

---

---

## Disability as Diversity in *Fortune* 100 Companies

Phoebe Ball,<sup>†</sup> Gregory Monaco,<sup>‡</sup>  
James Schmeling,<sup>§</sup> Helen Scharz<sup>||</sup>  
and Peter Blanck<sup>\*,¶</sup>

---

**To investigate the inclusion of people with disabilities in the diversity policies of the most successful businesses in the United States, we examined the publicly available workforce and supplier diversity policies of the top 100 companies on *Fortune Magazine's* 2003 list of the 500 most profitable companies in the nation. The majority of these companies have extensive information about their diversity policies and practices available on their corporate website. The information was used to categorize the policies into those that include people with disabilities, do not define diversity, and enumerate what is meant by diversity (e.g. in terms of race or gender) but do not expressly mention disability. In addition, we looked beyond the diversity policies to information available on corporate websites relating to a variety of diversity initiatives. Findings suggest that the majority of the companies that top the *Fortune* 500 list have developed and implemented diversity**

---

\*Correspondence to: Peter Blanck, Law, Health Policy and Disability Center, University of Iowa College of Law, Iowa City, IA 52242, U.S.A. E-mail: peter-blanck@uiowa.edu

<sup>†</sup>Phoebe Ball is Program Associate, Law, Health Policy and Disability Center (LHPDC), University of Iowa College of Law; J.D., Northeastern University School of Law.

<sup>‡</sup>Gregory Monaco is Note and Comment Editor, *Iowa Law Review*, University of Iowa College of Law; J.D. (expected May, 2005).

<sup>§</sup>James Schmeling is Associate Director, LHPDC, University of Iowa College of Law; J.D., University of Iowa.

<sup>||</sup>Helen A. Scharz is Director of Research, Associate Research Scientist, LHPDC; Ph.D., University of Iowa; J.D., University of Iowa College of Law.

<sup>¶</sup>Peter Blanck is Charles M. and Marion Kierscht Professor of Law, and Professor of Public Health, and of Psychology at the University of Iowa, and Director of the LHPDC, Ph.D., Harvard University, J.D., Stanford University.

The program of research described herein is supported, in part, by grants to Blanck from The National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), U.S. Department of Education grants: (1) "Technology for Independence: A Community-Based Resource Center," #H133A021801; (2) "IT Works," #H133A011803; (3) The Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Workforce Investment and Employment Policy for People with Disabilities, #H133B980042-99; The University of Iowa College of Law Foundation; and a generous endowment to the LHPDC from Stan and Gail Richards. For information on LHPDC grant funding, see <http://disability.law.uiowa.edu>. The authors would like to thank William Myhill and Daniel Kresowik for their editorial assistance.

Contract/grant sponsor: The National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR).

Contract/grant sponsor: U.S. Department of Education; contract/grant numbers: H133A021801; H133A011803; H133B980042-99.

Contract/grant sponsors: The University of Iowa College of Law Foundation.

**policies. Of these, 42% have diversity policies that include people with disabilities in the definition of a diverse workforce. Furthermore, 47% of companies with workplace diversity policies discuss diversity in a way that neither expressly includes nor excludes people with disabilities. Far fewer (15%) supplier diversity policies include disability in the definition of diversity, but a significant number of companies use criteria that allow a business owner with a disability to benefit from the company's supplier diversity program. Copyright © 2005 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.**

## INTRODUCTION

Companies in virtually all sectors of the economy are beginning to recognize that diverse employee backgrounds enhance competitiveness in the global economy (Ramirez, 2000). Ninety-two of the one hundred most economically prosperous companies in the nation, the "*Fortune* 100," have policies that express a commitment to promoting diversity in the workplace.<sup>1</sup> Many of these companies also have policies that support minority-owned suppliers.

Most corporate diversity policies reflect management's desire to create an atmosphere of integration in the company.

A culture of integration is based on highlighting and seeking out potential benefits of individual differences, including bringing new insights into product or service development, enhancing group decision quality and creativity, and generally enriching the set of experiences and perspectives that comprise the work environment (Spataro, 2005, p. 21–38).

Although many corporate diversity policies include racial, ethnic, cultural, and gender components, fewer than one-half of those on the *Fortune* 100 list have written diversity policies that expressly include persons with disabilities within the definition of diversity, and even fewer have supplier diversity statements that do so. Moreover, those companies that include disability under the umbrella of diversity often do so in the context of their standard equal opportunity statement without expressing further commitment to employing people with disabilities.

This article examines the degree to which people with disabilities are included in the written diversity policies of companies in the top 100 of the *Fortune* 500 list for 2003. *Fortune* magazine has since released the 2004 list; however, this list has changed little from the prior year, so this research remains relevant to the largest and most profitable companies in the United States.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Diversity statements were unavailable for AmerisourceBergen (2004), Berkshire Hathaway (2004), Walgreens (2004), Best Buy (2004), ConAgra Foods (2003), Archer Daniels Midland (2004), TIAA-CREF (2004a), and AutoNation (2004).

<sup>2</sup>Five companies have been added to the list. An examination of their diversity policies is included in the section "Finding from the diversity policies of the *Fortune* 100." The five companies discussed in this paper that are no longer in the top 100 are Cigna, Washington Mutual, Freddie Mac, Aetna, and Visteon.

The following section of this article highlights the reasons *Fortune* 100 companies have intensified their focus on diversity in recent years, the ways in which diversity policies benefit people in under-represented groups, and the degree to which people with disabilities are included in these statements. The next part explains the methodology used to determine the degree of inclusion of people with disabilities in *Fortune* 100 companies' employee and supplier diversity policies.

Then, we examine, in turn, employee diversity policies and supplier diversity policies. These respective discussions are subdivided into three discussions of written policies that (1) include people with disabilities explicitly, (2) do not define diversity in terms of specific groups, and (3) define diversity with reference to specific groups but do not include disability. In addition, in each of these categories, evidence is examined that is related to the commitment of *Fortune* 100 companies to hiring people with disabilities and promoting a positive workplace culture for their employees with disabilities. We then discuss our conclusions as to the status of disability as a respected element of diversity among the *Fortune* 100. We conclude with the implications of our findings for persons with disabilities, employers, and policymakers, and discuss whether disability itself is properly considered within traditional diversity programs that target women and minorities.

## **FORTUNE 100 DIVERSITY INITIATIVES**

Diversity policies inure to the benefit of the companies by enabling them to attract and retain a workforce that generates "new ideas and help[s] companies be more responsive in a diverse marketplace" (Brancato & Patterson, 1999, p. 5). AOL/Time Warner's (2004) written diversity policy draws a connection between the company's commitment to diversity and shareholder value: "To compete in the global economy, we must attract, develop and retain the world's best talent from among the broadest range of people, backgrounds and perspectives." The companies that are addressed in this article are leaders in their respective industries; it is a testament to the importance of diversity policies that the majority of the most successful companies in the United States have developed these policies.

Our content analysis of diversity policies illustrates that, in addition to the importance of attracting a diverse workforce, companies recognize the benefit of promoting tolerance in the workplace. Johnson and Johnson's (2004) diversity policy statement notes that, "[i]ntolerance is simply unacceptable. It divides people and creates barriers to the innovative, team-based environments that are so essential to our success as a corporation." Likewise, in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003), the Supreme Court cited briefs submitted by General Motors, 3M, and others as amici curiae for the proposition that "major American businesses have made clear that the skills needed in today's increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints" (p. 330).

ExxonMobil, E. I. Du Pont De Nemours and Company, and IBM filed briefs in *Grutter* stressing the importance of diversity in a global marketplace, though abstaining from expressing an opinion regarding the constitutional questions at issue (Brief of ExxonMobil Corporation as Amicus Curiae, 2003; Brief of Amici

Curiae Massachusetts Institute of Technology *et al.*, 2003). In addition, a consortium of 65 businesses, including many *Fortune* 100 companies,<sup>3</sup> filed a brief in support of the importance of diversity stating that “[t]he existence of racial and ethnic diversity in institutions of higher education is vital to efforts to hire and maintain a diverse workforce... [and] such a workforce is important to... continued success in the global marketplace” (Brief for Amici Curiae 65 Leading American Businesses, 2003, p. \*1).

There is evidence from the review of corporate policy that employers recognize that managing diversity effectively as a part of a comprehensive human resource management program may reduce absenteeism and turnover and increase commitment to the organization and general satisfaction levels (Gandz, 2001). For example, Microsoft (2003) lists their diverse employee resource groups as an example of the company’s attempt to help employees “create their own balance between their work and personal lives.” Additional evidence of the perception among large companies that diversity is an important factor in human resource management is found in a 1998 survey conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), which concluded that “84 percent of human resource professionals at Fortune 500 companies say their top-level executives think diversity management is important” (SHRM, 2004). Finally, the proliferation of diversity management courses in colleges and workshops across the country indicates that diversity is an important and valuable part of human resource management (Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 2003).

This growing interest in sophisticated diversity management is partly motivated by a desire to avoid or mitigate the potential for lawsuits with catastrophic consequences. In 1996, Texaco agreed to pay \$115 million to settle a discrimination claim filed by African-American employees. As part of the settlement, Texaco instituted diversity policies and programs designed to root out racism in the company’s corporate culture (ChevronTexaco, 1996).<sup>4</sup>

These problems, of course, are not unique to Texaco. Several of the top 100 companies have faced similar lawsuits. Coca-Cola Co., Microsoft, Boeing, Home Depot, and Lockheed Martin have been the target of high-profile class action discrimination suits (Ramirez, 2000; National Organization on Disability, 2003b). In particular, “[e]mployees who sued Coca-Cola Co. achieved a \$192.5 million settlement—the largest ever in a race bias discrimination case brought in the United States” (Hawkins, 2003, p. 54).

Sociologist Lauren Edelman (1992) has argued that large companies such as those in the *Fortune* 100 create quasi-legal structures within their organizations, more so than other types of company. They are sensitive to the legal environment because they face lawsuits at a high rate. They are organizationally and financially equipped to develop policies and procedures for the mediation and adjudication of disputes within the organization to avoid resort to the formal legal system (Edelman, 1992). Therefore, diversity policies often have an impact on the internal dispute resolution and human resource management mechanisms within these major corporations.

<sup>3</sup>*Fortune* 100 companies that signed onto this brief include Altria Group Inc., American Express Co., Bank One Corp., The Boeing Co., ChevronTexaco Corp. and many others.

<sup>4</sup>For a discussion of corporate culture, see Schur, Kruse, and Blanck (2005).

Appropriate and effective diversity policies benefit traditionally under-represented groups in several ways. First, diversity initiatives fund scholarships and mentoring programs designed to cultivate a diverse workforce at the educational level. These initiatives benefit students who might otherwise face barriers to educational opportunities. One example is the Bank of America Abilities Scholarship, a \$200,000 scholarship fund that students with disabilities can apply towards building the skills and training necessary to become successful members of the workforce (Bank of America Center for Scholarship Administration, 2002).

Second, as part of their efforts to build on the public's perception that they are committed to diversity, many *Fortune* 100 companies engage in philanthropic activities in diverse communities. AOL/Time-Warner (2004) is one of many companies that promote activities that support "a variety of community groups, including those supporting African Americans, Asians, Hispanics, Native Americans, women, gays and lesbians and the disabled."

Third, companies that focus on diversity make efforts to develop products and services that appeal to and benefit the communities they serve. Customers in under-represented communities are benefited when served by companies that anticipate and respond to their needs, allowing those customers to access higher quality goods and services (Gandz, 2001). If it is important that companies respond to the needs of minority communities generally, it is doubly important to the community of people with disabilities who may need products and services specifically designed to be accessible to them (Sandler & Blanck, 2005).

Fourth, applicants to and members of the workforce benefit from the elimination of barriers to employment they might face in the job-market. For instance, companies attend job fairs that cater to under-served populations and make other efforts to reach out to workers who might otherwise face numerous barriers to employment. Altria Group (2004a), for example, notes its support of the Industry Labor Council, a group working for expanded employment opportunities for people with disabilities. These kinds of public/private partnership are a focus of federal initiatives such as the One-Stop system under the Work Incentives Improvement Act, which seeks to foster positive relationships between employers and people with multiple barriers to employment, such as people with disabilities (Blanck, Hill, Siegal, & Waterstone, 2003; Law, Health Policy and Disability Center, 2004).

Finally, diversity policies that transcend the recruitment of under-represented groups and focus on the productivity of minority employees, female employees, and employees with disabilities have been shown to foster a supportive work environment for these employees. In an early study of 500 accommodations at Sears Roebuck, Blanck found that the low cost of accommodations for employees with disabilities produced substantial economic benefit to companies in terms of increased work productivity, injury prevention, reduced workers' compensation costs, and workplace effectiveness and efficiency (Annenberg Washington Program, 1994, 1996).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>These studies were conducted at Sears, Roebuck and Co. from 1978 to 1996, a time period before and after the July 26, 1992 effective date of ADA Title I. Nearly all of the 500 accommodations sampled required little or no cost. During the years 1993 to 1996, the average direct cost for accommodations was \$45, and from 1978 to 1992 the average direct cost was \$121.

Diversity policies that include a commitment to making accommodations for employees with disabilities not only reaffirm legal requirements imposed on the company, but also signal a top-level commitment to accommodating and including people with disabilities in the work environment. As noted by Schur *et al.* (2005) in this special issue, this kind of commitment has been found to be an important step in reducing barriers to employment for people with disabilities. Furthermore, diversity training and mentoring programs are a part of a comprehensive diversity initiative, and including people with disabilities in these programs may reduce barriers to employment (Schur *et al.*, 2005).

Diversity policies that promote the employment of people from under-represented groups have a positive impact on the businesses that promulgate them as well as in the communities that are targeted by the policies. In addition, policies designed to promote a diverse supplier base create entrepreneurial opportunities for small businesses owned by people from under-represented groups. However, these policies are inconsistent in their inclusion of people with disabilities within the definition of diversity. This article addresses this issue by examining the publicly available statements of *Fortune* 100 companies with regard to the inclusion of people with disabilities. What emerges is a description of the workplace and supplier diversity policies of the most successful companies in the nation vis-à-vis disability.

## DATA COLLECTION

This article examines the stated diversity policies of *Fortune* 100 companies from the disability perspective. Table 1 illustrates the *Fortune* 100 companies surveyed in this investigation with diversity policies publicly available on their corporate websites.

Table 1 shows the market break-out of the 100 companies in terms of industry affiliation. Early in the research process, the companies were divided into these general industry categories to facilitate comparison. In some cases, these categories are consistent with categories used on the *Fortune* 500 list. However, because this study concerns itself only with the top 100 companies on that list, some categories were merged to generate categories that would allow for comparisons among the limited number of companies examined here.

Some of the companies surveyed may have workplace or supplier diversity policies that could not be located through searches of the publicly available information on the web. For example, although researchers found references to TIAA-CREF's supplier diversity policy, and that company has received accolades from such organizations as *Working Woman* magazine for that policy (Benham, 2001), the policy itself was not available on the corporate website (TIAA-CREF, 2004a). Additionally, some of the companies examined have supplier or workplace diversity policies associated with a division of the company that differ from the overall corporate policy. These were not examined within the scope of this study.

To develop the summary presented in Table 2, two researchers independently identified and classified the content of the written diversity policies of *Fortune* 100 companies. There are two essential types of diversity policy: (1) workplace diversity policies with respect to employment, and (2) supplier diversity policies that promote the patronage of businesses owned by underserved populations. These two categories were then sub-divided according to whether the policy is (1) "inclusive" by

Table 1. *Fortune* 100 companies with website diversity policies

Industry	<i>Fortune</i> 100 Companies
Financial	Morgan Stanley, Merrill Lynch, Bank of America, Bank One, American Express, JP Morgan Chase, Wachovia, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs, Washington Mutual, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, Amerisource Bergen, Berkshire Hathaway, TIAA-CREF
Technology	Ingram Micro, Intel, IBM, Microsoft, Lockheed Martin, Cisco, Hewlett Packard, Boeing, Dell, Honeywell, Northrup Grumman, Electronic Data Systems
Health	McKesson, HCA, Cigna, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Merck, Abbot Labs, United Health, Cardinal Health, Pfizer
Retail	CVS, Walgreens, Best Buy, AutoNation, Safeway, Costco, Albertson's, Target, JCPenney, Lowe's, Supervalu, Wal-Mart, Kmart, Home Depot, Kroger's, Sears Roebuck
Communication/media	Viacom, Verizon, Motorola, ATT, Bellsouth, Sprint, SBC, AOL/Time Warner, Walt Disney
Chemical	Dow, DuPont
Oil/energy	Marathon Oil, Valero, ExxonMobil, ChevronTexaco, Alcoa, Conoco-Phillips
Consumer products/services	Johnson & Johnson, Tyson, Ford, UPS, Coca Cola, Federal Express, Altria, Procter & Gamble, General Electric, Pepsico, General Motors, Con Agra, Archer Daniels Midland
Industrial products/services	Sysco, Delphi, Weyerhaeuser, Visteon, Caterpillar, Johnson Controls, United Technologies, Georgia Pacific, International Paper
Insurance	New York Life, AIG, MetLife, Allstate, State Farm, Prudential, Aetna, MassMutual

explicitly including people with disabilities in the definition of diversity, (2) “non-committal” by not defining diversity in terms of any specific groups, or (3) “disability absent” by specifying groups included in the definition of diversity without mention of people with disabilities.

In addition to categorizing the type of diversity policy proffered by the *Fortune* 100 company, the researchers examined the company website for evidence of commitment to diversity generally, and to the inclusion of people with disabilities specifically. In particular, the researchers noted whether people with disabilities were included in diversity-related initiatives such as scholarship programs, community activities and outreach, employee resource groups, and recruitment and retention efforts. Last, the researchers examined whether the company website noted their accomplishments in the area of diversity, and, if so, whether people with disabilities were included in these accomplishments.

## FINDINGS FROM THE DIVERSITY POLICIES OF THE *FORTUNE* 100

The discussion to follow examines the contents of (A) *Fortune* 100 employee diversity policies, (B) *Fortune* 100 supplier diversity policies, and (C) the policies of five 2004 newcomers to the *Fortune* 100 status. Each discussion contains analysis of whether such policies are inclusive, non-committal, or disability absent.

Table 2. Workplace diversity policies by industry

Industry	Inclusive	Non-committal	Disability absent
Financial	Bank of America, American Express, JP Morgan Chase, Wachovia, Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley	Bank One, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Washington Mutual, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac	Merrill Lynch
Technology	Intel, IBM, Microsoft, Cisco, Hewlett Packard, Boeing, Dell, Honeywell, Northrup Grumman, Electronic Data Systems	Ingram Micro, Lockheed Martin	
Health	McKesson, Hospital Corp. of America, Pfizer	Cigna, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Merck, Abbot Labs	United Health, Cardinal Health
Retail	CVS, Target, JCPenney, Lowe's	Supervalu, Wal-Mart, Kmart, Home Depot, Kroger's, Sears Roebuck, Costco, Albertson's	Safeway
Communications/ media	Viacom, Verizon, AT&T	Bellsouth, Sprint, SBC Communications, AOL/Time Warner, Walt Disney	Motorola
Chemical	DuPont	Alcoa, Dow	
Oil/energy	Marathon Oil, Valero	Altria, ExxonMobil, ChevronTexaco, ConocoPhillips	Coca Cola
Consumer products/services	Johnson & Johnson, Ford	Federal Express, Tyson, Johnson Controls, United Technologies, Georgia Pacific, UPS, International Paper	Proctor & Gamble, General Electric, Pepsico, General Motors
Industrial products/services	Sysco, Delphi, Weyerhaeuser, Visteon, Caterpillar		
Insurance	AIG, MetLife, Allstate	State Farm, New York Life, Prudential, Aetna, MassMutual	

### Employee Diversity Policies

In our analysis, we identify three general types of workplace diversity policy with respect to the employment of people with disabilities as presented in Table 2: inclusive, non-committal, and disability absent. We further break down the companies by industry.

Thirty-nine (42%) of the ninety-two *Fortune* 100 companies that have workplace diversity policies expressly include people with disabilities in the illustrative lists (e.g. race, culture, ethnicity, gender) of their diversity statements. However, without further study of the application of diversity policies in these companies it is difficult to determine the extent to which people with disabilities at these companies actually benefit from the diversity policies. One method of determining whether a company has made a conscious effort to include people with disabilities in the workforce is to examine the company's initiatives, events, recruiting activities, and touted diversity activities made public on the corporate web sites. First, we turn to inclusive efforts.

### *Inclusive Companies*

As a general matter, we observe in Table 2 that more than 40% of *Fortune* 100 companies include people with disabilities in workplace diversity policy statements. Although it is encouraging that a substantial number of *Fortune* 100 companies have realized the role people with disabilities play in building a diverse workforce, at this point we are not able to assess the extent to which the inclusion is meaningful. Many of the inclusive diversity statements mirror the standard, legally required, equal employment opportunity policy:

[Company] is an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) employer and does not discriminate in any employer/employee relations based on race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, disability or veteran's status.<sup>6</sup>

Examples of companies whose diversity policies are written this way include JP Morgan Chase (2004a), Intel (2004), IBM (2003), Lowe's (2004a), Verizon Communications (2001), Valero Energy Corp. (2004), Caterpillar (2000), and American International Group (AIG) (2003).

In some cases, although the diversity policy mirrors the standard equal employment opportunity language, the corporate website indicates that the company engages in activities that evidence their commitment to diversity. Companies may show their commitment to diversity by highlighting (1) employee resource groups, (2) stories of diverse employees and their experiences with the company, (3) awards the company has received for their diversity initiatives, (4) efforts to recruit or retain a diverse workforce, (5) their involvement with special interest groups, or (6) efforts to make their products and services attractive and accessible to people in under-represented groups.

Unfortunately, many companies that include people with disabilities in their diversity statements do not elaborate on what that commitment means. Ford Motor Company (2003) includes people with disabilities in their equal opportunity statement. However, it is not apparent from Ford's written materials that the company has made similar efforts to recruit or retain employees with disabilities as it has done for other minority groups. Ford established, for instance, "company-sponsored Employee Resource Groups [that] provide support and fellowship, identify barriers, contribute to employees' professional development, and provide organized activities for employees of diverse backgrounds" (Ford Motor Company, 2003). These groups are geared toward a variety of minority groups, including African Americans, Muslims, women, and Asian-Americans. We could find no such existing group for employees with disabilities in the U.S. division of Ford.<sup>7</sup>

It is not possible to say whether the lack of an employee resource group has an adverse impact on the recruitment or retention of people with disabilities in Ford's workforce, or even whether the lack of a resource group for employees with disabilities has a negative impact on potential consumers of Ford products who have disabilities. It does suggest that, at least in the United States, people with disabilities may not benefit from the kinds of scholarship, recruitment, and

<sup>6</sup>This example arises from Williams (2004a).

<sup>7</sup>Ford in Britain, however, has a Disability Action Group. Ford Motor Company (n.d.).

networking initiatives offered by the employee resource groups representing other minority and interest groups at Ford Motor Company (2003).

By contrast, *Fortune* 100 companies in other industries have established resource groups for employees with disabilities. Microsoft, in the technology sector, has employee groups that provide support and networking opportunities, such as mentoring, college recruiting, career development, and promoting cultural awareness (Sandler & Blanck, 2005). Two of these groups in particular promote the interests of visually impaired and deaf and hard of hearing Microsoft employees (Microsoft, 2004).<sup>8</sup>

In the communications sector, AT&T sponsors a number of business resource groups for employees, including “Individuals with Disabilities Enabling Advocacy Link” (IDEAL). The AT&T (2004) webpage states

IDEAL’s mission is to enhance understanding and awareness of the challenges facing individuals with disabilities in the work place, support programs geared towards the realization of common goals and objectives, and aid in the removal of barriers that impede the full development and optimum productivity of employees with disabilities.

In the financial sector, JP Morgan Chase (2004b) sponsors interest groups for employees from a variety of backgrounds, including a group for employees with disabilities. Although categorized in the “disability absent” column in Table 2, Merrill Lynch has instituted a support group for employees/parents of children with disabilities, and co-sponsored the Blue Ribbon Panel on Corporate Culture and Disability (Law, Health Policy and Disability Center, 2003).

In addition to sponsoring employee groups, *Fortune* 100 companies demonstrate their commitment to diversity in the workplace in other ways. Allstate (2004), Lockheed Martin (2004), and Sprint (2002) mention that they were named among the top 50 companies to work for by *Careers and The disAbled* magazine.<sup>9</sup> Other companies that mention disability in their diversity policy dedicate a substantial section to discussion of disability issues with respect to employment in the company. Cisco Systems (2004) not only includes people with disabilities in its equal opportunity employment policy, but also indicates support for the ADA and its affirmative action initiative for people with disabilities. Weyerhaeuser (2001) notes that its managers are expected to encourage people with disabilities to apply for jobs and promotions for which they are qualified. Boeing (n.d.) notes its commitment to accommodating disability in the workplace exemplifies its commitment to diversity. Morgan Stanley (2002) mentions its commitment to the employment of people with mental and physical disabilities, and notes the company has been recognized by organizations such as the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill for its employment and support of people with disabilities.<sup>10</sup> United Parcel Service (2004) has a special page devoted to discussion of disability in the workplace, where they mention their association with the National Federation of the Blind.

<sup>8</sup>For further discussion of equal opportunity and accessibility issues specific to Microsoft, see Klein, Schmelting, and Blanck (2005) and Sandler and Blanck (2005).

<sup>9</sup>Sprint (2002). While both Allstate and Sprint mention that ability is a component of diversity, it is unclear whether Sprint’s policy refers to people with disabilities.

<sup>10</sup>See also Northrop Grumman (2004) (noting its participation in the President’s Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities).

In addition to company sponsored employee groups, expressions of a willingness to hire and promote women and minorities, and support for special interest groups, *Fortune* 100 companies note their participation in specialized job fairs geared towards minority students. However, none of the companies with workplace diversity policies that included people with disabilities made it clear that they focused on attending job fairs for people with disabilities.

In addition to the presence of inclusive employment practices, we found that many companies highlight their efforts to appeal to a diverse marketplace. However, there was not always a relation between a workplace diversity policy that was inclusive of disability and evidence on the corporate website that the company was actively concerned with making products and services accessible to people with disabilities. Bank of America (2004a) promotes its accessible banking features for customers with disabilities—such as large print and raised print checks, talking ATM machines, and TTY equipped banking by phone—as an example of the company’s attempts to market to a diverse body of consumers. Some technology companies express their commitment to disability by highlighting efforts to make their goods and services accessible.<sup>11</sup> IBM (2004) highlights their wide range of services aimed to help businesses and organizations embrace accessibility. Dell (2003a) includes people with disabilities in the definition of diversity and lists activities within minority communities, but notes none in the disability community. Dell further notes efforts to make technology available to minority groups; however, the company’s website does not indicate that the company has focused on accessible technology for people with disabilities (Dell, 2003b).

In some cases it is difficult to tell whether disability is included in the diversity statements. Hewlett Packard (2004a) notes that the definition of diversity includes “men and women from different nations, cultures, ethnic groups, generations, backgrounds, skills, abilities.” The wording of this diversity policy makes it impossible to ascertain whether the reference to “abilities” is a direct reference to people with disabilities or whether the term is being used more generically. Similarly, the companies described in the next subsection draft their diversity policies in such a way that it is not possible to determine from the policy at face value whether people with disabilities are considered an important part of a diverse workforce.

### *Non-Committal Companies*

Unlike the companies that enumerate the groups they would like to recruit and retain to develop a diverse workforce, the companies in this section applaud diversity but never describe it (see “non-committal” column in Table 2). Forty-three companies (47% of companies with diversity policies) do not define diversity in

---

<sup>11</sup>Microsoft (2001), for example, created its internal accessible technology group (ATG) to assist its hardware and software product groups in developing more accessible products, and they work with the National Business and Disability Council on the Able to Work Consortium, which is an independent business consortium dedicated to increasing employment opportunities for people with disabilities (see also Sandler & Blanck, 2005). Wells Fargo (2004) highlights its 2003 award for making education accessible to persons with disabilities. In contrast, Dell (2003b) fails to discuss increasing the accessibility of products to persons with disabilities on its “Increasing access to technology” website, despite defining “disability” within its diversity statement.

terms of which groups contribute to a diverse work environment. Therefore, unless there is evidence of the commitment of these companies to employing people with disabilities beyond the diversity statements, it is not possible to tell who benefits from these diversity policies. Home Depot's (2004) statement on diversity indicates that "diversity makes this Company the vital place that it is. We promise to maintain a safe and healthy workplace for all of our associates and to treat everyone with respect and dignity."

Companies that offer broad statements in support of diversity may further describe their activities to promote diversity. Many of these companies outline their diversity initiatives, highlight the percentages of minority employees, and describe philanthropic activities that benefit traditionally under-represented groups. These statements show that these companies often focus exclusively on race, gender, and ethnicity where workplace diversity is concerned.

BellSouth (2004a), for instance, declines to categorically define diversity. In discussing the accolades they have received for diversity, the percentages of women and minorities in the workplace, and company-sponsored employee organizations, the focus is on women and minority groups, such as African-Americans, rather than on people with disabilities. BellSouth (2004b) mentions on their website, nonetheless, that they are engaged in making their products accessible to people with disabilities. Fannie Mae (2004) notes it has been recognized by a number of groups for the percentage of women and minorities comprising its workforce, but does not indicate the number of employees with disabilities at the company. Similarly, State Farm Insurance (n.d.a) and Sprint (2004) focus on race and gender in describing the accolades their companies have received for workforce demographics.<sup>12</sup> Kmart has no stated diversity policy, but the corporate website devotes space to a discussion of Kmart's "multicultural initiatives." The fact that 32% of Kmart's workforce is made up of "multicultural minorities" is highlighted, but no mention is made of the percentage of people with disabilities employed (Kmart, 2000).

The highlighting of accolades and initiatives aimed at minority groups, without mention of disability, is a common trend of *Fortune* 100 companies with broad diversity statements, as is a focus on women and racial and ethnic minorities when describing workplace demographics.<sup>13</sup> This suggests that, though these statements seem inclusive, people with disabilities are not a focus of these companies' efforts to promote diversity.

In contrast, some companies whose diversity statements are broad provide evidence of their commitment to including people with disabilities in the workforce.

<sup>12</sup>State Farm (n.d.a) specifically notes its awards received from Hispanic, Chinese, and Korean publications and organizations. FedEx's (2004a) awards focus upon race. In contrast, Prudential Financial's (2004) hiring policies address race, gender, and disability and Wells Fargo's (2004) awards address gender, disability, culture, race, and sexuality. Freddie Mac (2004a) focuses upon race and gender, and American Express (2004) focuses upon race, gender, and sexuality.

<sup>13</sup>For instance, ExxonMobil (n.d.) discusses the increased percentage of women and minorities in their workforce. Kmart (2000) notes that 32% of its workforce is "multicultural" and Johnson Controls (2004) emphasizes race in discussing diversity initiatives. Citigroup's (2004) effort "to attract diverse talent" focus upon race, gender, and sexuality. Abbott Laboratories (2004) and United Technologies (n.d.) address race and gender when discussing workforce diversity. Similarly, Dow Chemical (2001) focuses upon gender, age, and race; Bristol-Myers Squibb (n.d.) focuses upon race, sexuality, and gender; and Tyson Foods Inc. (n.d.) focuses upon immigrants. Merrill Lynch (2003) addresses race and gender in discussing multicultural and diversified business development. TIAA-CREF (2004b) focus upon race in discussing the composition of the board of trustees.

Altria Group (2004b) includes “making accommodations for persons with disabilities” within its code of conduct Global Diversity and Inclusion Strategy.<sup>14</sup> Altria Group (2004a) further notes that it has a longstanding relationship with the Industry Labor Council, an organization dedicated to expanding employment opportunities for people with disabilities.

Safeway (n.d.) attends career fairs for job seekers with disabilities. FedEx (2004b) and Aetna (2004) express their commitment to including people with disabilities in a diverse work environment by citing their supportive partnerships with the Special Olympics and the National Organization on Disability, respectively. Goldman Sachs’s (2004) European operations support employee disability advocacy groups outside of the company. Wells Fargo (2004) identifies people with disabilities as part of a diverse customer base and highlights their efforts toward accessible banking for people with disabilities.

### *Disability-Absent Companies*

A few companies on the *Fortune* 100 list define diversity in terms that seem to exclude people with disabilities (see “disability absent” column in Table 2). Ten companies (11% of those companies that have publicly available workplace diversity policies) list a number of groups that add to the diversity of the workplace, but do not list persons with disabilities among these groups. In particular, the majority of these companies list gender, race, ethnicity, and sometimes sexual orientation as salient characteristics within their diversity statements.<sup>15</sup>

Cardinal Health (n.d.), for instance, notes “respect [for] differences in culture, ethnicity, gender and race,” but does not mention disability. Cardinal Health’s mentoring program focuses on women and racial and ethnic minorities. General Electric (2004) states that “[i]n the area of diversity, the company is dedicated to developing the careers of women and minorities.”

As noted earlier, many of the *Fortune* 100 express their commitment to diversity in sweeping language that mirrors the basic equal opportunity statement with little exposition, although they generally enumerate which groups are included in diversity. Interestingly, some of these companies reference groups protected by civil rights laws, but do not mention people with disabilities despite the fact that the ADA and numerous state laws designate people with disabilities to this protected class. United Health Group’s (2004) diversity policy affirms that the company hires based on qualifications and not on the basis of race, religion, sex, or other “protected characteristics.” Proctor and Gamble (2003) makes a similar statement, however, limiting the definition of diversity to “race, sex, age, cultural heritage, personal background and sexual orientation.”

It is difficult to determine whether diversity policy statements that do not include people with disabilities within the scope of those policies actually have a negative impact on the community of people with disabilities or the likelihood that they will be hired or retained by a particular company. Nonetheless, it is interesting that some companies still see diversity as defined in terms of race, gender, and ethnicity.

<sup>14</sup>Washington Mutual (2004), similarly, notes that “anyone needing an accommodation to complete the interview process should notify the recruiter.”

<sup>15</sup>For example, “diversity covers a broad range of personal attributes and characteristics such as race, sex, age, cultural heritage, personal background and sexual orientation” (Proctor & Gamble, 2003).

## Supplier Diversity Statements

In addition to adopting diversity statements for employment purposes, many *Fortune* 100 companies adopt policies regarding supplier diversity. These statements express the corporation's commitment to suppliers that are owned by members of traditionally under-represented groups. As with diversity policies in the employment context, these statements vary in their commitment to including people with disabilities within the spectrum of diversity.

Table 3 sets out the types of supplier diversity policy proffered by companies in the industries represented in the *Fortune* 100. Here again, the categories are diversity policies that are "inclusive" of disability, offer no particular definition of diversity (i.e. non-committal), and define diversity but do not include people with disabilities (i.e. disability absent). Additionally, corporations for which no supplier diversity policy was located are identified in the "none found" column.

### *Inclusive Supplier Diversity Statements*

We found supplier diversity policies for 73 of the *Fortune* 100. Among these, 15% of the policies include people with disabilities within the meaning of diversity.<sup>16</sup> Recall, for instance, that Bank of America includes disability in their diversity statement. This commitment carries over into their supplier diversity statement, which includes promoting women, minority, and disabled-owned small businesses (2004b). Similarly, IBM (n.d.) and Verizon (2004) mention disability in their supplier diversity policies. Other companies, such as State Farm, Georgia Pacific, Abbott Laboratories, Citigroup, and Motorola, provide inclusive supplier diversity policies, yet do not include people with disabilities in their employee diversity statements.<sup>17</sup>

Finally, some corporations do not mention people with disabilities in their supplier diversity statements, but their statements are written broadly so they could be interpreted to include people with disabilities (e.g. Marathon Oil, 2003b).<sup>18</sup> Hewlett Packard (2004b) notes that the suppliers who may be eligible under the company's supplier diversity policy include "men and women from different nations, cultures, ethnic groups, generations, backgrounds, skills, [and] abilities." Similarly, Sprint (2004) eschews categorical definitions of supplier diversity in favor of highlighting the company's "diverse group of suppliers." The company further highlights success stories showcasing women and minority owned enterprises that engage in business with Sprint (2004), but then fails to acknowledge any similar operations owned by people with disabilities. These companies are listed as "disability-absent" in Table 3 because they do not explicitly mention disability.

<sup>16</sup>For purposes of this analysis, "disability" does not include references to "disabled veteran status."

<sup>17</sup>Refer to Table 2, "non-committal" and "disability absent" columns. State Farm's (n.d.b) "supplier diversity program" specifically mentions businesses owned by "physically challenged" persons. Georgia Pacific's (n.d.b) specifically mentions businesses owned by "handicapped individual[s]" and "service-disabled individual[s]." Abbott Laboratories' (2001) policy supports "nonprofit organizations designed to provide employment for physically disabled and mentally impaired."

<sup>18</sup>Marathon Oil limits eligibility for supplier diversity program to "minority-owned, women-owned, and small disadvantaged businesses" (emphasis added).

Table 3. Supplier diversity policies by industry

Industry	Inclusive	Non-committal	Disability absent	None found
Financial	Bank of America, American Express, Citigroup, Washington Mutual, Wells Fargo	Fannie Mae, JP Morgan Chase	Wachovia, Bank One Corp., Goldman Sachs, Freddie Mac, Morgan Stanley, Merrill Lynch	Amerisource Bergen, Berkshire Hathaway, TIAA-CREF
Technology	IBM	Microsoft, Cisco	Hewlett Packard, Dell, Boeing, Honeywell, Electronic Data Systems, Lockheed Martin	Ingram Micro, Intel, Northrup Grumman
Health		Cardinal Health	Merck, McKesson, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Abbott Laboratories	Cigna, United Health, HCA, Pfizer
Retail	Wal-Mart, Home Depot		Kroger's, Sears Roebuck, Albertson's, Kmart, Safeway, JCPenney, Lowe's	CVS, Auto Nation, Target, Costco, Walgreens, Supervalu, Best Buy
Communication/media	Verizon	Bellsouth	Sprint, AT&T, SBC Communications, AOL/Time Warner, Motorola	Viacom, Walt Disney
Chemical	Dow Chemical	DuPont		
Oil/energy		ConocoPhillips	ChevronTexaco, Marathon Oil, ExxonMobil	Valero, Alcoa
Consumer products/services			General Electric, Con Agra, Ford, General Motors, Coca Cola, Johnson & Johnson, Proctor & Gamble, Altria, FedEx, UPS, Pepsico, Archer Daniels Midland	Tyson
Industrial products/services		Visteon, Georgia Pacific	United Technologies, Caterpillar, Johnson Controls, Weyerhaeuser	International Paper, Sysco, Delphi
Insurance	State Farm	Aetna	Allstate, Met Life, Prudential, New York Life	MassMutual, AIG

### *Disability Absent and Non-Committal Supplier Diversity Statements*

Of those companies that have publicly available supplier diversity policies, the majority (70%) mention race, ethnicity, gender and, occasionally, disabled veteran status, but do not mention disability. Kmart (2000) focuses solely on

minority-owned businesses in its supplier diversity statement.<sup>19</sup> Freddie Mac (2004b) defines its supplier diversity program solely in terms of race and gender. JP Morgan Chase (2004c) does not explicitly define diversity in its policy, but requires certification by one of several groups, such as the Small Business Administration (SBA).<sup>20</sup> JP Morgan Chase (2004c) considers certification by the National Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce sufficient to establish membership in the company's supplier diversity network, but does not recognize membership in any disability organizations for the same purpose.

Twenty-two (of forty-four) companies that adopt "non-committal" employee diversity policies state their policy with regard to supplier diversity in a way that excludes people with disabilities.<sup>21</sup> These companies limit their definition of supplier diversity to women and minorities (e.g. Merck, 2004) and, sometimes, disabled veterans (e.g. SBC Communications, 2003). In addition, 19 companies whose supplier diversity statements do not include people with disabilities do include people with disabilities in their definition of workforce diversity.<sup>22</sup> Corporations such as MetLife (2003b), Lowe's (2004b), and Wachovia (2004b) list people with disabilities as an important part of workplace diversity, but do not include them in the disability supplier statement. Caterpillar (n.d.) places emphasis on supplier diversity and notes a number of awards in this area by groups representing women and racial and ethnic minorities. Although Caterpillar includes people with disabilities in their employee diversity statement, no similar mention is made in the context of the company's supplier diversity program (n.d.).

Many of the companies represented on the *Fortune* 100 list are considered the top companies for encouraging supplier diversity, as noted by Diversity Business.com (2003). The Diversity Business.com listing was based on the responses of 200,000 women and minority owned businesses and, therefore, represents the views of a significant number of women and minorities that benefit from the supplier diversity policies of the represented companies. This makes it possible to examine whether there is a relation between a company's publicly available supplier diversity policy and the response of its intended beneficiaries. A number of *Fortune* 100 companies comprise the majority of those that made Diversity.com's list of the top 50 companies that support women and minority owned businesses. Table 4 provides a comparison of the 37 *Fortune* 100 companies that made the Diversity Business.com list with their supplier diversity policy status.

Although there are a few companies on the Diversity Business.com list that are not *Fortune* 100 companies, 26 of the 37 *Fortune* 100 companies appear in either the "disability absent" or "none found" category. This indicates that a focused strategy for identifying under-represented suppliers may be an effective way to enhance business relationships with those suppliers.

<sup>19</sup>Kmart "works with minority-owned vendors who have been certified by the National Minority Business Council and the Women's Business Council."

<sup>20</sup>SBA offers certification and various benefits to businesses that are at least 51% owned by "socially and economically disadvantaged" individuals.

<sup>21</sup>This figure is arrived at by cross-tabulating the chart of companies that are "non-committal" in defining diversity for purposes of their workplace diversity policies and those that do not include people with disabilities in their supplier diversity statements.

<sup>22</sup>Similarly, this figure is arrived at by cross-tabulating the chart of companies that include people with disabilities in the definition of workplace diversity and those that do not include people with disabilities in their supplier diversity statements.

Table 4. Diversity Business.com list and supplier diversity policy status

Inclusive	Non-committal	Disability absent	None found
1 Wal-Mart	10 BellSouth	2 Lockheed Martin	12 Northrop Grumman
5 IBM	16 Microsoft	3 United Parcel Service	40 Pfizer
8 Bank of America	35 Fannie Mae	4 Dell Computers	44 Walt Disney
11 American Express	43 Cisco Systems	6 General Motors	45 Intel
18 Verizon	47 Cardinal Health	7 Boeing Company	
37 Wells Fargo		14 SBC Communications	
		15 Ford Motor	
		19 Coca-Cola (sic)	
		19 PepsiCo (sic)	
		21 Altria Group	
		22 General Electric	
		23 Johnson & Johnson	
		24 Hewlett-Packard	
		25 ExxonMobil	
		28 Procter & Gamble	
		30 Time Warner Inc.	
		31 AT&T	
		36 Sprint	
		41 Abbott Laboratories	
		46 Bristol-Myers Squibb	
		49 Wachovia	
		50 Sears Roebuck	

### 2004 Additions to the *Fortune* 100

Five companies were recently added to the *Fortune* 100 for 2004, including Comcast, Duke Energy, Williams, Wellpoint Health Networks, and Medco Health solutions. Comcast (2004a) expresses its commitment to employing people with disabilities in a generic equal opportunity statement. The rest of the section of the corporate website is devoted to a discussion of diversity, but does not delineate which groups add to a diverse workforce. It is notable that the website indicates that Comcast will participate in a job fair for multi-ethnic students and students with disabilities (Comcast, 2004b). Although Comcast's supplier diversity policy does not specifically mention disability, the section on eligibility criteria does include people with disabilities (Comcast, 2004c).

Duke Energy's workplace diversity policy limits the definition of diversity to women and ethnic and social backgrounds (2004a). The company has an anti-harassment policy in place that prohibits harassment on the basis of disability (2004b). Duke Energy's (2004c) supplier diversity initiative includes "minorities, women, Vietnam-era vets and persons with disabilities capable of providing commodities and services at competitive prices"; however, its eligibility criteria appear to apply only to women, minorities, and disabled veterans. The Williams' (2004b) workplace diversity policy does not mention particular groups, although there is a link to its standard equal opportunity policy enumerating required groups, including disabilities. A supplier diversity policy for Williams could not be located. Similarly, Wellpoint Health Networks (2004) defines diversity but specifies no groups. A diversity policy for Medco Health Solutions (2004) could not be located.

## DISCUSSION

A significant portion of *Fortune* 100 companies recognize the role of people with disabilities in a diverse workforce; forty-two percent of *Fortune* 100 companies expressly mention disability within the publicly available written statements of their workplace diversity policies. Though it is not yet possible to generalize the trends evident among the *Fortune* 100 to other companies in the same industries, it is interesting to note patterns that emerge. For example, technology sector companies represented on the *Fortune* 100 list are the most consistent in their inclusion of people with disabilities in their diversity policy statements, perhaps also in response to Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. Similarly, although there are few chemical companies on the list, all of them include people with disabilities in their diversity policies. By contrast, diversity policies among financial companies tend to be less specific about the definition of diversity and, overall, these companies were somewhat less likely to have such policies.

We also found that where the diversity policy includes people with disabilities within the definition of a diverse workforce, many such companies fail to mention a commitment to the inclusion of people with disabilities, and yet laud their accomplishments with other under-represented groups. Conversely, many companies evidence their commitment to hiring people with disabilities with recruitment efforts that target qualified people within that population as well as other under-represented populations.

*Fortune* 100 companies possess enormous hiring and market power. In recognition of the importance of the purchasing decisions of these companies in the marketplace, many of them have instigated supplier diversity policies to promote a diverse supplier base. While the number of companies including disability within their definition of diversity for purposes of employment is significant, only 11 of the companies that have written supplier diversity policies express a commitment to people with disabilities within their policies to promote supplier diversity.

In addition to the immediate impact of establishing relationships with supplier companies owned by minorities, women, and people with disabilities, these kinds of initiatives build the diverse employer base of the future. As noted in the Bank of America (2004b) supplier diversity policy statement, a primary goal of supplier diversity policies is helping minority, women, and disabled-owned businesses grow and expand opportunities within their communities. To that end, the majority (73%) of *Fortune* 100 companies have established supplier diversity policies that promote the patronage of under-represented suppliers.

Another factor that may contribute to the existence of an inclusive supplier diversity policy is the role of the Small Business Administration (SBA), which, as noted above, offers certification and various benefits to businesses that are at least 51% owned by "socially and economically disadvantaged" individuals. African-Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, Subcontinent Asian Americans, and Native Americans are presumed to qualify. Seventy percent of supplier diversity policies include these groups and women in their definition of diverse suppliers under the company's supplier diversity initiative (Small Business Association, 2004).

Although it is possible for a business owned by a person with a disability to achieve certification under the SBA's 8(a) program, "[e]ntrepreneurs with disabilities must go through a lengthy, bureaucratic process to be certified for 8[a] whereas

other disadvantaged small business owners with presumptive 8[a] eligibility do not” (Paralyzed Veterans of America, n.d.). Certification programs, such as that of the SBA, are worthy of further research to determine their impact on the inclusion of workers and suppliers with disabilities among America’s top corporations.

## CONCLUSION

Although the importance of policies and procedures that increase diversity in the workplace has been recognized by most *Fortune* 100 companies, many do not include (at least explicitly) the contribution of people with disabilities to the diverse work environment. Many companies that recognize people with disabilities as an important element of a diverse workforce do not state this commitment with regard to efforts to recruit and retain people with disabilities. Few companies that describe their commitment to diversity in sweeping, generic terms evidence their commitment to a diverse workforce with recruitment and retention efforts aimed at people with disabilities. Finally, a number of companies list groups that are included in the definition of diversity, but do not include people with disabilities on that list.

While it is encouraging that the most successful companies in the United States show significant efforts to include people with disabilities in the diverse workforce, this examination of company diversity policies reveals that there remains room for improvement. Furthermore, many companies do not support businesses owned by people with disabilities, although they develop initiatives to advance minority and women owned businesses and make an effort to engage suppliers that are owned by women and racial, ethnic, and cultural minorities. Although it is difficult to say what, if any, effect these trends have on people with disabilities—as job-seekers, employees, consumers, and small business owners—it is possible that people with disabilities are not benefiting from the focus on diversity as much as other groups that fall within definitions of diversity. In turn, companies that fail to include people with disabilities within their definitions of diversity may not be reaping the benefits of a diverse workforce.

Diversity policies have become an important part of successful companies’ management strategies. The largest percentage of growth in the workforce over the next several decades is likely to be among women, minorities and immigrants, as well as an increasing number of people with disabilities entering or re-entering the workforce (U.S. Department of Labor, 1996). Regardless of the extent to which the ADA and other federal initiatives help increase the employment of people with disabilities, the rate of people with disabilities in the workforce is expected to increase as the population ages (Zwerling et al., 2003).

In this investigation, we have identified three major types of diversity policy with respect to people with disabilities: (1) those that explicitly include people with disabilities in the definition of diversity, (2) those that are non-specific as to what constitutes “diversity,” and (3) those that mention minority, gender, or other status but do not mention disability specifically. This investigation finds that while most *Fortune* 100 companies have policies promoting workplace and, to a lesser extent, supplier diversity, many companies fail to explicitly recognize the role of people with disabilities in building a diverse marketplace. Furthermore, this investigation reveals that even those companies that include people with

disabilities within these policies do not always support their policies with actions that actively promote the inclusion of people with disabilities in the workplace and initiatives to work with diverse suppliers.

There is reason for optimism. This investigation shows there are a number of companies that include people with disabilities within the definition of diversity and, by extension, in the diverse workplace itself. A smaller number of companies include people with disabilities in their supplier diversity statements and make efforts to promote and support businesses that are owned by people with disabilities.

Future research must examine more closely the actual effect of diversity policies on people with disabilities in the workplace, as suppliers, and as consumers of the goods and services offered by these major corporations. There is preliminary evidence that diversity policies generally have a positive impact on the status of people with disabilities in the workplace. A 2004 *New York Times* market research survey found that “companies with workplace diversity programs had twice as many people with disabilities in management positions (2%) as companies without diversity programs (1%)” (National Organization on Disability, 2003a). Future research should attempt to assess the inclusion of people with disabilities in corporate diversity strategies as associated with higher rates of hiring and retaining employees with disabilities in those companies.

Finally, Thomas Kochan of MIT’s Sloan School of Management notes that there is a dearth of data relating efforts at promoting diversity with verifiable outcomes (Hanson, 2003). Kochan and colleagues find that studying diversity in organizations is difficult and companies are reluctant to allow researchers to examine their successes and failures with regard to such a litigious topic. After initiating conversations with 20 *Fortune* 500 companies, Kochan and his colleagues were able to enlist the participation of four companies (Kochan *et al.*, 2003). They point out that “organizations need to do a better job of tracking and evaluating the impact of their strategies for managing a diverse workforce” (p. 17).

Until these barriers to assessing the effectiveness of diversity policies are overcome, it will be difficult to quantify the effect of including people with disabilities in diversity policies and programs. Additionally, it will be difficult to establish the relation of diversity policies generally, and those including people with disabilities specifically, to the things that *Fortune* 100 companies care most about: profits, shareholder value, decreased lawsuits, lower staff turn over rates, and other indicators of successful human resource management. The CEOs of the most successful companies in the nation may be inclined “to do the right thing” with regard to including people with disabilities in the workplace and as suppliers. However, this inclination will need to be transformed into action to demonstrate policies and practices that include people with disabilities are good for profitability.

## REFERENCES

- Abbott Laboratories. (2001). *Global citizenship report*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://abbott.com/citizenship/pdf/2000-01\\_gc\\_report.pdf](http://abbott.com/citizenship/pdf/2000-01_gc_report.pdf)
- Abbott Laboratories. (2004). *Diversity fact sheet*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://abbott.com/news/facts/diversity.html>
- Aetna. (2004). *Awards and recognition*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.aetna.com/aboutaetna/awards\\_and\\_recognition.html](http://www.aetna.com/aboutaetna/awards_and_recognition.html)

- Alcoa. (2004). *Human rights*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.alcoa.com/global/en/about\\_alcoa/human\\_rights.asp/chartpg.8](http://www.alcoa.com/global/en/about_alcoa/human_rights.asp/chartpg.8)
- Allstate. (2004). *Press kit: Awards and recognition*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.allstate.com/Media/PressKit/PageRender.asp?page=awards.htm>
- Altria Group. (2004a). *Diversity timeline*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.altria.com/download/pdf/Careers\\_Diversity\\_Timeline.pdf](http://www.altria.com/download/pdf/Careers_Diversity_Timeline.pdf)
- Altria Group. (2004b). *Commitment to diversity*. Retrieved September 8, 2004 from [http://www.altria.com/careers/05\\_01\\_commitmenttodiversity.asp](http://www.altria.com/careers/05_01_commitmenttodiversity.asp)
- Altria Group. (2004c). *Altria code of conduct for compliance and integrity*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from [http://www.altria.com/download/pdf/responsibility\\_Altria\\_Code\\_of\\_Conduct.pdf](http://www.altria.com/download/pdf/responsibility_Altria_Code_of_Conduct.pdf)
- American Express. (2004). *Global awards*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from <http://www10.americanexpress.com/sif/cda/page/0,1641,19162,00.asp>
- American International Group (AIG). (2003). *Learn diversity at AIG*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.aig.com/careers/about\\_div\\_frameset.htm](http://www.aig.com/careers/about_div_frameset.htm)
- AmerisourceBergen. (2004). *Homepage*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.amerisourcebergen.com/cp/1/index.jsp>
- Annenberg Washington Program. (1994). *Communicating the Americans with Disabilities Act: Transcending compliance—A case report on Sears Roebuck & Co.* (White Paper). Washington, DC: Blanck.
- Annenberg Washington Program. (1996). *Communicating the Americans with Disabilities Act: Transcending compliance—1996 follow-up report on Sears Roebuck & Co.* Washington, DC: Blanck.
- AOL/Time Warner. (2004). *Time Warner: Diversity*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from [http://www.time-warner.com/corporate\\_information/diversity.adp](http://www.time-warner.com/corporate_information/diversity.adp)
- Archer Daniels Midland. (2004). *ADM global homepage*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.admworld.com>
- AT&T. (2004). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.att.com/hr/life/diversity.html>
- AutoNation. (2004). *Homepage*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.autonation.com/Corporate/Default.asp?Page=Home>
- Bank of America. (2004a). *Accessible banking*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.bankofamerica.com/accessiblebanking/index.cfm?template=overview&statecheck=IA>
- Bank of America. (2004b). *Multicultural supplier development*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from [http://www.bankofamerica.com/supplierdiversity/index.cfm?template=sddi\\_ov.cfm](http://www.bankofamerica.com/supplierdiversity/index.cfm?template=sddi_ov.cfm)
- Bank of America Center for Scholarship Administration. (2002). *Bank of America ADA abilities scholarship program*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from [http://www.scholarshipprograms.org/fsp\\_bankofamerica.html](http://www.scholarshipprograms.org/fsp_bankofamerica.html)
- BellSouth. (2004a). *Diversity philosophy*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from [http://www.bellsouth.com/employment/car\\_diversity.html](http://www.bellsouth.com/employment/car_diversity.html)
- BellSouth. (2004b). *Recognition*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://bellsouthcorp.com/policy/diversity/recognitions.htm>
- Benham, B. (2001, April). Get your share. *Working Woman*, 54.
- Berkshire Hathaway. (2004). *Official home page*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.berkshirehathaway.com/>
- Best Buy. (2004). *Homepage*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.bestbuy.com/>
- Blanck, P., Hill, E., Siegal, C., & Waterstone, M. (2003). *Disability civil rights law and policy*. St. Paul, MN: Thomson-West.
- Boeing. (n.d.). *Culture: Diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.boeing.com/employment/culture/diversity.html>
- Brancato, C. K., & Patterson, D. J. (1999). *Board diversity in U.S. corporations: Best practices for broadening the profile of corporate boards* (Rep. No. 1230-99-RR).
- Brief for Amici Curiae 65 Leading American Businesses in Support of Respondents, Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003) (Nos. 02-241, 02-516). Retrieved September 6, 2004, from Westlaw: 2003 WL 399056.
- Brief of Amici Curiae Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Leland Stanford Junior University, E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., International Business Machines Corp., National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering, Inc., in Support of Respondents Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003) (Nos. 02-241, 02-516). Retrieved September 6, 2004, from Westlaw: 2003 WL 367215.
- Brief of ExxonMobil Corporation as Amicus Curiae in Support of Neither Party, Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003) (Nos. 02-241, 02-516). Retrieved September 6, 2004, from Westlaw: 2003 WL 554411.
- Bristol-Myers Squibb. (n.d.). *Why Bristol-Myers Squibb? Diversity and work life*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.bms.com/career/data/workdive.html>
- Cardinal Health. (n.d.). *Careers: Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004 from <http://www.cardinal.com/content/careers/cardiversity.asp>

- Caterpillar. (2000). *Code of worldwide business conduct*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.cat.com/cda/components/securedFile/displaySecuredFileServletJSP?fileId=89709&languageId=7>
- Caterpillar. (n.d.). *Supplier information: Supplier diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.cat.com/cda/layout?m=39740&x=7>
- ChevronTexaco. (1996, November 15). *Texaco announces settlement in class action lawsuit*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from [http://www.chevrontexaco.com/news/archive/texaco\\_press/1996/pr11\\_15.asp](http://www.chevrontexaco.com/news/archive/texaco_press/1996/pr11_15.asp)
- Cisco Systems. (2004). *Diversity: Our commitment*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.cisco.com/en/US/about/ac49/ac55/about\\_cisco\\_our\\_commitment.html](http://www.cisco.com/en/US/about/ac49/ac55/about_cisco_our_commitment.html)
- Citigroup. (2004). *Corporate citizenship: Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.citigroup.com/citigroup/citizen/diversity/index.htm>
- Comcast. (2004a). *Comcast principles and policies*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from <http://www.comcast.com/diversity/execute/eeopolicy.html>
- Comcast. (2004b). *Keeping cultures, communities, and customers connected*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.comcast.com/diversity/?LinkID=89>
- Comcast. (2004c). *Supplier diversity criteria*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.comcast.com/Diversity/Suppliers/Criteria.html#SDB>
- ConAgra Foods. (2003). *Contact us: "Diversity at ConAgra Foods."* Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.conagrafoods.com/utilities/diversity\\_report.jsp](http://www.conagrafoods.com/utilities/diversity_report.jsp) (online form for requesting diversity report).
- ConocoPhillips. (n.d.). *Career options*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.conocophillips.com/careers/ops.asp>
- Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations. (2003). *Diversity management*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/mgmtprog/dm/default.html>
- Dell. (2003a). *Diversity events*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://dellapp.us.dell.com/careers/diversity/events.asp>
- Dell. (2003b). *Increasing access to technology*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://dellapp.us.dell.com/careers/diversity/access.asp>
- Diversity Business.com. (2003). *America's top organizations for multicultural business opportunities—2003*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://div2000.com/Resources/DivLists/2003/DivTop50/2003Div50.htm>
- Dow Chemical. (2001). *The Dow Louisiana operations public report 2001: Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.dow.com/publicreport/2001/louisiana/response/diversity.htm>
- Duke Energy. (2004a). *Workforce diversity: Embracing change and new ideas*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from <http://www.duke-energy.com/careers/diversity/>
- Duke Energy. (2004b). *Harassment in the workplace: Duke Energy's code of business ethics*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from <http://www.duke-energy.com/investors/governance/ethics/harass.asp>
- Duke Energy. (2004c). *Program overview: Duke Energy's supplier diversity program*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.duke-energy.com/company/suppliers/diversity/overview.asp>
- Duke Energy. (2004d). *Criteria and eligibility: Requirements for Duke Energy's supplier diversity program*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.duke-energy.com/company/suppliers/diversity/criteria.asp>
- Edelman, L. B. (1992). Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6), 1531–1576.
- ExxonMobil. (n.d.). *Why focus on diversity?* Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/Publications/diversity/c\\_whyfocus.html](http://www.exxonmobil.com/Corporate/Newsroom/Publications/diversity/c_whyfocus.html)
- Fannie Mae. (2004). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.fanniemae.com/careers/diversity/>
- FedEx. (2004a). *FedEx careers: Awards and recognition*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.fedex.com/us/careers/diversity/awards.html>
- FedEx. (2004b). *FedEx careers: Diversity at FedEx*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.fedex.com/us/careers/diversity/>
- Ford Motor Company. (2003). *On the team: Valuing diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.mycareer.ford.com/ONTHETEAM.ASP?CID=15>
- Ford Motor Company. (n.d.). *A way of life*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.isitparatofyou.co.uk/diversity-at-ford/way-of-life2.htm>
- Freddie Mac. (2004a). *Accolades*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from <http://www.freddiemac.com/careers/accolades.html>
- Freddie Mac. (2004b). *Vendors and suppliers*. Retrieved September 2, 2004 from <http://www.freddiemac.com/corporate/about/vendors.html>
- Gandz, J. (2001). *A business case for diversity*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from [http://www.equalopportunity.on.ca/eng\\_g/documents/BusCase.html](http://www.equalopportunity.on.ca/eng_g/documents/BusCase.html)
- General Electric. (2004). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.ge.com/en/commitment/social/diversity/index.htm>

- Georgia Pacific. (n.d.a). *Employee development*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.gp.com/careers/diversity/divdevelopment.html>
- Georgia Pacific. (n.d.b). *Supplier diversity: How our program works*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.gp.com/supplierdiversity/ourprogram.asp>
- Goldman Sachs. (2004). *Affiliations*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.goldmansachs.com/our\\_firm/the\\_culture/global\\_leadership\\_and\\_diversity/affiliations.html](http://www.goldmansachs.com/our_firm/the_culture/global_leadership_and_diversity/affiliations.html)
- Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).
- Hanson, F. (2003). Diversity's business case doesn't add up. *Workforce Management*, 82(4), 28–32. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.workforce.com/section/11/feature/23/42/49/>
- Hawkins, M. W. (2003). Current trends in class action employment litigation. *Labor Lawyer*, 19(1), 33–62.
- Hewlett Packard. (2004a). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.jobs.hp.com/content/Informations/diversity.asp?Lang=ENen>
- Hewlett Packard. (2004b). *Diversity and inclusion: The meaning behind the words*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.hp.com/hpinfo/abouthp/diversity/meaning.html>
- Home Depot. (2004). *Ethics and compliance policy*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from [http://www.homedepot.com/HDUS/EN\\_US/corporate/about/compliance.shtml](http://www.homedepot.com/HDUS/EN_US/corporate/about/compliance.shtml)
- Honeywell. (2003). *Our culture: Valuing diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.honeywell.com/about/page1\\_2\\_1.html](http://www.honeywell.com/about/page1_2_1.html)
- IBM. (2003). *Valuing diversity: Equal opportunity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www-306.ibm.com/employment/us/diverse/equal\\_opportunity.shtml](http://www-306.ibm.com/employment/us/diverse/equal_opportunity.shtml)
- IBM. (2004). *Services to support your accessibility initiatives*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www-306.ibm.com/able/solution\\_offerings/services.html](http://www-306.ibm.com/able/solution_offerings/services.html)
- IBM. (n.d.). *Principles and practices*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www-1.ibm.com/procurement/proweb.nsf/ContentDocsByTitle/United+States~Principles+and+Practices?OpenDocument&Parent=About+procurement>
- Intel. (2004). *Diversity at Intel: Our commitment*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.intel.com/jobs/diversity/commitment.htm?iid=jobshomenav+commit&>
- JCPenney. (2004). *A world of diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [https://jcpdmz1.jcpenny.com/Career\\_Opportunities/diversity.asp](https://jcpdmz1.jcpenny.com/Career_Opportunities/diversity.asp)
- Johnson Controls. (2004). *Diversity in the workplace: Resources and initiatives*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.johnsoncontrols.com/hr/diversity.htm#resources>
- Johnson and Johnson. (2004). *Our company: Global diversity*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from [http://www.jnj.com/our\\_company/diversity/index.htm](http://www.jnj.com/our_company/diversity/index.htm)
- JP Morgan Chase. (2004a). *Diversity: Non-discrimination policy*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.jpmorganchase.com/cm/cs?pagename=Chase/Href&urlname=jpmc/community/diversity>
- JP Morgan Chase. (2004b). *Workplace initiatives*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from <http://www.jpmorganchase.com/cm/cs?pagename=Chase/Href&urlname=jpmc/community/diversity/workplace>
- JP Morgan Chase. (2004c). *Supplier diversity: Certification agencies*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.jpmorganchase.com/cm/cs?pagename=Chase/Href&urlname=jpmc/about/suppliers/sdiv/cert>
- Klein, D., Schmeling, J., & Blanck, P. (2005). Emerging technologies and corporate culture at Microsoft: A methodological note. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* (this issue).
- Kmart. (2000). *Multicultural initiatives: Kmart multicultural fact sheet*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.kmartcorp.com/corp/Multicultural\\_initiatives/Kmart\\_Multicultural\\_Fact\\_Sheet.stm](http://www.kmartcorp.com/corp/Multicultural_initiatives/Kmart_Multicultural_Fact_Sheet.stm)
- Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., et al. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management*, 42, 3–21.
- Law, Health Policy and Disability Center. (2003). *Corporate culture and disability symposium*. Retrieved August 31, 2004 from [http://disability.law.uiowa.edu/lhpdc/archives/2003\\_merrill\\_lynch/ml\\_sym\\_p\\_archive.html](http://disability.law.uiowa.edu/lhpdc/archives/2003_merrill_lynch/ml_sym_p_archive.html)
- Law, Health Policy and Disability Center. (2004). *Disability program navigators and work incentive grantees*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://disability.law.uiowa.edu/lhpdc/projects/doltech.html>
- Lockheed Martin. (2004). *Honors and achievements: Recognition for diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.lockheedmartin.com/wms/findPage.do?dsp=fec&ci=12955&rsbc=12952&fti=0&ti=0&sc=400>
- Lowe's. (2004a). *Equal opportunity—unequaled excitement*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.lowes.com/lkn?action=pg&p>AboutLoves/CareersDivAndInc&topic=aboutLoves>
- Lowe's. (2004b). *Lowe's careers: Fairness*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.lowes.com/lkn?action=pg&p>AboutLoves/Fairness&topic=aboutLoves>
- Marathon Oil. (2003a). *Diversity: Our competitive advantage*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.marathon.com/Values/Diversity/>
- Marathon Oil. (2003b). *Supplier diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.marathon.com/Values/Diversity/Supplier\\_Diversity/](http://www.marathon.com/Values/Diversity/Supplier_Diversity/)

- MassMutual. (2004). *Corporate careers: Working at MassMutual: Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.massmutual.com/mmfg/careers/diversity.html>
- McKesson. (2004). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.mckesson.com/diversity.html>
- Medco Health Solutions. (2004). *Homepage*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.medco-health.com/medco/consumer/home.jsp>
- Merck. (2004). *Supplier diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.merck.com/supplierdiversity/>
- Merrill Lynch. (2003). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.ml.com/diversity/>
- MetLife. (2003a). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.metlife.com/Applications/Corporate/WPS/CDA/PageGenerator/0,1674,P2841,00.html>
- MetLife. (2003b). *Supplier diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.metlife.com/Applications/Corporate/WPS/CDA/PageGenerator/0,1674,P4483,00.html>
- Microsoft. (2001, July 24). *Microsoft's accessible technology group strives to knock down barriers with technology*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.microsoft.com/presspass/features/2001/jul01/07-24accessibility.asp>
- Microsoft. (2003). *Work/life balance*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.microsoft.com/mscorp/citizenship/diversity/inside/worklife.asp>
- Microsoft. (2004). *Pride in diversity/diversity and employee groups*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.microsoft.com/careers/mslife/diversepride/employeeegroups.mspx>
- Morgan Stanley. (2002). *Disabilities: Gaining access to untapped potential*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.morganstanley.com/about/diversity/disabilities.html?page=div>
- Motorola. (2004). *Supplier profile form*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.motorola.com/supplierdiversity/profile\\_form2.xls](http://www.motorola.com/supplierdiversity/profile_form2.xls)
- National Organization on Disability. (2003a, February 13). *Workplace diversity programs enhance employment of people with disabilities, survey finds*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.nod.org/content.cfm?id=1318>
- National Organization on Disability. (2003b, September 25). *EEOC sues the Home Depot for terminating employee with disability*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.nod.org/content.cfm?id=1440>
- Northrop Grumman. (2004). *Workforce diversity: Outreach efforts*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.northropgrumman.com/diversity/outreach.html>
- Paralyzed Veterans of America. (n.d.). *PVA and Capitol Hill: Disability and entrepreneurship*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.pva.org/caphill/adv/policyresource/2002/02005.htm>
- Pfizer. (2004). *Our differences are our strength*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.pfizer.com/are/careers/mn\\_working\\_diversity.html](http://www.pfizer.com/are/careers/mn_working_diversity.html)
- Proctor and Gamble. (2003). *Corporate info: Company culture: Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.pg.com/jobs/corpinfo/diversity.jhtml>
- Prudential Financial. (2004). *Diversity @ Prudential*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.prudential.com/HTMLEmbed/0,1469,intPageID%253D4799%2526blnPrinterFriendly%253D0,00.html>
- Ramirez, S. A. (2000). Diversity and the boardroom. *Stanford Journal of Law, Business and Finance*, 6(1), 85–133.
- Safeway. (n.d.). *Diversity events*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.safeway.com/Employment/Employment\\_Diversity\\_Events.asp](http://www.safeway.com/Employment/Employment_Diversity_Events.asp)
- Sandler, L., & Blanck, P. (2005). The quest to make accessibility a corporate article of faith at Microsoft: Case study of corporate culture and human resources dimensions. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* (this issue).
- SBC Communications. (2003). *Supplier diversity*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from [http://www.sbcsuppliers.com/sd\\_home.asp](http://www.sbcsuppliers.com/sd_home.asp)
- Schur, L., Kruse, D., & Blanck, P. (2005). Corporate culture and the employment of persons with disabilities. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* (this issue).
- Sears Roebuck. (2004). *Business opportunities: Vendor diversity*. Retrieved September 3, 2004, from [http://www.sears.com/sr/misc/sears/jobsec/vendor\\_main.jsp?BV\\_UseBVCookie=Yes&vertical=SEARS](http://www.sears.com/sr/misc/sears/jobsec/vendor_main.jsp?BV_UseBVCookie=Yes&vertical=SEARS)
- Small Business Association. (2004). *About small disadvantaged business (SDB) certification and eligibility*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.sba.gov/sdb/indexaboutsd.html>
- Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM). (2004). *What is the "business case" for diversity?* Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.shrm.org/diversity/businesscase.asp>
- Spataro, S. E. (2005). Diversity in context: How organizational culture affects the consequences of demographic diversity in organizations. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 21–38.
- Sprint. (2002). *Awards 2002*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from [http://www.sprint.com/sprint/ir/sd/awards\\_02.html](http://www.sprint.com/sprint/ir/sd/awards_02.html)
- Sprint. (2004). *Supplier diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.sprint.com/supplierdiversity/>

- State Farm Insurance. (n.d.a). *Awards and recognition*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.statefarm.com/careers/awards\\_recog.htm](http://www.statefarm.com/careers/awards_recog.htm)
- State Farm Insurance. (n.d.b). *What is the State Farm<sup>®</sup> Supplier Diversity Program?* Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://b2b.statefarm.com/b2b/supplier/s\\_whatism.asp](http://b2b.statefarm.com/b2b/supplier/s_whatism.asp)
- Target. (2004). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://target.com/targetcorp\\_group/careers/diversity.jhtml](http://target.com/targetcorp_group/careers/diversity.jhtml)
- TIAA-CREF. (2004a). *Web center*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.tiaa-cref.org/>
- TIAA-CREF. (2004b). *An introduction to the TIAA-CREF governance system*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from <http://www.tiaa-cref.org/pubs/html/governance/trustees.html>
- Tyson Foods Inc. (n.d.). *Tyson team members*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.tysonfoodsinc.com/corporate/people/default.asp>
- United Health Group. (2004). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.unitedhealthgroup.com/careers/offer/offer\\_diversity.htm](http://www.unitedhealthgroup.com/careers/offer/offer_diversity.htm)
- United Parcel Service. (2004). *Worker with disabilities: Focusing on abilities*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.community.ups.com/community/diversity/workplace/disabilities.html>
- United Technologies. (n.d.) *Diversity: Diversity in action*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.utc.com/careers/diversity/action.htm>
- U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Disability Employment Policy. (1996). *Diversity and disabilities*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.dol.gov/odep/pubs/ek96/diverse.htm>
- Valero Energy Corp. (2004). *Affirmative action and equal opportunity policy*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.valero.com/legal/EEO>
- Verizon Communications. (2001). *Our code of business conduct: Connecting through integrity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www2.verizon.com/about/careers/codeofconduct.pdf>
- Verizon. (2004). *Welcome to the Verizon supplier diversity website*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from [http://www2.verizon.com/about/community/supplier\\_diversity/sdindex.html](http://www2.verizon.com/about/community/supplier_diversity/sdindex.html)
- Viacom. (2004). *Employment site*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [https://jobhuntweb.viacom.com/Viacom/main/jobhome\\_viacom.asp](https://jobhuntweb.viacom.com/Viacom/main/jobhome_viacom.asp)
- Wachovia. (2004a). *Diversity at Wachovia*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from [http://www.wachovia.com/inside/page/0,,137\\_362,00.html](http://www.wachovia.com/inside/page/0,,137_362,00.html)
- Wachovia. (2004b). *Supplier diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [https://www.wachovia.com/inside/page/0,,136\\_1343,00.html](https://www.wachovia.com/inside/page/0,,136_1343,00.html)
- Walgreens. (2004). *Homepage*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.walgreens.com/>
- Washington Mutual. (2004). *Diversity recruiting*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://publicsite.wamu.com/about/jobs/wamuway/diversityrecruiting.asp>
- Wellpoint Health Networks. (2004). *Diversity at Wellpoint*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from [http://www.wellpoint.com/commitments/wellpoint\\_diversity.asp](http://www.wellpoint.com/commitments/wellpoint_diversity.asp)
- Wells Fargo. (2004). *Awards and recognition*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.wellsfargo.com/about/diversity/awards.jhtml>
- Weyerhaeuser. (2001). *Company culture: Diversity*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.weyerhaeuser.com/careers/companyculture/diversity.asp>
- Williams. (2004a). *Equal employment opportunity policy*. Retrieved September 6, 2004, from <http://www.williams.com/careers/eeopolicy.asp>
- Williams. (2004b). *Diversity*. Retrieved September 2, 2004, from <http://www.williams.com/careers/diversity.asp>
- Zwerling, C., Whitten, P. S., Sprince, N. L., Davis, C. S., Wallace, R. B., et al. (2003). Workplace accommodations for people with disabilities: National health interview survey disability supplement. *JOEM*, 45(5), 517-525.