overview of different possible training approaches. By "approaches" is meant the underlying philosophies and assumptions of such training, and the corresponding methodologies and training content implied by these. We can see examples of contrasting approaches by examining the recent history of training within one country, the United Kingdom.

Until the mid-1960s, the assumption had been that post-war immigrants to the United Kingdom had a responsibility to "assimilate" themselves into the host society. The onus was on immigrants themselves to learn about British society, and the corresponding implication was that training should "Teach them about us" (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 9). In the mid-1960s a new philosophy came to be expounded in some official quarters, that of "pluralistic" integration, with the assumption that immigrant cultures would to some degree persist in British society, and should be accorded respect. This had implications for the training of professionals, such as social workers, teachers and other service providers, who should be properly informed about 'immigrant cultures', and be aware that immigrants themselves might have 'special needs' deriving from their cultural difference. Thus the emphasis changed to "teach us about them" (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 10).

This remained throughout most of the 1970s the dominant training assumption in the United Kingdom. Then, from the late 1970s onwards, training which mainly consisted of the provision of cultural information about ethnic minorities became increasingly questioned. Many of the underlying assumptions of multi-culturalism came under attack as masking the reality of racism and discrimination, and doing little to address issues of justice and equality (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 10). The 1976 Race Relations Act in Britain considerably strengthened measures to address discrimination, and marks the beginning of a new stage in that it placed the goal of racial equality more squarely on the policy agenda at the institutional level (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 11). Thus training aimed at preventing racism and discrimination increased, and was further stimulated after

the 1980 and 1981 urban disturbances in cities such as London and Liverpool, which brought to public attention the disaffection of many black urban youth.

This training generally occurred at the local authority level rather than national level. In many local authorities and service providers an initially prominent emphasis was the type of Racism Awareness Training which emphasised confronting and attempting to change individual racist attitudes of white staff.   This confrontational approach received much criticism as inducing resistance and resentment amongst trainees, or at best leading to feelings of guilt and self-blame. Another criticism was that the individual-centred approach diverted attention away from organisational, institutional and structural issues (Sivanandan 1985).   Other types of equal opportunity training sought instead to produce changes in the behaviour and actions of staff dealing with ethnic minority clients or applicants, training people in, for example, procedures for the avoidance of discrimination in line with the Commission for Racial Equality's Code of Practice for employers (1984).   A later development was training to include both of these strands, aiming to both produce attitude change towards a commitment to anti-racist goals, and produce behavioural change towards non-discriminatory procedures.

Throughout much of the training literature runs a debate as to whether it is better to attempt changes in attitudes or in behaviour,[6] and despite the fallacy inherent in trying to separate completely one from the other, much training, implicitly at least, still subscribes to one or other emphasis. The original debate about whether to emphasise attitude change or behavioural change can be seen to relate to different assumptions over a number of issues, not only on the question of the relationship between attitudes and behaviour, but also on the nature of racism and discrimination, how it is defined, and how it is to be combated.

A typology of approaches
If there exists such a variety of training emphases and approaches within one country then in an international study these differences could well be multiplied. If an international comparison is to be made, and any meaningful generalisations result, then it would be important to organise and categorise different training approaches into some kind of usable typology. In fact, one typology of training approaches already exists, and for this we can turn to the work of Luthra and Oakley (1991).   Luthra and Oakley see typologies as important tools of analysis, by allowing the identification of a number of main tendencies, each with its own internal consistency:

> Without conceptual tools of this kind, there can be no agreed point of reference for defining particular forms of training, and no basis for comparison or for the evaluation of particular training effects (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 32).

Luthra and Oakley delineate the different training approaches and methodologies which have evolved in the UK over thirty years. They set out five "ideal type" models of the main training approaches, covering training for service delivery staff in the UK. These were:

- Race Information training
- Racism Awareness training

---

[6] For further debate on this particular issue see Peppard 1983, Chesler and Delgado 1987, Brown and Lawton 1991, Bovenkerk 1992.

- Race Equality training
- Anti-Racism training
- The Educational Approach[7]

The next task was to see whether Luthra and Oakley's typology would be a useful categorisation device for an international comparison of anti-discrimination training. To get some insight into this, it was necessary to look at some further examples of training, outside the UK. Therefore, before commencing the main research, a pilot exercise was carried out. Letters were sent to contacts provided by the ILO in various European countries, asking them to provide any information they were aware of on anti-discrimination training in their particular country. At the same time, a brief literature search was carried out the subject. These exercises produced varying results - for some countries, a lot of activity was indicated; for others, there seemed to be virtually nothing (see Wrench and Taylor 1993: 4-7).

The greatest response came from the Netherlands, which seemed to have a veritable industry of training provision, and a complete range of emphases, ranging from management courses on "pluralistic organisations" to help managers identify the implications of culturally shaped beliefs and behaviours for organisational policies, to the more politically-guided anti-racist training where employees are urged to confront racism at all levels in their organisation. Training is provided by an equally wide range of organisations, from professional management consultants to small ideologically motivated voluntary organisations. However, some of the literature is rather critical of much of this activity, and critics have argued that the 1980s "boom" in the provision of training has led to problems of quality. An attempt to provide an inventory of activities of fighting racism and discrimination in the Netherlands, including training, found that only a small amount of activities could be properly described because most of the organisations approached were unable to provide adequate information about aims, methods and basic assumptions (Abell, 1991). Although Abell did find a number of organisations which were found to do a good job, the conclusion he came to was that "because of vague objectives, obscure methods and the lack of sound assumptions, one must seriously question the effectiveness of most activities" (p.181).

Evidence on training in other European countries was harder to come by. In many of these, authorities have only recently started to pay attention to issues of racial and ethnic discrimination. In Sweden, for example, there seemed to be much activity in the way of training directed at immigrants and refugees themselves, and some training on immigrant issues is directed at civil servants concerned with vocational guidance and job placement. However, in general, training which directly tackles discrimination seemed to be rare. In countries such as Italy and Spain the emphasis of training seemed only to be that of training migrants, including vocational training, to assist them to integrate and get them on an equal footing with local workers.

The most common activity in Germany seemed to be language courses for migrants and special programmes for young people to facilitate their transition from school to work. There was some evidence of educational activity directed at the German majority population, such as the provision of geographical and cultural information on migrant countries of origin for staff in Job Centres, and

---

[7] The main characteristics of the first four of these types can be found later in this paper, under the discussion on the six main types within the international typology. The 'educational approach' worked from the assumption that change will come through the personal development of the individual, and this is facilitated in a collaborative personal relationship between trainer and trainee in small group discussions, with 'race' elements forming part of a much broader educational curriculum (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 30-31).

campaigns on "living together with foreigners", but no established tradition of equal opportunities/anti-discrimination training directed at the majority population, such as is found in the neighbouring Netherlands.

This first pilot exploration of training and educational activity, though hardly a rigorous enquiry, nevertheless, provided enough material to help with two methodological questions. Firstly, did the evidence so far on the types of training in different European countries fit Luthra and Oakley's training typology? Secondly, could this typology then be then used within a more rigorous international exploration and critique of anti-discrimination training activity?

Although some of the types of training from the pilot exercise clearly did fall under the heading of one of Luthra and Oakley's five types, others did not seem to fit into any category at all. It seemed, therefore, that it would be necessary to add some extra types to this classification. In order to extend the typology with new types it is necessary to be clear about the nature of the criteria which define the existing types. However, the problem here was that different types seemed to be defined by different criteria. For example, some were defined by their training content, whilst others seemed to be defined by their aims or techniques.

On reflection, there were probably two problems inherent in trying to use this pre-existing typology 'off- the-shelf'. Firstly, the typology had been designed to categorise training for *service providers*, whereas we were looking at anti-discrimination training for gatekeepers. Secondly, the typology was designed to cover training only within the UK, whereas we wanted one for international use. It was therefore decided to go back to basic principles and attempt to construct a new typology, based on the two main criteria which seemed to define the types in Luthra and Oakley's model - those of *training strategy*, and *training content*.

A new typology
In order to construct the new international training typology, the technique of "cross-classification" was used, the combination of two conceptual dichotomies in a single framework, which then produces a set of classificatory types (Baldamus 1976: 98). As C. Wright Mills (1959) writes in his essay "On Intellectual Craftsmanship", "the process of cross-classifying ... is the best way to imagine and get hold of new types as well as to criticise and to clarify old ones". The basis of the typology was certain regularities of strategy and content which have run through much equal opportunities/anti-discrimination training. By cross-classifying these we can see how some well-known training types fall into their conceptual place, and also identify the possibilities of others which as yet we may be unaware of.

The first dimension is that of *strategy*. There seemed to be four main possibilities here:

- Firstly, the training strategy might be one of straightforward *information provision*, with the underlying assumption that the problem to be tackled is largely one of ignorance, and that the provision of new information will itself produce changes in attitudes and behaviour.

- Secondly, the training might be characterised by a more active and direct strategy of specific mechanisms to produce *attitude change* in the trainees.

- Thirdly, the main emphasis might be on training to produce *behavioural change* in the trainees, perhaps with the assumption that attitude change may follow.

- Finally the emphasis might be a broader one of producing *organisational change* rather than simply restricting the focus to the attitude and behavioural change of those trainees who attended the course.

The second dimension is that of the *content* of training. Here there seemed to be three main possibilities:

- Firstly, the main emphasis of training content could be *multi-cultural* - focusing on the characteristics of migrants and ethnic minorities themselves.

- Secondly, the emphasis might be on *racism and discrimination*, with attention focused on the actions of the majority population and the structures of society.

- Finally the emphasis might be on *broader issues* which may include a multi-cultural and anti-racist content but locate these in a much broader social context.

If we arrange these dimensions in the form of a cross-classification diagram (Figure 1) we find that this produces in theory twelve different types of training. Labelling the four categories on the "strategy" dimension A, B, C and D, and on the "content" dimension 1, 2, and 3, provides a short-hand way of identifying all the possible types: A1, B2, C3, D3 etc.

Figure 1: Anti-Discrimination Training Typology

Content Strategy	MULTI-CULTURAL 1	ANTI-DISCRIMINATION/ ANTI-RACIST 2	BROADER ISSUES 3
INFORMATION PROVISION A	A1 Information Training	A2 Information Training	A3
ATTITUDE CHANGE B	B1 Cultural Awareness Training	B2 Racism Awareness Training	B3
BEHAVIOUR CHANGE C	C1	C2 Equalities Training	C3 Equalities Training
ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE D	D1	D2 Anti-Racism Training	D3 Diversity Training

Although the cross-classification process throws up twelve theoretical types, this does not mean that in reality all these twelve will exist. Furthermore, whilst some established training approaches clearly fit into individual boxes of the typology, others might best be categorised by a combination of two or three adjacent boxes. In fact, for our purposes it seemed that the varieties crystallise into six main types, four of which correspond closely to four of those in Luthra and Oakley's UK typology. Therefore, this cross-classification exercise seemed to produce what we wanted - it largely encompassed Luthra and Oakley's types, but also allowed logically for the extension into some new ones, along consistent criteria.

In the context of the ILO's programme, it was decided to use slightly different terminology to label the types. For one thing, the term "race" is not used, because, although use of the term is common in the UK and the US, it is alien to many other countries. The main training approaches were categorised as follows (see Wrench and Taylor 1993: 16).

(1) Information Training   (A1 or A1.A2)
(2) Cultural Awareness Training   (B1 or B1.A1)
(3) Racism Awareness Training   (B2 or B2.A2 or B2.A2.B1)
(4) Equalities Training   (C2 or C2.C3)
(5) Anti-Racism Training   (D2 including elements of C2, B2 and A2)
(6) Diversity Training   (D3 including elements of most other types)

(1) Information Training
In many European countries there would appear to be much training effort which could fall into this category: programmes to encourage inter-cultural awareness and promote better communication and understanding, training directed at those dealing with the integration of migrants which provides demographic facts and figures on migrants, their countries of origin, their current employment patterns, etc. Generally, material is presented in the form of straightforward lectures, videos or written material. In type **A1** the content of such training is primarily cultural information on migrant and ethnic minority communities. Type **A1.A2** provides cultural information but also includes factual information on prejudice and racism, the evidence and processes of discrimination, the legal context of discriminatory acts, etc. The assumption behind this approach is that most people are fair, but are often unaware of the extent and effect of racial discrimination. Training is required to inform them about discrimination and disadvantage in society, so that they will be disposed to implement measures to tackle it. In both variations of this type the underlying assumption is that the provision of correct information is enough to lead to behavioural change. According to Luthra and Oakley, experience in the UK suggests that this is still the approach that many clients indicate would be preferable and sufficient.

(2) Cultural Awareness Training
Type **B1** or **B1.A1** This not only provides cultural information, but actively engages trainees in exercises to change their attitudes; for example, role play exercises, or intensive group discussions. Sometimes these involve invited representatives of migrant/ethnic minority communities. Courses of cultural awareness might include material on the majority culture of the trainees on the grounds that thinking critically about their own culture will help in understanding others better. Courses on the theme of "living/working together with foreigners/migrants" will often fall under this heading. Although Cultural Awareness Training, unlike simple Information Training, is more active in trying to produce attitude change in the trainees, it still remains similar to Information Training in seeing behavioural change as relatively unproblematic. Implicit in this approach is the idea that raising trainees' awareness and changing prejudiced attitudes will thereby automatically reduce discriminatory behaviour.

(3) Racism Awareness Training
This approach is typified by the "Human Awareness" or "White Awareness" programme of Katz (1978) in the USA and those who follow her model. The premise of Racism Awareness Training is that racism is located in white people and operates to their interests; it is therefore their responsibility to tackle it. White people need to be made aware of their own racism as a

precondition of being able to tackle the problem in their own lives (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 24). The methods are generally techniques to induce self-awareness in a group setting, with trainers sometimes using confrontational techniques, along with role-play and other self-awareness exercises. "The training thus aims to create a heightened awareness of racism within each participant, and largely presumes this will give rise to motivation at the behavioural level. So far as it addresses behaviour, Racism Awareness Training is strongly norm-oriented rather than being skill-oriented" (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 24). The narrow focus of this training is on racism itself, with the aim of producing a relatively rapid change in attitudes. As the focus of this approach is on personal attitudes there is no intrinsic necessity to consider legal or social policy issues in this type of training. Type **B2** is the "classic" form of Racism Awareness Training. There may well be "softer" or broader forms which could be categorised as **B2.A2** or **B2.A2.B1**.

(4) Equalities Training

(This type might also be known as "Equal Opportunities Training".) In complete contrast to Racism Awareness Training which seeks to change attitudes, Equalities Training refers to training which is designed primarily to affect behaviour. The training seeks to side-step attitudes by seeing them as private and irrelevant to the job, and simply aims to instruct the trainees in legally or professionally appropriate behaviour. This is defined as precisely as possible in terms of the appropriate norms and behaviour, and the required skills (Luthra and Oakley 1991:27). In many countries the starting point of Equalities Training will be that the law proscribes racial discrimination and that agencies and professionals must therefore make sure that discrimination, whether deliberate or unintentional, does not occur. "The actual extent or the causes of such discrimination are of less interest than the simple recognition that it is liable to occur, and that agencies need to have positive, systematic and effective strategies to identify and prevent it" (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 26). Training provision may be routinely built in to the induction of new recruits to the organisation.

In the UK, this approach has been broadly that advocated by the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE). Under the influence of the CRE and its Code of Practice a number of public sector and large commercial employers have provided this sort of training within a broader equal opportunities strategy. Type **C2** is classic equalities training, such as that which instructs trainees in all the stages of recruitment and selection so as to avoid discrimination and bias. Type **C2.C3** is a broader form of Equalities Training covering other issues than simply the avoidance of discrimination in recruitment: for example, how to write and implement a positive action/affirmative action policy. The training may also be part of a broader programme to include gender and disability issues.

(5) Anti-Racism Training

Anti-Racism Training was developed after disillusion with Racism Awareness Training, retaining a strong commitment to combating racism directly, whilst seeking to change organisational practice rather than individual self-awareness. The premise of this approach is that racism cannot be simply reduced to a problem of (white) individuals, and yet neither can it be tackled purely in terms of discriminatory behaviour without addressing the level of personal attitudes and awareness. The goal is to secure the support of individuals in challenging the racism which is endemic in the culture and institutions of the society, and Anti-Racism Training forms part of an organisational strategy designed to pursue this aim. Training exercises are geared to developing both self-awareness and job performance. Although producing change at the behavioural level is the target, the tackling of attitudes is seen as a necessary condition of effective behaviour change. Inappropriate attitudes cannot simply be by-passed, and so the training seeks to integrate both normative and behavioural aspects, integrated at the individual and organisational levels (Luthra and Oakley, 1991: 28-29).

Although this approach would seek to tackle racial discrimination in recruitment, the approach seeks to combat racism at all levels in the organisation, not simply at this point of entry. The important characteristic of this training approach is that racism and discrimination are still seen to constitute the main problem within the organisation, and the main reason for the training programme. This type of training is seen by Luthra and Oakley as less easy to typify than the other approaches. It is categorised as **D2** in the typology, though in reality this training is likely to include aspects of the content of C2, B2 and A2.

(6) Diversity Training

Type **D3** is the most recent development, perhaps best typified by "Managing Diversity" programmes in the United States (Thomas 1990; MacDonald 1993). It has been argued that Diversity Management is the logical next step after measures such as equal opportunities initiatives and affirmative action programmes have broken down barriers to the employment of minorities, producing a more diverse workforce. Diversity management is seen as a strategy of fully tapping the resources within an organisation, getting people to perform to their potential. The training, which is mainly directed at managers, emphasises the importance of valuing difference. It argues that ethnic, racial and sexual groups have different cultural styles of working which should not be negatively labelled by white managers. Fairness is not seen as treating people equally but treating people appropriately. Managers should carry out a "cultural audit" to discover what it is that is blocking the progress of "non-traditional" employees; this may uncover the organisation's "institutional racism". The objective is not to assimilate minorities (and women) into the dominant white (and male) organisational culture but to create a dominant *heterogeneous* culture.

It is different to the previous training approaches in that it is broader in emphasis, more ambitious, and long-term in perspective. It is not aimed simply at "front-line" staff or those people involved in recruitment, but sees its most important target group as managers who have the power to produce organisational change. Being the latest and broadest type, it is likely to include elements of many of the other types: for example, awareness exercises on "racial sensibility" similar to Racism Awareness Training; sessions on cultural sensitivity as found in Cultural Awareness Training; or strategies of fair recruitment, as found in Equalities Training. It might aim to produce individual attitude and behaviour change as well as long-term organisational change. Paradoxically, "equal opportunities" aspects can become less visible, although potentially more widespread, as practical aspects are assimilated into normal business strategies and routines. This could be seen either as a positive development, if equal opportunities are seen to become 'normal' and relevant to everyone, or a negative development if equal opportunities lose their power and visibility by becoming swallowed up and assimilated into broader developments (Jewson et al. 1995).

Further observations on the typology

In reality it is possible that there may exist no training types to fit in some of the boxes of the typology. For example, it is quite possible that types in the two extreme "wings" of the typology - D1 and A3 - will not be found to be relevant to this exercise. Types C1 and D1 may perhaps be found to exist in service delivery; for example, C1 could be when trainees are trained to respond to clients or customers in ways which take account of cultural differences; this might even include training for staff in the language of ethnic minority clients. An example of training which would fit into B3 would be what Luthra and Oakley call the "Educational Approach", such as in the programme for the development of police training in the UK at Brunel University (Luthra and Oakley 1991: 30-32). Again, this is a case of service delivery training rather than employment

training, and therefore will not be considered to fall within the scope of this particular project. If A3 does exist it would probably constitute the weakest form of anti-discrimination training.

The aim of the typology is to provides us with a basis for comparison and enable us to understand and categorise the different assumptions which underlie different training approaches. For example, trainers involved in Equalities and Anti-Racism training (D2 and C2) are likely to work from the assumption that combating discrimination remains the most important issue, and may well be critical of any trend towards Diversity training (D3) on the grounds that the fight against discrimination becomes diluted amongst many other issues. In some countries the typology may be a useful device to clarify a chronological trend. In the UK, for example, it seems the direction of fashion in training approaches has been to start at A1 and move (diagonally through the figure) through B2 - C2 - D2 -D3. Later countries which have had the benefit of learning from the experiences of others may reveal a different path.

This typology was incorporated into a standardised research manual which provided a common methodological framework for comparing case studies of training practice in different countries (Wrench and Taylor 1993). Because of the difficulties in achieving precise and objective indicators of training effects, the manual draws heavily on qualitative methods, mainly semi-structured interviews, and gives guidance on who to interview, what questions to ask, and how to write up the findings. It also gives guidance to researchers on how to collect and present the (limited) objective information which is available. Rather than furnishing statistical 'proof' of outcomes, the common methodology enables researchers in different countries to come to reasoned judgements about the efficacy of particular practices, whilst being flexible enough to allow for the very different national contexts in which the case studies are located.

Application of the typology
The first aim of this exercise was to test whether the typology was in fact a useful classificatory tool for understanding anti-discrimination training in different national contexts. If this was so, then the next task was to describe the national variety observed, and make some observations as to the implications of these differences. The paper reports on the application of the typology in four of the ILO's national studies: those of the UK, the Netherlands, Spain and Finland. (The full findings can be found in the national reports - Taylor et al. 1997, Abell et al. 1997, Colectivo Ioé 1997, Vuori 1997).

1. The UK national report
With one exception, which will be discussed later, the typology proved to be a workable device in categorising and describing the emphasis of anti-discrimination training activity in the UK. The UK report documented the activities of a sample of 57 training providers, most being independent training consultants. Training in the UK was found to have progressed beyond the simply information provision of the Information Training type, although the provision of factual information on problems of racism and discrimination, and the legal context, was still part of the syllabus of other types of training. Nor was there any evidence that the formerly common types of "attitude change" training, Cultural Awareness Training and Racism Awareness Training, were used any more. Most of the current training activity could be classified as "Equalities Training", the defining characteristic of which is to change behaviour. By far the most common activity here was the imparting of skills for fairness in recruitment and selection.

A relatively new development was the increasing use of Diversity Training, the approach which emphasises the benefits of a diverse workforce, linking, for example, productivity gains to identifying, valuing and drawing upon cultural differences within a workforce. This trend was noticeable, even after having made allowances for the fact that some trainers mis-labelled their courses as "diversity" simply to take advantage of the current fashion (Taylor et al. 1997: 60).

In the UK study, as with other national reports, case studies of different training types were selected, and these were used to discover the reactions of trainers, clients, and trainees to the training experience. In terms of the reactions of the participants, the most common type of training - Equalities Training - came out best in this study. In the six case studies which operated Equalities Training for the staff working in the 'Personnel/Management' target group,[8] the participants were generally very positive about their experiences. Many were able to relate how changes in behaviour and in working practices were positively achieved. Responses to Anti-Racism Training were less consistently favourable than for Equalities Training. Although Anti-Racism Training does try to produce changes in behavioural practice, it also addresses individual attitudes, and it emphases combating racism as a primary goal. Some trainees resented this aspect of the training because they felt that there was an implicit criticism of their own professionalism, and this was particularly true in the one case study covering staff in the 'Job Centre' target group. Nevertheless, despite these elements of resentment, which were not encountered in the Equalities Training case studies, many other trainees did feel positive about their experiences, and in some case studies over 60 per cent of the participants claimed that the training had produced identifiable change in their working practices. This was also true for the case from the 'Job Centre' target group, where the training resulted in considerable internal activity, including changes when dealing with employers using the service (Taylor et al. 1997: 61).

The responses to Diversity Training were quite mixed. The relatively pure and narrow form of 'valuing diversity' approach aroused little positive reaction. Often trainees felt that Diversity Management was something which needed to follow on from, rather than replace, effective anti-discrimination and equal opportunities policies. Indeed, in its original formulation, Diversity Management works on the assumption that barriers to the employment of minorities have already largely been broken down, resulting in a diverse workforce. Trainees felt that as this stage had not been reached, Diversity Training was a little premature. However, in those cases where Diversity Training included elements of Anti-Racism Training and Equalities Training, (in other words, where the training was not categorised simply as D3 in the typology, but as D3-C3-D2) then trainees were far more positive about its impact. Where trade unionists were exposed to Diversity Training, reactions were less sympathetic, in one case producing the response that it was just a new way of masking exploitation. Trade unionist trainees seemed to be more ideologically suited to Equalities Training, and this type was shown in the documentation stage of the research to be by far the most common type of training directed at the 'Trade Union' target group (Taylor et al. 1997: 62).

Feedback from all parties to the training process suggested that many people expect real change to be effected only when there are significant numbers of people from minorities in positions of power in organisations. This issue is relevant to the one 'failure' in the application of the typology to the UK - the discovery of a type of anti-discrimination training which did not fit into the original typology. This exception was a course on "Anti-Racism for Black Managers", which sought to facilitate black managers' personal and professional skills for effectively challenging racism and

---

[8] The other target groups were' Job Centre staff' and 'Trade Unions'.

discrimination in the workplace. It worked from the assumption that progress will be encouraged by black people working effectively in management positions, and that those who have succeeded in entering the corridors of power from the ranks of the disadvantaged are also likely to have a particularly strong commitment to extending that access, and to extending anti-discrimination practice in organisations. The content of the course contained elements of Information Training, Equalities Training, and Racism Awareness Training, but the course itself could not be categorised within the typology. That is because one of the main assumptions behind the typology had been that 'anti-discrimination training' was by definition training directed at the white majority, those whose attitudes and practices lay behind the structures of exclusion. The corresponding assumption was that training directed at ethnic minorities themselves was likely to be in some way 'compensatory', and was therefore outside the remit of this exercise. In fact, this new course was both directed at the minority group, and classifiable as 'anti-discrimination'. Like the purer forms of Diversity Training, it is a type which logically is only appropriate when some barriers have been broken down and people from previously excluded minorities have found their way into some of the higher levels of the organisation. This relatively new and innovative approach to anti-discrimination training produced a very positive response from those black managers who participated (Taylor et al. 1997: 62).

2. The Netherlands national report

The typology also proved workable in categorising training activity in the Netherlands, and its value was made evident in the realisation of one of its major aims, the ability to categorise clear differences in emphasis in the training approaches found in two European countries.

The Dutch researchers found that most of the activities of the Dutch 'inter-cultural management' training providers are classifiable as Information Training and Cultural Awareness Training, although it seems that Information Training is no longer given alone, but rather in combination with some form of Cultural Awareness Training. Of a sample of 54 training providers, almost half the courses fell into the category of Cultural Awareness Training. A number of Dutch commentators were found to be quite critical of the dominant 'cultural' approach in the Netherlands. Advocates of the approach are criticised as making caricatures of the cultures of societies which in fact are internally very diverse. Cultures are portrayed as static and unchanging, and explanations for communication problems between native workers and immigrants are sought primarily in the culture of the latter, neglecting non-cultural factors such as power relations between the communicators. Furthermore, the approach assumes that discrimination will disappear if people have a better understanding of each other's cultural backgrounds, and that racism is simply caused by ignorance (see Abell et al. 1997: 28, 30).

In contrast to the UK, Equalities Training in its narrower type - primarily instructing trainees in legally and professionally appropriate behaviour to avoid discrimination in recruitment and selection (type C2) - seems to be rarely provided in the Netherlands. Instead, the broader form is more common (type C2.C3) where it may be part of a programme including gender and disability issues, and covering positive action policies. Furthermore, this type of training is likely to be a component of other types of training in the field of management development (Abell et al. 1997: 33). Racism Awareness Training (type B2) is also not common in the Netherlands, and, unlike the UK, was not common in the past. Anti-Racism Training (type D2) is not as popular in the Netherlands as it is in the UK. According to Abell et al. one reason for these differences is that public discussion on issues of racism and discrimination is more recent in the Netherlands than it is in the UK, and the existence of these phenomena continued to be denied for a long time.

However, in common with the UK study, the report detected a recent shift in training activities towards Diversity Training, mainly directed at managers, and emphasising the value of difference and the creation of a heterogeneous culture. The Dutch researchers suggest that the beginnings of a shift away from Cultural Awareness Training to Diversity Training could be seen as a step in the right direction, away from the simple "attitude change" paradigm towards one which envisages more practical changes. Indeed, taking the responses of the participants in the Dutch training, their experiences of Equalities Training and Diversity Training generally provoked more positive reactions than Cultural Awareness Training, possibly, according to Abell and his colleagues, because of the preference of trainees for more practical 'handles'. However, the significance of the shift towards Diversity Training depends on what the exact content of this type of training turns out to be. At worst, it could simply be a strategy for managers to side-step unpopular positive action programmes. The Dutch researchers argue that as a varied workforce is still more of an exception than a rule in most Dutch companies, there will be a need for positive action for many years to come (Abell et al. 1997: 62).

3. The Spanish national report

Whilst the typology proved to be useful in categorising training activity in the UK and the Netherlands, this was not the case in the third ILO national study, that of Spain, primarily because there was very little activity to categorise. Preliminary investigation suggested the non-existence, or at best, the scant implementation of anti-discrimination programmes designed for 'gatekeepers (Colectivo Ioé 1997). The report concluded that within the Spanish world of work there is no general awareness of a potential problem of ethnic or racial discrimination existing in the system. Indeed, stage (ii) of the ILO programme had shown that at that time Spain was one of the few industrialised migrant receiving countries which still had not introduced anti-discrimination legislation to protect non-national workers. The Spanish researchers were told that immigrants were concentrated in certain segments of the labour market, without being in competition for jobs with the majority population, and this was one reason why there was little recognition of a 'problem'. However, the research report did find evidence of the beginnings of change, with labour market actors becoming increasingly receptive to the idea of anti-discrimination training. The initiatives were coming first from people in local government, trade unions, and NGOs, with an added impetus coming from the internationalisation of enterprises which brought in experience from other countries, together with the increasing openness of Spanish officials to initiatives from the EU. The curricula of vocational training programmes were also broadening and becoming more sensitive to anti-discrimination issues.[9]

4. The Finnish National Report

The Finnish report (Vuori 1997) concluded that from both the literature and from the interviews carried out with 28 representatives of different sections of the labour market, there was little evidence of anti-discrimination training in Finland. Many respondents felt that racial or ethnic discrimination itself was rare, meaning that such training was unnecessary, and most people felt that there was no real demand for anti-discrimination training among labour market actors. The author of the report saw the lack of demand for anti-discrimination training as related to the lack of awareness of existing discrimination. In particular, it seemed, there was no recognition of indirect discrimination, such as the use of recruitment channels to which migrants do not have access, or unnecessary language criteria for jobs. When respondents were asked as to what training might be

---

[9] Report of regional seminar in Catalonia on the findings of the ILO programme in Spain, May 1997.

necessary in the future, most identified the sort which would be categorised as Information Training and Cultural Awareness Training. There was already some training of this sort targeted at civil servants working in labour exchanges to provide cultural information on migrant and ethnic minority communities, and to improve intercultural skills. A general assumption was that the provision of accurate information on ethnic minorities, and a greater cultural sensitivity in dealing with them, would be enough to prevent discrimination and ensure equal treatment for them. The anti-discrimination scene did seem to be 'evolving', with some training for service delivery to minority clientele in the public sector, and anti-discrimination training being developed by some Finnish trade unions. A conclusion drawn from the report was that "a fundamental prerequisite for further training to be developed is a raising of the awareness of the occurrence of discrimination against migrant and ethnic minority workers - an awareness which is still lacking among many of the labour market gatekeepers interviewed for this research".[10]

Conclusion

Although typologies are often no more than ideal types, masking a more complex reality, they are necessary as organising principles to provide a basis for the comparison of widely different social activities in different national contexts. Starting from an earlier typology of training for service delivery in Britain, a new international typology of anti-discrimination training was developed. The typology in this case covered the *training approach*. By this is meant not only the content of the training and the method by which it is delivered, but the principles and assumptions which underpin it, such as on the nature of racism and discrimination. The six-fold typology was then applied in several countries and found to be a workable device in categorising anti-discrimination activity. In Spain there was found to be little activity to categorise. However, when the typology was applied to the two countries in Europe which have the most experience of such training - the Netherlands and the UK – it was able to demonstrate both common trends and important differences between them. In Finland, although there was as yet relatively little training, the typology was used to identify the types of training that key labour market actors felt should be introduced in the future, namely Information Training and Cultural Awareness Training.

Based on both the European evidence and that from the US project (which has not been discussed here) the ILO's overall conclusion of this part of its project was that training which simply aimed to provide information on migrants and their culture was of limited value. Similarly, training which focussed primarily on trying to change trainee's attitudes did not appear to be effective in changing actual behaviour, and could even produce a contrary effect. However, training which takes place in the context of statutory obligations with regard to equal treatment, and which instructs trainees on the appropriate behaviour to satisfy these obligations, seemed more useful in producing behavioural change. Furthermore, it was important that this formed part of a wider organisational equal opportunities policy, and that the policies were actively promoted by the organisation's top management (Zegers de Beijl 2000: 103).

Implications of the national differences within Europe

The ILO's exercise demonstrated a great variety in anti-discrimination training and education measures in different countries. At the one end of the continuum was the USA (Bendick et al. 1998) where a strong tradition of anti-discrimination training exists, and a wide range of training approaches is provided by an industry of training providers. At the other end of the continuum was

---

[10] Foreword to the report by M.I.Abella, Vuori 1997 p.vi.

Belgium, where there existed such an unsympathetic climate to the very notion of anti-discrimination training that it was concluded that it was probably best that any such training should be 'disguised' by integrating it into other more general training "in order to avoid unfavourable reactions or even powerful opposition."[11] The national report described how in Belgium, attempts to move the emphasis of anti-discrimination training away from training directed at migrants to training aimed at representatives of the societal majority met with significant resistance, countering some of the potential effects of anti-discrimination training measures and leading to some initiatives being discontinued (Castelain-Kinet et al. 1998).

From looking in a little more detail at the experiences within four European countries which lie in between these two extremes it is possible to perceive great differences in the experiences of anti-discrimination activities. The Spanish example shows that in some countries there is little experience or awareness of anti-discrimination training, equal opportunity policies or diversity management, because the local circumstances are so different from countries where such phenomena are more noticeably established.[12] The Finnish report shows that there can be a lack of awareness of employment discrimination issues by key labour market actors at the same time that evidence shows that organisational responses to discrimination are starting to become necessary. Whilst the UK and the Netherlands had the longest experience of anti-discrimination training, there were significant differences between them. Historically, experience in the UK has developed roughly through the six types in sequence, with some activities going out of fashion, and most now concentrated in the last three types, Anti-Racism Training, Equalities Training and Diversity Training. In the Netherlands, much activity still seems rooted in the earlier types such as Cultural Awareness Training, with apparently a smaller proportion of trainers than in the UK covering the forms of training which try to confront racist attitudes or change discriminatory behaviour. However, it was noticeable that in both countries there is a trend towards Diversity Training. It is also clear that the term "Diversity Training" can hide a wide range of different emphases and approaches. For example, diversity management in might primarily emphasise the importance of valuing difference in a heterogeneous organisational culture. Other forms of diversity management can encompass strong forms of anti-discrimination or positive action - i.e. elements of Equalities Training or Anti-Racism Training.

In the Netherlands, in terms of the typology, it seems that there has been something of a 'leap over' the intermediate types of training, with evidence of a move directly from Cultural Awareness to Diversity. The question to ask is whether this will mean that anti-discrimination measures will be less likely to form a component of Dutch diversity management. Indeed, the Dutch researchers were of the opinion that although a move away from straightforward Cultural Awareness Training would be a positive development, a new emphasis on diversity management simply as a way of avoiding still-necessary positive action would be retrogressive.

Thus even in those two countries with the most experience of organisational anti-discrimination policies there are differences in context which have potential implications for the character of future developments in anti-discrimination practice within those countries. More specifically, drawing on the evidence of the ILO study, we can raise a question in the context of the spread of diversity management in Europe: if within a particular country there is relatively little experience of recognising the existence of discrimination in employment, and even less experience in

---

[11] Report on the seminar organised in Belgium to evaluate the results of research conducted in association with the ILO project; ILO Geneva 1998.

[12] For a discussion of these factors in more detail see Wrench 2000

organisational policies to combat it, will the development of diversity management in that country also underplay the 'combating discrimination' elements within it? For example, the ideas of diversity management are now starting to be discussed in Finland, with a conference on the subject organised in Helsinki in September 2000.[13] Will the development of diversity management in Finland take on a different form to that in the US or even in the UK simply because of the lack of experience of previous organisational approaches in Finland?

When, in European countries, the labour market integration of immigrants and their descendants is starting to be perceived as a 'problem', the first stage of reaction is often to treat this as a supply-side issue, and direct training at the immigrants themselves. When this is recognised as inadequate and issues of demand-side exclusion are raised, it seems that there is a tendency for the next phase to be the introduction of initiatives which can be characterised in the ILO typology as Information Training and Cultural Awareness Training, with the assumption that this will change attitudes enough to counter any problem of discrimination. If diversity management is introduced when awareness is characterised by that stage, then it might take a form where some of the stronger anti-racist and anti-discrimination elements are absent.

The ILO evidence suggested that diversity management was increasing in popularity in the UK and the Netherlands. Since the national studies were published (1997) the influence of diversity management has continued to spread in these two countries, as well as in other EU countries, most notably, it seems, in Sweden. We can see from the US experience that it is possible for diversity management training in its broad 'whole-organisational' approach to include aspects of all the other types of training within it. The question to ask is whether in the European context diversity management might be used to prioritise the 'softer' rather than the 'harder' equal opportunities practices. A form of diversity management might be adopted which excludes those aspects of previous equal opportunities and anti-discrimination strategies which are less popular with employers. For example, employers might be more receptive to the "inter-cultural awareness" aspects and less receptive to positive action measures such as targets to produce a workforce which reflects the ethnic make-up of the locality, anti-discrimination training to modify the behaviour of white managers and employees, or internal anti-harassment initiatives. If diversity management in Europe develops into little more than celebrating cultural diversity, it will fail to address the demand-side problem of racial and ethnic discrimination in employment which still operates in European labour markets. Valuing and managing for diversity needs to exist within the context of continuing anti-discrimination measures both at an organisational and a national level.

---

[13] This was a two day seminar and workshop, "Managing Diversity for Improving Business Performance in Nordic Countries" and "Tools for Diversity Management" organised by UnICom the University of Jyväskylä, European Business Network for Social Cohesion, Ministry of Labour, Centre for Business and Diversity and Finnish Business and Society.

REFERENCES

Abell, J.P. (1991). Racisme, Vooroordeel en Discriminatie: bestrijding door beinvloeding van de meerderheid met niet-juridische middelen. University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Abell, J.P., Havelaar, A.E. and Dankoor, M.M. (1997) The documentation and evaluation of anti-discrimination training in the Netherlands International Labour Office, Geneva.

Arrijn, P. Feld, S. and Nayer, A. (1998) Discrimination in access to employment on grounds of foreign origin: the case of Belgium International Labour Office, Geneva

Baldamus, W. (1976). The Structure of Sociological Influence. Martin Robertson, London.

Banton, M. (1994) Discrimination Open University Press, Buckingham

Banton, M. (1997) "The ethics of practice-testing" New Community Vol. 23 No.7

Bendick, M., Egan, M.L. and Lofhjelm, S. (1998) The documentation and evaluation of anti-discrimination training in the United States International Labour Office, Geneva

Bovenkerk, F. (1992). Testing Discrimination in Natural Experiments: A Manual for International Comparative Research on Discrimination on the Grounds of "Race" and Ethnic Origin. International Labour Office, Geneva.

Bovenkerk, F., Gras, M.J.I. and Ramsoedh, D. (1995) Discrimination against Migrant Workers and Ethnic Minorities in Access to Employment in the Netherlands International Labour Office, Geneva

Brown, C. and Lawton, J. (1991) Training for Equality: A Study of Race Relations and Equal Opportunities Training. Policy Studies Institute, London.

Castelain-Kinet, F., Bouquin, S., Delagrange, H. and Denutte, T. (1998) Pratiques de Formations Antidiscriminatoires en Belgique International Labour Office, Geneva.

Chesler, M, and Delgado, H. (1987). "Race Relations and Organisational Change", in J.W. Shaw, P.G. Nordlie and R.M. Shapiro (eds.) Strategies for Improving Race Relations: the Anglo-American Experience. Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Colectivo Ioé: M. Angel de Prada, W. Actis, C.Pereda and R. Pérez Molina (1996) Labour market discrimination against migrant workers in Spain International Labour Office, Geneva

Colectivo Ioé: M. Angel de Prada, C.Pereda and W. Actis (1997) Anti-discrimination training activities in Spain International Labour Office, Geneva

Commission of the European Communities (1993) Legal Instruments to Combat Racism and Xenophobia Office for Official Publications of the European Union, Luxembourg

Forbes, I. and Mead, G. (1992) Measure for Measure Employment Department Research Series No. 1, London

Goldberg, A., Mourinho, D. and Kulke, U. (1995) Labour market discrimination against foreign workers in Germany International Labour Office, Geneva

Hansen, N-E. and McClure, I. (1998) Protecting Migrants and EthnicMinorities from Discrimination in Employment: the Danish Experience International Labour Office, Geneva

Hjarnø, J. and Jensen, T. (1997) Diskrimineringen af unge med indvandrerbaggrund ved jobsøgning. Migration Papers No. 21, Danish Centre for Migration and Ethnic Studies, South Jutland University Press, Esbjerg.

Jewson, N., Mason, D., Drewett, A. and Rossiter, W. (1995) Formal Equal Opportunities Policies and Employment Best Practice. Department for Education and Employment, Sheffield.

Katz, J. (1978). White Awareness: Handbook for anti-racism training. University of Oklahoma Press, Oklahoma.

Luthra, M. and Oakley, R. (1991). Combating Racism Through Training: A Review of Approaches to Race Training in Organisations. Policy Paper in Ethnic Relations, No.22, University of Warwick.

MacDonald, H. (1993). "The Diversity Industry" The New Republic, 5 July 1993.

MacEwen, M. (1995) Tackling Racism in Europe Berg, Oxford

MacEwen, M. (1997) Anti-Discrimination Law Enforcement Ashgate, Aldershot

Mills, C. Wright (1959). The Sociological Imagination. Oxford University Press, New York.

Peppard, N. (1983). "Race relations training: the state of the art" New Community, Vol 6, Nos.1/2.

Sivanandan, A. (1985). "RAT and the degradation of black struggle" Race and Class, Vol.25, No.4.

Smeesters, B. (1999) Approche juridique de la discrimination à l'accès à l'emploi en Belgique en raison de l'origine étrangère International Labour Office, Geneva.

Taylor, P., Powell, D. and Wrench, J. (1997) The evaluation of anti-discrimination training activities in the United Kingdom International Labour Office, Geneva

Thomas, R.Roosevelt Jnr (1990). "From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity", Harvard Business Review, March/April.

Vuori, K. (1996) Protecting (Im)migrants and ethnic minorities from discrimination in employment: Finnish and Swedish experiences International Labour Office, Geneva.

Vuori, K. (1997) <u>Anti-discrimination training activities in Finland</u> International Labour Office, Geneva.

Wrench, J. and Taylor, P. (1993) <u>A Research Manual on the Evaluation of Anti-Discrimination Training Activities</u>. International Labour Office, Geneva.

Wrench, J. (1996) <u>Preventing Racism at the Workplace: A report on 16 European countries</u> Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg

Wrench, J. (1997) <u>European Compendium of Good Practice for the Prevention of Racism at the Workplace</u> Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg

Wrench, J. (1998) "Towards an International Typology of Anti-Discrimination Training in Employment" <u>Migration papers</u> No. 26, South Jutland University Press, Esbjerg

Wrench, J. (2000) "Combating employment discrimination in Europe: national variation and the dawn of 'good practice'" in E. Appelt and M. Jarosch (eds) <u>Combating Racial Discrimination: Affirmative Action as a Model for Europe?</u> Berg, Oxford

Zegers de Beijl, R. (1991). <u>Although Equal before the Law: The scope of anti-discrimination legislation and its effect on labour market discrimination against migrant workers in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden</u>, International Labour Office Working Paper, Geneva.

Zegers de Beijl, R. (2000) <u>Documenting Discrimination against Migrant Workers in the Labour Market: A comparative study of four European countries</u> International Labour Office, Geneva.