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INTRODUCTION

With the impending mass retirement of baby boomers, scholars and policy makers have been focused on the potential problems that may arise as a result of the aging American workforce. Further compounding the threat of valued institutional knowledge and skills that will be lost as baby boomers retire is the fact that America’s fertility rate has decreased since the 1960's, thereby shrinking the cohorts of younger employees who will be able to move up the ranks and replace older workers (Government Accountability Office, 2005). Research by SHRM (Collison, 2005 and 2006) further suggests that even if replacement workers can be found, some employers believe that many younger employees lack the critical competencies needed to perform their jobs well, thus intensifying a potential labor shortage. Unless the productivity of the current American population is increased or the country changes its immigration policies, by the mid-21st century America's labor force growth will be less than a fifth of what it is now (Government Accounting Office, 2005). This can spawn a pronounced slow-down of the American economy and a significant reduction in federal revenues.

Despite these alarming statistics, and despite common awareness that the aging workforce represents a challenge that companies will have to overcome (Arnone, 2006), the majority of companies surveyed (Arnone, 2006; Schramm, 2006) have yet to take proactive steps to curtail the negative effects that the aging workforce may have for the future growth of their companies. Given the research which suggests that age is often positively associated with performance (e.g., Arvey, Miller, Gould & Burch, 1987; Avolio, Waldman, & McDaniel, 1990; Bass & Turner, 1973; Cleveland & Shore, 1992; Nelson, 2002), one obvious means of responding to a shortage in skills is to retain older workers longer, particularly high performing older workers (Feyrer,
2007), as they are among the most skilled and knowledgeable workers in the labor force

However, as has been argued by the International Labour Organizaton (Ghosheh, Lee, &
McCann, 2006) and others (e.g., Schultz, Sirotnik & Bockman, 2000; Shore & Goldberg, 2004),
a major obstacle to the full utilization and retention of older workers is ageism, or discriminatory
attitudes and behaviors toward aging workers, which can discourage older workers from
remaining in the workforce. Evidence of increasing verdicts against employers for discriminating
against older workers – costing defendants a total of $72.1 million in 2009 alone (U.S. EEOC,
2009) – suggests that ageism is indeed a major problem in organizations (Lieber, 2007). In fact,
because age stereotypes are thought to operate in more subtle ways than gender and race
stereotypes, the courts are more lenient in what they require of plaintiffs to bring an age
discrimination case to court, thereby increasing the legal liability that employers face. Thus, for
both legal and strategic purposes, it behooves organizations to understand how they can reduce
ageism and associated turnover within their organization (Pave, 1991).

Although past research has helped to increase our understanding of the nature of stereotyping
against older workers, little is known about the contextual factors that make it more or less likely
for older workers to experience ageism (Perry, 1997). This is problematic because it is difficult
to know whether evidence of age discrimination in one context is likely to generalize to other
contexts, a failure to assess context may contribute to the mixed effects that have been observed
in past research related to ageism, and because the general lack of research on contextual factors
has limited our understanding of the process through which they may influence age
discrimination (Perry & Finkelstein, 1999; Cleveland & Hollman, 1991). Thus, in response to
calls by numerous scholars for research that explicitly focuses on contextual factors that
influence the likelihood of ageism (e.g., Perry & Finkelstein, 1999; Perry & Parlamis, 2005; Shore & Goldberg, 2004), and in keeping with recent attention to the importance of inclusion in organizations (Davidson & Ferdman, 2001; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Holvino, Ferdman, & Merrill-Sands, 2004; Roberson, 2006), we explore three forms of inclusion as possible contextual factors that affect experiences of ageism: the inclusiveness of workers’ unit climates; inclusion in the unit manager’s ingroup as measured in terms of LMX; and inclusion in the unit’s age cohort as measured by one’s dissimilarity to others in terms of age. Our expectation is that these factors influence individuals’ cognitive processes and make it more or less likely that they discriminate against their coworkers based on age. In turn, we examine the relationship between experiences of ageism and job satisfaction, and between job satisfaction and actual turnover.

A key strength of our approach is that we differentiate between functional and dysfunctional turnover of older workers. In the vast majority of research, turnover is separated into the two categories of voluntary and involuntary turnover. Such a simple dichotomy implies that all individuals who are not terminated but voluntarily leave represent a loss for the organization. Yet the reality is that organizations are relieved when employees about whom they have negative evaluations leave the organization; thus, their departure is considered functional (Todor, Krackhardt & Dalton, 1982). In contrast, when organizations are unable to retain high performers that they would prefer to keep, the departure of those individuals represents a significant cost to the organization and is considered dysfunctional (Dalton, Krackhardt & Porter, 1981). The distinction between functional and dysfunctional turnover is particularly important when considering older workers for a few reasons. First, the costs associated with dysfunctional turnover are potentially greatest when organizations lose veterans with immense institutional knowledge, experience, skills, and leadership (Sturman, Trevor, Boudreau, & Gerhart, 2003).
Second, the negative relationship that has been observed between age and turnover (Ng & Feldman, 2009) indicates that older workers become less likely to physically leave from the organization as they age. This implies that even if they are dissatisfied at work, they may remain in their jobs, and their dissatisfaction may instead manifest in undesirable ways such as psychological withdrawal, absenteeism, and/or lower levels of task and contextual performance (Griffeth, Horn, & Gaertner, 2000; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Clearly, organizations would be motivated to keep the former but not the latter. And thus, in this study, we focus on the contextual factors that impact experiences of ageism among high performing older workers, with the expectation that experiences of ageism are among the reasons why older workers may choose to leave their jobs.

**HYPOTHESES**

**Age Discrimination**

As mentioned previously, although age is often positively associated with performance (Ng & Feldman, 2008; Waldman & Avolio, 1986) and negatively associated with turnover (Ng & Feldman, 2009), when older workers experience age-related discrimination, they are likely to withdraw from their work when experiences with age-related discrimination dampen their motivation and morale (Ghosheh, Lee, & McCann, 2006). Age discrimination, or “ageism,” can take many forms, but often involves feeling singled out, isolated, or treated poorly as a result of ageist attitudes (e.g., people should retire by age 60) and discourse (e.g., jokes), and being discriminated against in training, hiring, promotion, and firing decisions (Nelson, 2002). For example, research by Erber (1989) and Erber and Rothberg (1991) revealed that the same level of memory performance by young and older individuals tends to be perceived differently, with memory failures being attributed to a lack of ability for older individuals but a lack of effort for
younger workers. Stereotypical expectations about the elderly are often to blame for such age discrimination (Finkelstein & Farrell, 2007; Nelson, 2002).

Most age stereotypes ascribe negative characteristics to older individuals. Examples are that older workers have lower ability, are less motivated, and perform at lower levels than younger workers (e.g., Cuddy & Fiske, 2002; Finkelstein & Burke, 1998; Finkelstein, Burke & Raju, 1995; Shore, Cleveland & Goldberg, 2003), are resistant to change and less adaptable (e.g., Chiu, Chan, Snape & Redman, 2001; Weiss & Maurer, 2004), and have lower ability to learn and develop (e.g., Brooke & Taylor, 2005; Finkelstein, et al., 1995). However, there is extensive research that refutes these stereotypes, indicating instead that job performance is unaffected or even improves as employees age (Ferris & King, 1992; Posthuma & Campion, 2009). In the absence of stereotypes – that is when contextual factors reduce the salience or use of age-based stereotypes – there is a good chance that the attributes that people “see” of older workers will not be negative; as such, associated discrimination against older workers should decrease.

Taking steps to reduce the occurrence of age-discrimination is important because it is negatively related to job satisfaction (Orpen, 1995; Redman & Snape, 2006), and job satisfaction in turn is an important predictor of valued outcomes such as turnover (Griffeth, Horn, & Gaertner, 2000), citizenship behaviors (LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002), and performance (Judge, Thoresen, & Bono, 2001). Unfortunately, very little research has been conducted on the contextual factors that influence levels of age discrimination within organizations. Although some scholars have discussed what some of these factors may be – for example, physical conditions of the job, type of work, work hours, stress at home (Ghosheh, Lee, & McCann, 2006), as well as technology requirements on the job, the structure of internal labor markets, and organizational values (Perry & Finkelstein, 1999) – there have been surprisingly few associated
empirical investigations. This is troublesome given how rapidly the U.S. labor force is aging: the BLS (2008) estimates that the number of older workers 65 and over will increase by 80% in just the decade between 2006 and 2016, and workers between 55 and 64 will increase 37% during that period. Thus, we aim to contribute much needed research in this area, and turn next to presenting our hypotheses about the role that we expect three forms of inclusion to play in reducing experiences of age discrimination among older workers.

**Contextual Factors that Help to Reduce Age Discrimination**

The existence of research evidence that both supports and refutes the existence of age stereotypes (Posthuma & Campion, 2009) suggests that whether or not people engage in ageism may depend on the context (Finkelstein & Farrell, 2007). The context matters to the extent that it affects the likelihood that people engage in the type of stereotypical thinking that results in ageism. The process through which stereotypes lead to ageism is thought to be highly similar to the way that other stereotypes operate, with similar organizational factors expected to influence this process (Fiske & Taylor, 1992). However, it is possible that because an individual’s age is generally more ambiguous than his or her sex, perceptions of age may be more influenced by contextual cues than would be the case for other demographic categories like sex (Perry & Finkelstein, 1999). According to cognitive theory (Fiske & Taylor, 1992), age discrimination is more likely to occur when someone’s age is salient, the person is perceived in ways consistent with age-related stereotypes, and those stereotypes clash with stereotypic expectations of the job or role held by the individual (Perry & Finkelstein, 1999). To the extent that contextual factors reduce the salience of age, help perceivers see stereotype-inconsistent and/or individuating information about older workers, and/or minimize the relevance of age in job stereotypes, ageism should be attenuated (Fiske & Taylor, 1992; Hamilton & Trolier, 1986; Taylor, 1981).
**Climate for inclusion.** Inclusive climates are characterized by the belief that people’s diverse backgrounds are a source of insight and skill that should be utilized to adapt and improve the organization’s strategic tasks (Nishii & Rich, in press). In order to successfully resource diversity for learning, employees are expected to expend considerable effort exploring their differences and exhibit a deep commitment to educating and learning from each other (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Holvino, Ferdman, & Merrill-Sands, 2004). This is made possible by fairly implementing HR practices such that demographically-based status differentials are eliminated (Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley, 1990; Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992). However, equitable HR practices alone do not define inclusive climates; the organization’s norms and values must also encourage employees to enact their “whole selves” (Cox, 1993; Ramarajan, 2009) so that employees feel psychologically safe to engage the core aspects of their self-concept at work without suffering unwanted consequences (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Kahn, 1990; Ragins, 2008; Schlenker, 1986). In inclusive climates, the openness of the work environment to learning about people’s different identities should help promote the development of cross-cutting ties that reduce the salience of demographic boundaries among employees (Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002). Inclusive climates are also characterized by active efforts to seek and incorporate diverse perspectives in decision-making in order to facilitate collective learning and improve strategic functioning (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998).

We expect experiences of age-based discrimination to be lower in inclusive climates for a number of reasons. First, we expect age to be a less salient source of social categorization processes (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) in inclusive climates. In contexts where employees perceive that employment practices are implemented free of bias against aging workers (or members of any other demographic group), principles of expectation states (Berger, Fiske, Norman &
Zelditch, 1997) and structural ritualization theories (Knottnerus, 1997) would suggest that age will be less likely to be associated with within-group status differentials. When demographic characteristics are not predictive of status, they are less likely to be used to categorize one another, and therefore age-based stereotypes are less likely to be evoked, and may even be delegitimized (Ridgeway, 1987; 1991); as a result, levels of age-based intergroup bias should be reduced (Hogg & Terry, 2000), as should associated ageism.

In addition, because people in inclusive climates are encouraged to learn from each other and share their core identities with others, they are likely to engage in more effortful and less stereotypic processing about others. In particular, because egalitarian values are highly valued in inclusive climates, employees will be motivated to engage in a variety of cognitive control mechanisms aimed at inhibiting stereotypic processing and prejudicial behavior (Devine & Monteith, 1993; Perry & Finkelstein, 1999). Indeed, research suggests that people engage in more effortful and less stereotypic information processing when the social context motivates them to do so (Brewer, 1988; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Fiske, 1993). They are also more likely to de-emphasize the informational value of a coworker’s age, since they will have collected much more meaningful and descriptive information about the coworker through authentic conversations and collaborative decision-making (Kite & Johnson, 1988; Lee & Clemons, 1985; Posthuma & Campion, 2009). In indirect support of this, Finkelstein, Burke, and Raju (1995) found that when raters have job information about an individual, they are less likely to rely on stereotypes when making decisions. Taken together, this suggests that in inclusive climates, age stereotypes should be less likely to be activated, and even if they are, employees should be more motivated to prevent stereotypes from guiding their interactions with others. Accordingly:
Hypothesis 1: The inclusiveness of a unit’s climate will be negatively associated with experiences of age discrimination among high-performing older workers in the unit.

Although no prior research has examined the negative relationship between inclusive climates and age discrimination, scholars have suggested that a culture that is accepting of all workers (i.e., inclusive) is important for managing and retaining older workers (Solomon, 1995). Similarly, a fundamental premise of discourse on diversity climate has been that members of historically marginalized groups should be subjected to less bias in positive climates for diversity (Cox, 1993). For example, Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found that gay employees experience higher rates of sexual discrimination in organizations that lack supportive diversity policies, and Triana (2009) found that perceived organizational efforts to support diversity were negatively associated with racial discrimination. In related research, McKay and his colleagues (McKay, Avery, Tonidandel et al., 2007) found that positive perceptions of diversity climate were associated with lower turnover, particularly for black respondents. Although the mediating mechanisms that explain this effect were not tested, a possible explanation is that in positive diversity climates, people experience less discrimination and therefore are less likely to leave.

Inclusion in One’s Manager’s Ingroup (LMX). Leader-member exchange, or LMX, refers to the quality of the relationship that an employee shares with his/her manager (Gerstner & Day, 1997). LMX relationships range from high-quality social exchange relationships in which an employee and his/her manager share mutual trust, respect, and obligation, to low-quality exchanges that are more transactional in nature (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Because of the many positive benefits that are associated with being in a high quality LMX relationship with one’s leader – including greater access to developmental opportunities and resources, personally motivating exchanges with the leader, and valued group responsibilities (Gerstner & Day, 1997)
employees with high quality LMX exchanges are thought to be included in their manager’s “ingroup” and are conferred high status within their groups (Liden, Erdogan, Wayne, & Sparrow, 2006; Scandura, 1999). As a result, whether an employee is involved in a high- or low-quality LMX relationship has important implications for one’s standing within the group (Nishii & Mayer, 2009).

Older workers who enjoy high quality LMX relationships with their manager should suffer less age discrimination for a few reasons. First, their high status within the group should serve to delegitimize negative stereotypes that may be associated with age (Ridgeway & Correll, 2006). Furthermore, because older workers in high-quality LMX relationships will feel validated by virtue of their high quality relationships with the leader, they are likely to feel more empowered to perform at their best, and will also have the backing of managerial resources and support in order to do so (Gomez & Rosen, 2001; Schyns, Paul, Mohr, & Blank, 2005). Consequently, they will be more likely to debunk any stereotypes about ability and motivation through their behavior. Finally, assuming that older workers who feel validated and accepted by virtue of their high quality relationships with the manager feel psychologically safe to engage in interpersonal risk-taking and sharing (Nishii & Mayer, 2009), they may be more likely to behave authentically in ways that allow coworkers to see them for who they are rather than in stereotypic ways (Polzer, et al., 2002; Swann, Kwan, Polzer, & Milton, 2003; Swann, Milton, & Polzer, 2000). Once again, these processes should help invalidate negative age stereotypes, and/or make it less likely that they are used to guide behavior when interacting with older workers who enjoy high-quality relationships with their managers.

In contrast, people in low-quality LMX relationships tend to exhibit lower levels of engagement, motivation, and even performance (Gerstner & Day, 1997), and thus older workers
in low quality LMX relationships may be more likely to be perceived by coworkers in stereotype-consistent ways, thereby making it more likely that their coworkers exhibit ageism towards them. In addition, because workers who are excluded from their managers’ ingroups are deemed to be of lower status, their lower status may serve to confirm negative stereotypes that may exist about older workers. Assuming, as cognitive theorists do (Fiske & Taylor, 1992), that cognitive processes direct behavior, people holding negative stereotypes about older workers will be more likely to behave toward them in ways that are consistent with the stereotypes, thus increasing the possibility of ageism. Thus, we hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 2:** The quality of a high-performing older worker’s relationship with his/her manager (LMX) will be negatively associated with experiences of age discrimination.

**Inclusion in the Group’s Age Cohort.** Being included in a work group’s age cohort by virtue of being similar in age to a majority of one’s coworkers is likely to have numerous advantages when it comes to ageism. It is reasonable to expect that when someone is highly dissimilar from unit peers, their age difference will be salient (Fiske & Taylor, 1992), thereby making it more likely that they are perceived as a member of an outgroup when it comes to age. Following assumptions of social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998), it may then be more likely that they are disfavored relative to ingroup members, as evidenced in higher levels of ageism (Finkelstein & Burke, 1998; Garstka, Schmitt, Branscombe & Hummert, 2004). Put differently, when an older worker is not dissimilar from unit peers, then it is more likely for the individual to be perceived as a member of the ingroup (vis-à-vis age), and therefore ingroup favoritism will protect the individual from experiences of ageism. In support of this, research has shown that younger workers rated younger workers more favorably than older workers in terms of their perceived job qualifications, potential for development, and
capability to perform a physically demanding job (Finkelstein, et al., 1995). Similarly, older workers view other older people more favorably than they do younger people (Celejewski & Dion, 1998; Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1997).

Another explanation for why older workers may experience more ageism when they work among younger peers is that they are more likely to be viewed as being “behind time” in terms of their career timetable (Lawrence, 1984). If workers within a unit are of similar rank (as they were in our sample of employees without any supervisory responsibilities) and are relatively homogeneous in age, then stereotypes about the appropriate age for group members tend to develop (Cleveland & Hollman, 1990; Lawrence, 1988). The more dissimilar someone is from the perceived “correct age,” the more likely it is that stereotypical expectations about age-related declines in competency are confirmed, thereby making it more likely for aging workers to experience ageism. In their review of the literature on age stereotypes, Posthuma and Campion (2009) concluded based on findings from twenty relevant studies that age stereotypes have a greater effect on perceivers’ decision making when there is a mismatch between the target’s age and the “correct age” for a position. Consistent with these arguments, we propose:

Hypothesis 3: The greater the dissimilarity between higher-performing older workers’ age and the age of their unit coworkers, the more likely it is that they will experience age discrimination.

Our focus on age discrimination as an outcome of age dissimilarity represents an important empirical contribution to relational demography research, which has tended to focus more on outcomes such as turnover, cohesion, and communication rather than discrimination per se, and has also tended to focus more on race and gender dissimilarity than age dissimilarity (cf. Goldman, Gutek, Stein & Lewis, 2006; Redman & Snape, 2006). Research has shown that age
dissimilarity influences trust (Krebs, Hobman & Bordia, 2006), communication (Zenger & Lawrence, 1989), and ultimately turnover in groups (Jackson, Brett, Sess, Cooper, Julin & Peyronnin, 1991; O’Reilly, Caldwell & Barnett, 1989; Pfeffer & O’Reilly, 1987; Wagner, Pfeffer, & O’Reilly, 1984), and that older employees who are age dissimilar from their peers report lower levels of organization-based self-esteem, peer relations, and altruism (Chattopadhyay, 1999), but without explicit attention to age discrimination, it is not certain whether these outcomes can be attributable to age discrimination as assumed (Perry & Finkelstein, 1999). However, research on dissimilarity in other demographic characteristics suggests that these outcomes may in fact be the result of experiences with discrimination. For example, Avery, McKay, and Wilson (2008) found that women who are more dissimilar from their coworkers in terms of gender experienced higher levels of sex discrimination, and Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found that gay employees in mostly heterosexual workgroups experienced higher rates of sexual discrimination.

**Lower Job Satisfaction and Higher Turnover as Outcomes of Age Discrimination**

We expect that the amount of age discrimination that is experienced by high-performing older workers is important because it will have a negative impact on job satisfaction. Although very little empirical evidence exists related to the attitudinal outcomes associated with age discrimination (Redman & Snape, 2006), research on gender and racial discrimination has clearly documented that people who experience discrimination report lower levels of job satisfaction and higher turnover intentions (e.g., Raver & Nishii, 2010). We do not expect older workers experiencing age discrimination to be any different, particularly since older adults, as a group, are described as striving for high quality interpersonal relationships at work (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004; Sorkin & Rook, 2006), suggesting that negative interpersonal treatment may be
particularly disappointing for them. Indeed, the very limited research evidence that we were able to find does indicate that age discrimination is negatively related to job satisfaction (Orpen, 1995; Redman & Snape, 2006) and well-being (Garstka, et al., 2004). Therefore, we hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 4:** Experiences of age discrimination will be negatively associated with job satisfaction among high-performing older workers.

It comes as no surprise that meta-analytic results support a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover (Griffeth, et al., 2000), since individuals whose needs are not being satisfied through the job are likely to be motivated to change jobs so that they can get their needs satisfied (Lawler & Porter, 1967). In fact, dissatisfaction is thought to play a larger role in people’s turnover decisions than labor market conditions or pay (Mitchell & Stedham, 1996). Moreover, experiences of age discrimination may represent a “shock” that causes people to leave the company (Mitchell & Lee, 2001; Mitchell, Holtom, & Lee, 2001). Therefore our final hypothesis is:

**Hypothesis 5:** Job satisfaction will be negatively associated with actual turnover among high-performing older workers.

Our focus on actual turnover rather than turnover intentions represents a strength of our study, as turnover intentions are only predictive of actual turnover under some conditions (Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999), and is only moderately correlated with actually turnover (Griffith, et al., 2000). Given meta-analytic results that support a negative relationship between age and turnover (Ng & Feldman, 2009), it is likely that turnover intentions may be even more weakly associated with actual turnover for older than younger workers. For one, their advanced age may lead them to question their ability to find suitable alternatives to their current job despite
their positive performance reviews, and if they have been with the organization for an extended period of time, their links with other people and groups within the organization and community may represent obstacles to actually leaving the organization (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001). Therefore, we reasoned that reports of turnover intentions would inflate the relationship between satisfaction and turnover and chose to focus on actually turnover instead.

METHOD

Sample and Procedures

The participants in our research were employees of a large national wholesale distribution company in the construction industry. All 18,530 employees, supervisors, and managers of this company were encouraged by the senior leadership to participate in a confidential online survey about their experiences at work. A total of 14,276 individuals completed the survey for a response rate of 77.04%. Of these returned surveys, only survey responses from non-supervisory employees who worked in co-located units with at least one unit respondent who was at least 55 years of age at the time of survey administration were included in our analyses. This still left us with a large sample of 4,625 individuals nested within 779 work units. Consistent with prescriptions by climate scholars that climate is a shared construct and therefore should be measured with the unit as the referent and be calculated based on the mean of unit members’ perceptions (e.g., Schneider & Reichers, 1983; Reichers & Schneider, 1990), survey responses from all the individuals working in these units – young or old, and regardless of performance – were used to calculate work unit means on the climate for inclusion construct. Supervisory performance ratings for the full relevant sample of 4,625 individual were used to calculate the grand mean on performance ratings, and to subsequently identify older workers who received performance ratings above the grand mean. However, because the purpose of our research was to
examine the factors that can help reduce dysfunctional turnover among older workers, we were specifically interested in modeling the relationship between the three contextual inclusion factors, age discrimination, satisfaction, and turnover for just the 411 individuals who were 55 or older and received supervisory performance ratings that were above the grand mean of our sample.

Measures

Age. The participating organization provided us with the birthdates of all survey respondents. In order to calculate a participant’s age, their year of birth was subtracted from the year of survey administration. We then used their chronological age to identify them as “older” workers. Unfortunately, there is little agreement in the literature about what age marks the beginning of being “older.” Some scholars have used age 40 as the cutoff because of its consistency with how the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967 defines “older.” Realistically, however, few people retire at the age of 40, and thus older cutoffs are often used instead. Numerous scholars have suggested that 55 is the age at which individuals tend to be considered older (Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2007; Kite, Stockdale, Whitley, & Johnson, 2005; Maloney & Paul, 1989; Erickson, Morison, & Dychtwald, 2006; Noonan, 2005), and thus this is the cutoff that we chose for our research. We agreed that this was a reasonable cutoff age since most financial penalties for withdrawing from retirement accounts early (including those imposed by the IRS) are relaxed or eliminated when people turn 55, thereby making it an age at which people could quit their jobs and retire with few major disincentives, should they decide to do so. At the same time, we reasoned that 55 is also young enough so that a person who is thinking about leaving his/her job but does not yet feel ready to retire will have
sufficient job alternatives to consider, thereby making it more likely that they quit rather than stay in a job with which they are dissatisfied.

**High performers.** The organization involved in this research provided us with the annual performance rating for each survey respondent. All employees within the company are assessed by their direct supervisors on a standardized set of seven organizational competencies (e.g., communication, strategic thinking and vision). For each competency, ratees were evaluated using a numerical scale ranging from 1 (“fails to meet expectations”) to 5 (“consistently exceeds expectations”). Ratings for each of the seven competency areas were then averaged to arrive at an overall performance score. High performing older workers were defined as workers over 55 who scored above the grand mean.

**Age Discrimination.** We adapted James, Lovato, and Cropanzano’s (1994) workplace prejudice/discrimination inventory for use in our study. The original scale was written with race as the demographic category of interest, and included both items with the unit (i.e., the workplace in general) and the individual as the referent. Because we were focused on individuals’ own experiences with age-based discrimination, we selected the three items with individual-level referents and substituted “age” for “race.” The three items were, “I have sometimes been unfairly singled out because of my age,” “At work I feel socially isolated because of my age,” and “At work I am treated poorly because of my age.” The items were based on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Despite the fact that the scale only had 3 items, it exhibited excellent reliability ($\alpha = .94$).

**Climate for Inclusion.** We assessed climate for inclusion using the only measure of its kind of which we are aware (Nishii, 2008). We felt that it was important to utilize a measure of climate for inclusion rather than more traditional measures of diversity climates because the
latter tend to focus on whether organizations have adopted diversity practices and/or value diversity (e.g., Gilbert & Ones, 1998; Hicks-Cla_cke & Iles, 2000; Hopkins, Hopkins, & Mallette, 2001), without focusing also on the relational and decision-making context that affect inclusion. The measure that we utilized contained a total of 20 items: 6 items to assess the first dimension tapping fairness of employment practices ($\alpha = .88$), 7 items to tap the openness of the work environment to learning about people’s whole selves ($\alpha = .91$), and 7 items that assess the existence of mechanisms and efforts to solicit and incorporate diverse viewpoints in decision making ($\alpha = .94$). Example items for each of the dimensions (respectively) are, “The performance review process is fair in this unit,” “This unit is characterized by a non-threatening environment in which people can reveal their ‘true’ selves,” and “In this unit, everyone’s ideas for how to do things better are given serious consideration.” Dimension scores were averaged to create a total climate for inclusion scale. The mean $r_{wg}$ value across units was .94. The ICC-(1) value was .12 and the ICC-(2) was .60, all surpassing suggested cut-off values for aggregation (Bliese, 2000).

**LMX.** We assessed the quality of leader-member exchanges using an adapted version of the LMX-7 measure (Scandura & Graen, 1984), which is assumed to exhibit the highest scale reliability of the LMX measures (Gerstner & Day, 1997). The LMX items were assessed on a 5-point Likert-type scale and were answered by employees. An example item is, “I feel that my manager recognizes my potential.” The reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .94$.

**Age Dissimilarity.** We operationalized age dissimilarity as the difference in age between an individual employee and all other employees in the individual’s work unit. In line with previous research, we used the Euclidean distance formula to compute age dissimilarity scores for each individual in the sample (e.g., Pfeffer & O’Reilly, 1984; O’Reilly, Caldwell & Barnett,
where \( s_i \) is each individual’s age, \( s_j \) is the age of each employee in the individual’s work unit, and \( n \) is the total number of employees in the work unit. The computed age dissimilarity score provides a numerical representation of how much an individual differs in age relative to the other employees in their work unit. Computed age dissimilarity scores ranged from 0 to 43.09, with a mean of 14. The higher the score, the greater the age dissimilarity between the individual and their coworkers. Values of zero represent individuals who are identical in age to their coworkers (e.g., all employees in the unit are 45 years old).

It should be noted that the \( n \) used to compute the age dissimilarity score includes all respondents from each high-performing older worker’s unit—not just the older, high performers in each work unit. The use of the full \( n \) was necessary to calculate accurate age dissimilarity effects, as the mean size of the work units dropped to 1.28 after restricting the sample to only high-performers over age 55. Calculating age dissimilarity scores using this small \( n \) would have been misleading, as the scores would not have demonstrated the true age dissimilarity that exists, as other younger, non-high performers would not be included in the computation.

**Job Satisfaction.** Overall job satisfaction was measured using 5 items originally written by Brayfield-Rothe (1951) and later made popular by Judge and his colleagues (Judge, Locke, Durham & Kluger, 1998). Example items include, “Most days I am enthusiastic about my work,” and “I find real enjoyment in my work.” Respondents answered the questions using a 5 point
Liker-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .83$.

**Turnover.** Consistent with past research (e.g., Goerge & Bettenhausen, 1990), approximately six months after survey administration, the organization provided information about who had left the organization since the survey had been administered, together with information about whether each case was categorized as voluntary turnover or involuntary termination. Instances of voluntary turnover were the focus for this study.

**Analyses**

The hypotheses were tested simultaneously using multi-level structural equation modeling. A multi-level model was necessary because climate for inclusion represents a unit-level construct, and because there were a few instances in which units contained more than one high-performing older worker. In these cases, the error terms for the individuals would be correlated as a result of shared group membership, and thus it was necessary to reflect this using nested, multilevel modeling.

**RESULTS**

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations for high performing aging workers are displayed in Table 1a, and statistics for the full sample are displayed in Table 1b. Consistent with past research (e.g., Arvey, Miller, Gould & Burch, 1987; Avolio, Waldman, & McDaniel, 1990; Bass & Turner, 1973; Cleveland & Shore, 1992; Nelson, 2002), age was positively associated with performance in our sample. Thus, aging workers should be seen as valuable within the sample overall. However, as planned, we focused our analyses on high-performing aging workers only, and the results of the multi-level SEM test of the hypotheses using this sample are reported in Table 2a.
As can be seen in this table, the overall model fit for the multi-level SEM model used to test the study hypotheses exhibited excellent fit ($\chi^2 = 14.37; df = 6; p = .03; CFI = .95; \text{RMSEA} = .05; \text{SRMR} = .04$). As predicted by Hypotheses 1 and 2, high-performing older workers experienced less age discrimination when they worked in units with a positive climate for inclusion ($\beta = -.35; p < .01$) and enjoyed high quality relationships with their manager ($\beta = -.37; p < .01$). The relationship between age dissimilarity and experiences of age discrimination was not significant ($\beta = -.14; p > .05$), and thus Hypothesis 3 was not supported. As hypothesized in Hypothesis 4, age discrimination was negatively related to job satisfaction ($\beta = -.18; p < .01$), and in turn job satisfaction was negatively associated with dysfunctional turnover ($\beta = -.09; p < .01$), thereby supporting Hypothesis 5.

**Post-hoc analyses**

In recognition of the fact that workers of all ages may feel that they have experienced discrimination based on their age, we decided to test a post-hoc model involving the full sample of 4,625 respondents. We were motivated to see whether the three forms of inclusion help to reduce ageism for younger workers too, or whether they are somehow more beneficial for older workers. In order to examine whether the three forms of inclusion are more critical for reducing the age discrimination experiences of older workers, we modeled them as moderators of the age to ageism relationship. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 2b. As can be seen, age was positively associated with age discrimination as we would have expected ($\beta = .60; p < .05$). This relationship was not attenuated by any of the contextual variables. Instead, climate for inclusion ($\beta = -.12; p < .01$), LMX ($\beta = -.31; p < .01$), and age dissimilarity ($\beta = .21; p < .01$) all exhibited direct relationships with ageism. In turn, experiences of age discrimination were negatively associated with job satisfaction ($\beta = -.29; p < .01$), and job satisfaction was negatively
related to turnover ($\beta = -0.22; p < 0.01$). These results suggest that the three forms of inclusion are equally important for reducing age discrimination for workers of all ages.

**DISCUSSION**

The results of our research contribute to research on aging workers by responding to calls for empirical research on the contextual factors that may reduce the likelihood that older workers experience age-based discrimination and its associated strain outcomes (e.g., Finkelstein & Burke, 1998; Perry & Finkelstein, 1999; Posthuma & Campion, 2009; Shore & Goldberg, 2004). Departing from the more common use of laboratory research methods, we collected data from 411 high performing workers over the age of 55 and confirmed our expectation that older workers experience less age-based discrimination when they work in units with inclusive climates (Hypothesis 1) and when they are in high-quality LMX relationships with their manager (Hypothesis 2). Contrary to expectations, exclusion from age cohorts, as measured in terms of age dissimilarity, did not influence one’s chances of experiencing age-based discrimination (Hypothesis 3). Our data further confirmed that those high performing older workers who experienced age-based discrimination were significantly less satisfied, and in turn were significantly more likely to quit their jobs within the 6 months following survey administration than their peers who had not experienced age-based discrimination. Although these relationships may seem intuitive and are certainly taken for granted, there has been very little empirical research on the relationship between ageism and work attitudes, and ultimately with turnover; thus, our research contributes much needed empirical support for these relationships using sophisticated analytic methods.

Overall, the message emerging from these results is clear: managers that fail to cultivate inclusive climates in their units and who are not inclusive in their leadership practices
(Hollander, 2009) potentially represent a strategic and legal liability to their organization. Experiences with discrimination may represent “shocks” (Mitchell, Holtom, & Lee, 2001) that cause high-performing older workers – workers who have presumably amassed significant amounts of tacit institutional knowledge and expertise – to leave their organization. Alternatively, experiences with age-based discrimination may lead individuals to file formal discrimination claims against the company, thereby increasing the legal liability faced by these organizations.

Although one might have expected that aging would benefit more from the three forms of inclusion than younger workers because there are more negative stereotypes associated with older age, the post-hoc analyses suggest that climate for inclusion, high quality relationships with one’s manager, and demographic (age) similarity with coworkers help reduce ageism in similar ways for workers of all ages. This implies that the potential benefits of designing interventions to improve climate for inclusion, the overall quality of LMX relationships, and balance in age distribution within groups may be quite extensive, for they should help reduce negative interpersonal interactions, improve job satisfaction, and reduce turnover among employees of all ages. More research is needed to reconcile the inconsistent findings that we found across the two sets of analyses involving age dissimilarity.

Although age dissimilarity was not a significant predictor of ageism for high performing older workers, the post-hoc analyses that we conducted on the full sample revealed that age dissimilarity may indeed be important, as expected. In these analyses, we saw that individuals who are more different from their coworkers are more susceptible to ageism, regardless of age. The finding that climate for inclusion and inclusion in leaders’ ingroups (vis-à-vis high quality LMX relationships) exert main effects on ageism rather than interactive effects involving age
suggest that these contextual variables are also equally valuable for reducing ageism for workers of all ages. This suggests that the potential benefits of designing interventions to improve climate for inclusion, the overall quality of LMX relationships, and balance in age distribution within groups may be substantial as they play an important role in minimizing negative interpersonal interactions, improving job satisfaction, and reducing turnover among all employees. Moreover, because such interventions would not be designed to target any specific demographic group (i.e., improving inclusion benefits everyone, not just aging workers, women, or ethnic minorities), the potential for backlash and resistance would not be of concern.

It is worth noting that the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover was significantly larger for the full sample involved in the post-hoc analyses than in the subsample of high-performing older workers. This is most likely because of the larger incidence of turnover in the full sample than the subsample (i.e., higher variability in the DV in the larger sample), but it is possible that it also reflects a true difference in the magnitude of the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover for older workers versus workers as a whole. Indeed, a recent meta-analysis of the relationship between age and turnover (Ng & Feldman, 2009) revealed a negative relationship (-.14), suggesting that even despite being dissatisfied, older workers are probably less likely to leave their jobs than comparable younger workers.

Overall, the findings of this study illustrate the importance of assessing the organizational and relational context within which older workers are embedded, as they influence the likelihood that older workers will experience discrimination. This suggests that findings from one study involving the employment outcomes of older workers may not generalize to other organizations (or even units within the same organization), since the two units under comparison could differ significantly in the contextual factors that dictate the socio-relational experiences of older
workers. There are likely other contextual factors that might help to mitigate ageism. For example, in organizations that have a strong learning-oriented culture, employees may be more likely to revere older workers for their accumulated wisdom and knowledge, thereby minimizing negative age stereotypes and making ageism less likely. Managerial role modeling behaviors are also likely to influence the way that employees interact with older workers; to the extent that managers role model inclusive, egalitarian, and cooperative behaviors, it is more likely that the unit norms that develop inhibit negative ageism against older workers. Finally, when work is designed to promote cooperative interdependence, people are more likely to become relationally-focused (Brickson, 2000), thereby developing personalized understandings of one another rather than relying on the kinds of stereotypes that can trigger ageism and other discriminatory behavior.

Future research could consider how age interacts with other demographic characteristics in influencing older workers’ vulnerability to experiencing ageism, and perhaps also their likelihood of leaving once experiencing ageism. As others have noted (e.g., Shore & Goldberg, 2004), because each employee has multiple social-identity referents, a simultaneous consideration of multiple identities would be valuable for capturing the complexity of older workers’ experiences at work. Although we have taken an important step towards capturing the complexity of older workers’ experiences at work by being among the first to empirically assess the role that context plays in influencing age discrimination (Perry & Parlamis, 2005) future research should build on ours by also considering older workers’ other identities.

In addition, work on demographic faultiness in groups (Lau & Murninghan, 1998) suggests that the salience of age within any work group may be dependent in part on the distribution of other demographic identities within the group (e.g., race, age). When groups first form, group
members are thought to use salient individual attributes (e.g., demographic characteristics) to categorize group members into subgroups. The more demographic attributes are correlated, the fewer the number of subgroups that can be formed and the greater the homogeneity within subgroups (Lau & Murninghan, 1998). In contrast, faultlines are weakest in groups where demographic attributes are not aligned and many cross-cutting subgroups can be formed, thereby weakening the possibility of strong subgroup-identifications among group members and blurring the lines that demarcate ingroups from outgroups. To the extent that age is uncorrelated with gender, race, and/or other demographic attributes or deeper-level individual differences, it may be less salient within the group, thereby minimizing the reliance on age-based stereotypes to differentiate ingroups from outgroups. By creating opportunities for group members to discover deeper-level information about the values, preferences, and personality of coworkers, organizations can increase the chances that group members develop cross-cutting ties and minimize the salience of age differences within the group.

Organizations would be well served by attending to other interventions that are likely to circumvent the cognitive processes that give rise to age discrimination. For example, one tactic would be to reduce the salience of worker age and the activation of associated stereotypes by ensuring that organizational policies and practices are not viewed as biasing against age groups, and that they are effective in increasing age diversity within the workforce. Ensuring fairness of employment practices requires not only that organizations dutifully collect and analyze HR metrics related to hiring, pay, promotions, and the sort, but also that they include questions in their annual employee surveys about employees’ experiences with and perceptions of HR practices and examine whether there are meaningful subgroup differences in responses to those questions (Nishii & Wright, 2008). Any group differences that emerge should then be probed
further through the use of focus groups in order to understand the root cause of subgroup differences. Furthermore, organizations can reduce the likelihood that people will rely on age stereotypes by motivating them to engage in effortful, rather than stereotypic, processing of information. When managers emphasize the importance of learning by framing mistakes and challenges as opportunities for learning, role-model feedback-seeking and giving, and structure work tasks to be completed by collaborative dyads, they can help cultivate learning-oriented norms that make it more likely that employees engage in “mindfulness,” thereby minimizing reliance on simplified stereotypes (Fiol, Pratt, & O’Connor, 2009). Managers may also be more effective at creative inclusive groups if they receive training about the importance of developing inclusive, high-quality LMX relationships with all of their employees, as well as guidance on how such high-quality relationships can be nurtured (Nishii & Mayer, 2009).

Interventions designed to enhance the three forms of inclusion that we examined in this study should help to minimize the legal and strategic liability faced by organizations, as mentioned previously. They should also help to mitigate other costs associated with age discrimination and turnover. Turnover has consistently been found to relate negatively with unit-level outcomes such as operational efficiency (Alexander, Bloom, & Nuchols, 1994), wage costs (Balkin & Gomez-Mejia, 1984), revenue growth (Baron, Hanna, & Burton, 2001), sales (Kacmar, Andrews, Van Rooy, Steilberg, & Cerrone, 2006), as well as productivity (Huselid, 1995). Importantly, it is dysfunctional turnover, not overall turnover, which is particularly detrimental for these valued outcomes (Dalton, et al., 1981). Age discrimination is costly not just from a legal standpoint, but also because it negatively affects both individual-level outcomes (Raver & Nishii, 2010) and group-level outcomes. When members of a group experience discrimination, it hampers their ability to work with others, as they tend to try to avoid collaborative efforts that necessitate
interaction with the perpetrator negative interpersonal interactions (Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000). When group members engage in discriminatory behavior towards each other, it can also cost the group in terms of lost efficiencies, for group managers spend as much as 13% of their time trying to resolve conflicts among workers, and group productivity tends to drop and absenteeism tends to increase (Pearson & Porath, 2005). Even if individuals are not directly involved in the negative interactions, they can suffer as bystanders, as seen in work by Raver and Gelfand (2005) who found that harassment within the larger group affects group conflict and cohesion and even groups’ financial performance.

CONCLUSION

The concluding message from this study contains both bad and good news. The bad news is that organizations are at risk of losing valuable high-performing older workers if and when those workers experience discriminatory treatment based on their age. The good news is that organizations can do something about it. High-performing older workers should be motivated to stay with their employer, consistent with meta-analytic results involving the negative relationship between age and turnover (Ng & Feldman, 2009), when they work in units that have inclusive climates, and which are led by managers that include older workers in their “ingroups.” Overall the results of this study confirm emerging evidence about the value of inclusion for organizations
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TABLE 1a

Descriptive Statistics and Inter-Correlations for High-Performing Older Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageism</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dissimilarity</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All correlations are at the individual-level of analysis (N=3672-4625) except for those involving climate for inclusion (N=779 units)
a Could not be computed by SPSS

TABLE 1b

Descriptive Statistics and Inter-Correlations for the Full Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>42.21</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageism</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dissimilarity</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All correlations are at the individual-level of analysis (N=4625) except for those involving climate for inclusion (N=779 units)
### TABLE 2a

**Multi-level SEM Results Involving Subsample of High Performing Older Workers (55 and above)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ageism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-3.35</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dissimilarity</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Inclusion</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-3.98</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageism</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 14.37; \ df = 6; \ p = .03; \ CFI = .95; \ RMSEA = .05; \ SRMR = .04 \)

*Note:* All directional tests of hypotheses are one-tailed.

N = 411 employees nested within 322 units; average unit size = 1.28 (however, unit-level climate values and age dissimilarity scores were calculated based on data for all respondents rather than just high-performing older workers)

### TABLE 2b

**Multi-level SEM Results for Testing All Hypotheses Simultaneously on Full Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ageism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (random slope)</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-13.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age *LMX</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dissimilarity</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age*Age Dissimilarity</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate for Inclusion</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age*Climate for Inclusion</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unit-level moderator)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageism</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-17.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-12.59</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 4625 employees nested within 779 units; average unit size = 5.94