

**Diversity and its Not so Diverse Literature: An International
Perspective *)**

Karsten Jonsen
IMD
(Karsten.Jonsen@imd.ch)

Martha L. Maznevski
IMD

Susan C. Schneider
HEC, Université de Genève

*) A previous version of this paper has been conditionally accepted for the International Journal of Cross Cultural Management 2009 Review Issue, appearing in Volume 10, Issue 1, April 2010.

Diversity and its Not so Diverse Literature: An International Perspective

Abstract

This paper reviews the [workforce] diversity literature and its research findings. Arising from the dominance of US-centric research and a lack of informational diversity, we elicit important gaps between the diversity literature and the diversity management needs in an international context. We conclude that the diversity field itself is not so diverse and we provide suggestions for future research themes: language diversity, cultural contextualization of diversity and social class diversity.

Diversity Literature: An International Perspective

Cultural diversity has more to do with our capacity to feel our way into alien sensibilities, modes of thoughts we do not possess, and are not likely to, than whether we can escape preferring our own preferences...It is not that we must love one another or die (if that is the case – Blacks and Afrikaners, Arabs and Jews, Tamils and Sinhalese – we are, I think, doomed). It is that we must know one another, and live with that knowledge, or end marooned in a Beckett-world of colliding soliloquy.

- Geertz, 1986

Although cultural anthropologists such as Clifford Geertz have studied cultural diversity for almost 150 years, the subject of diversity has only been addressed in management literature for the last 30 years. During that time, diversity as a topic for peer-reviewed articles, as well as for the popular press and books, has reached a substantial level. For example, during the last 10 years the number of academic articles increased by more than 110% over the previous decade and the increase was almost 500% in the popular press, since the mid 1980s.¹

The management of diversity has been characterized as a strategic issue (Maxwell et al., 2001; Wilson and Iles, 1999), crucial to economic and competitive success (e.g., Catalyst, 2004; Cox, 2001). Increased globalization, changes in workforces and an increasing representation of minorities of all kinds have fueled the consideration that the diversity debate has moved beyond issues of legal and moral obligations to become an inevitable reality, both inside and outside of today's organizations (e.g., Kwak, 2003; Merril-Sands et al., 2000).

“Workforce diversity” refers to the composition of work units (work group, organization, occupation, establishment or firm) in terms of the cultural or demographic characteristics that are salient and symbolically meaningful in the relationships among group members.” (DiTomaso, et al., 2007: 474). “Diversity management” refers to a set of managerial actions aiming at either increasing diversity, and/or promoting amicable, productive working relationships. Despite decades of practice and increased attention, criticism has been raised that little real progress has been made toward promoting better working relationships across differences in the workplace. A recent study confirms that strong gender stereotyping of leaders is still prevalent across cultures

¹ Using the databases Web of Science; Factiva; Library of Congress; “Diversity” was used as a search term as an exact word match in titles, yet excluding titles that contain *strategic* and *financial*. Some of this increase can be explained by decreasing use of terms like *equal opportunities*, which were gradually replaced by *diversity*.

(Prime et al., 2008). Bond and Pyle (1998) further argue that blatant and explicit discrimination is being replaced by more subtle biases.

Growing tension between the promise and the reality of diversity in team processes and performance, has led some scholars to question the relevance of existing research on diversity. They warn about serious implications for the credibility of the field, both in terms of future adoption by practitioners and for theory building (e.g., Jayne and Dipboye, 2004; Joshi and Roh, 2008; Mannix and Neale, 2005; Wise and Tschirhart, 2000). These authors claim that research has not been “market-oriented” enough and that the overall mandate for diversity in organizations may come under threat. Apparently, the findings of diversity studies do not address their overall relevance to management and HRM practices (Kossek et al., 2006). This, perhaps, follows a growing concern that university scholarship has gone astray (see Adler and Harzing, 2009) and that businesses are ignoring business schools as the specific areas of research in the diversity literature often do not correspond to the interests and needs of practitioners (Rynes et al., 2007).

For example, despite the extensive research that has been done over the past 20 years, a recent report has demonstrated that Swiss organizations do not see diversity as a strategic advantage in ensuring corporate sustainability, or in the development of the next generation of talent (Filler et al., 2006). Boxenbaum (2006), wrote that the first-ever mention of diversity management in the largest business-oriented newspaper in Denmark was in 2000. By 2002, only nine newspaper articles in Denmark had made references to diversity management. Furthermore, as Roberson (2006) has noted, there has been an “exclusion of inclusion” in academic literature. Inclusion is a way of actively valuing differences and using them constructively in all aspects of organizational life - from business issues to organizational climate. Diversity departments in organizations have included inclusion in their work for many years (often called D&I), yet the area has only recently caught scholastic attention with special issues, such as *Academy of Management Learning and Education* (September, 2008) and *Human Resource Management* (Summer & Fall, 2008). Consequently, we only have a few proven means of measuring and assessing inclusiveness, primarily based upon individual perceptions and, more importantly, we have limited knowledge about interventions and how to create an inclusive climate in different cultural contexts.

We suggest that one of the important reasons that diversity research is unhelpful to diversity practice is that it itself not diverse, especially with respect to its cultural assumptions. Research has mainly been conducted in and influenced by a single cultural paradigm. In this paper, we first synthesize the current state of the literature and research. We then conduct a systematic narrative review (Jones, 2004), taking into consideration key-word searches of

Business Source Complete, ProQuest, ScienceDirect and Google Scholar, with particular emphasis on articles that have been cited most (Web of Science). In order to address our “culpa” of primarily soliciting English language / international databases and literature, we also consulted with researchers who have specific knowledge of non-Western cultures, thus bringing a broader and richer cross-cultural perspective (see Appendix I for names and affiliations). Their input has been used throughout this article, especially for the development of future research directions. Through this review and analysis, we illustrate the dominant cultural assumptions in diversity research and identify its limits, gaps and weaknesses. We conclude by suggesting ways to broaden the scope of diversity research by incorporating other cultural contexts and issues.

Definitions, History and Boundaries

The term *diversity* is often taken for granted by organizations and in diversity literature (Harrison and Klein, 2007). Many studies and articles lack explicit definitions of workforce diversity (e.g., Milliken and Martins, 1996), or they use many different terms interchangeably (e.g. dispersion, heterogeneity, dissimilarity, divergence and variation). Harrison and Klein (2007) offer the following definition of diversity: “The distribution of differences among members of a unit with respect to a common attribute.” The authors mention tenure, ethnicity and conscientiousness as possible attributes. Diversity scholars such as Jackson et al. (1995) and Thomas and Ely (1996) have argued for a broader definition of diversity that encompasses all the ways in which team members can differ.

Mor Barak (2005), in her typology of diversity definitions, makes a distinction among narrow category-based, broad category-based, and those based on a conceptual rule. Often the narrow definitions are restricted in alignment with the particular study and measure, for example Lau and Murnighan (1998) noted: “We limit our consideration of diversity to demographic differences, focusing particularly on age, sex, race and job tenure.” An example of a broad category-based definition is from Dobbs (1996): “Broadly defined, diversity may refer to any perceived difference among people, such as age, functional specialty, profession, sexual preference, geographic origin, life style and tenure or position with the organization.” An example of a definition based on a conceptual rule is from Cox (1994): “Cultural diversity means the representation, in one social system, of people with distinctly different group affiliations of *cultural* significance.” And for Mor Barak (2005) the definition of workforce diversity is as follows: “Workforce diversity refers to the division of the workforce into distinct categories that (a) have a perceived commonality within a given *cultural or national context* (italics added) and that (b) impact potentially harmful or beneficial employment outcomes such as job opportunities,

treatment in the workplace and promotion prospects – irrespective of job-related skills and qualifications.”

These last two are examples of broader definitions that include a national context, which is central to this review. For example, a study by Simons (2002) found that European companies have a tendency to try to embrace a greater range of diversity dimensions than US-owned companies. Singh and Point (2004) found significant differences in main “diversity types” mentioned on company website statements Website Statements, for example with culture being mentioned on 84% of German sites and only 37% in Finland. Gender was mentioned by 73% of the companies in the United Kingdom but only by 29% of companies in Switzerland.

Many dimensions and types of diversity have been empirically studied, including differences in terms of race, age, gender, religion, sexual orientation, functional knowledge, personality and culture (e.g., Homan et al., 2008; Mannix and Neale, 2005; Stahl et al., forthcoming; van Knippenberg and Schippers, 2007). A mix of surface-level and deep-level attributes characterizes the diversity literature of the past decade (e.g., Harrison et al., 2002). It distinguishes visible or demographic diversity (such as race, gender, and age) from invisible or informational diversity (such as work experience, educational background, functional background, and tenure), value diversity (e.g. due to culture or religion) or psychological characteristics such as personalities and attitudes (Harrison et al., 1998). Surface or observable traits represent approximately 89% of the research as estimated by Jackson et al. (2003), because they are easy to operationalize and are assumed to be proxies for underlying or deeper traits (Harrison et al., 1998, 2002; Jackson et al., 2003; Jehn et al., 1999; Pelled, 1996; Pfeffer, 1983). The legitimacy of this approach is, however, being questioned by some researchers (e.g., Garcia-Prieto et al., 2003; Lau and Murnighan, 1998).

Diversity management. The term *diversity management* can refer to “...a strategic organizational approach to workforce diversity development, organizational culture change and empowerment of the workforce; it represents a shift away from the activities and assumptions defined by affirmative action to management practices that are inclusive, reflecting the workforce diversity and its potential” (Arrendondo, 1996, p. 17). More recently, Mor Barak (2005, p. 208) defines diversity management as: “The voluntary organizational actions that are designed to create greater inclusion of employees from various backgrounds into the formal and informal organizational structures through deliberate policies and programs.” The same author also defines international diversity management and cross-national diversity management by referring to “the

management of a workforce consisting of different citizens and/or immigrants” (Mor Barak, 2005, p. 209).

Diversity management originated in North America (e.g., Kandola and Fullerton, 1998; Maxwell et al., 2003; Özbilgin, 2008), where it was rooted in the anti-discrimination movement of the 1960s (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). Later on, this focus was reoriented towards other drivers, such as changing demographics and the business case for diversity (Jayne and Dipboye, 2004). It has been claimed that diversity management within the US has been a way of dealing with a bad conscience and ghosts of the past (the authors are aware of the simplification by comparing regions). Diversity has, nonetheless, been a powerful influence on terminology and practice worldwide (Simons, 2002: xix). For several decades, diversity debates in the US were focused on legislative issues, such as equal employment opportunities (EEO) and affirmative action (AA). EEO refers to policies guaranteeing access to job interviews and more broadly to development and qualification initiatives. AA refers to a system of practices, such as hiring quotas, designed to directly increase the proportion of people from minorities in the workplace. Quotas were typically set to make up for past discrimination. Both EEO and AA are supported with legislation in the US and AA was often a court-ordered solution for companies that were found to be in violation of EEO laws.

The fact that diversity management was rooted in EEO is important, primarily because the difference between the two is substantial and some scholars see EEO and diversity management as two different and competing models (e.g. Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000). It has later been argued by Özbilgin (2008) that equal opportunities and diversity create false dichotomy and are increasingly seen as complementary. Diversity management takes a more individual focus, empowering individual characteristics, as opposed to a group focus in which attributes and characteristics are broadly ascribed to a group and the link between the individual and the group is taken for granted (Zanoni and Janssens, 2004). Not surprisingly, managers, consultants and employers embrace diversity management as a performance imperative, whilst trade unionists and critical scholars are more closely aligned with the equal opportunities approach (Özbilgin, 2008).

In essence, it can be argued that EEO and AA predominantly reduce the negative effects of exclusion, whereas diversity management predominantly promotes the positive effects of inclusion. Diversity management paves the way for managing differences pro-actively rather than necessarily ensuring consistent and equal treatment of all groups; equal treatment does not necessarily mean good treatment. Diversity management also tries to reduce the “us versus them”

(or ingroup-outgroup dynamics) that can result in hostility, discrimination and competition for resources. Although some have characterized the equal opportunities approach as outdated (Maxwell et al., 2001), others criticize diversity management for being opportunistic and dissolving the basis of disadvantage which could help disadvantaged groups, such as women or ethnic minorities (e.g., Liff and Wajman, 1996).

Table 1

Comparison between EEO and Diversity Management (Idealized)

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES	DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT
Programs derive from legal frameworks outlawing discrimination. <i>Positive action</i> .	Programs depend on <i>organizational initiative</i> , organizational culture.
<i>Externally</i> driven. Confrontational at times.	<i>Internally</i> driven, proactive. Voluntary self-interest.
Equality through sameness, merit-based. Driven by <i>legal compliance</i> , target compliance and <i>moral responsibility</i> .	Contribution through uniqueness. Business case and <i>commercial objectives</i> linked to rationale.
Aims to increase proportion of <i>minorities</i> . Tracking movements of disadvantaged groups. Particular focus on gender and ethnicity.	Aims to increase inclusion of people with unique characteristics. Moving beyond statistics; valuing differences and benefits. Maximizing potential of <i>all employees</i> .
<i>Operational</i> concern, especially involving human resource function and focusing on formal processes.	<i>Strategic</i> concern. All managers involved, especially line managers and upper management levels.
Primarily <i>group</i> perspective. Sees the workforce as collective.	About groups as well as <i>individuals</i> .
Concentrates on <i>issues of discrimination</i> , correcting injustice and redressing past wrongs. Also focuses on power and oppression.	Mosaic result: Equality through <i>differences</i> . Both organizations and employees can benefit.

The differences between EEO and diversity management as summarized in Table 1², have been neglected, according to European scholars (e.g., Foster and Harris, 2005; Kandola and Fullerton, 1998; Liff, 1999; Zanoni and Janssens, 2004). It is likely that managers are not making the distinctions between the two approaches that some scholars have advocated. This blurry perception may put diversity management (and managers...) in a difficult position because of the negative connotations of, and resistance and anger toward, equal opportunity and affirmative action initiatives (Kuklinski et al., 1997; Thomas, 1990).

The Non-diversity of Diversity Authors

The following section describes “the zygoty of diversity research”, insofar that the similarity of author backgrounds is elicited; restricted to a few surface-level dimensions only. The first part is about the mono-cultural influence on the field, the second part concerns the professional diversity and our claim of bidisciplinarity.

Intellectual colonialism

Decades of studies have addressed diversity and its effects, e.g., on performance, as well as on potential moderators. However, most of them fall short of providing critical insights into the definitions and practices of diversity and diversity management outside of the U.S. Starting a diversity article with “The US workforce...” (Stevens et al., 2008) is indeed fairly common practice. A recent review of diversity research showed a European representation of 7% (Joshi and Roh, 2008) and previous reviews have shown a similar low representation of non-American study settings. Egan and Bendick (2003), for example, reported only one international (i.e., non-North American) study of the business case for diversity and Wise and Tschirhart (2000) noted that only 9% of the diversity articles they reviewed were about non-American subjects. Moreover, we found that close to 90% of the authors are primarily Americans and British (many of whom work for North American universities) as shown in Appendix II.

² Table 1 is adapted from Gagnon and Cornelius (2000, p. 69); Harris (2002); Kandola and Fullerton (1998); Mavin and Girling (2000); Maxwell et al. (2001); McDougall (1996); Overell (1996); Shapiro (2000); Thomas (1990); Wilson and Iles (1999).

Less than 4% of all diversity articles published since 1956 (ISI Web of Knowledge) have been authored by French or German scholars. In a similar vein, Rosalie Tung noted in her 2005 Presidential Address Academy of Management, only two (2) of its 1101 members, whom she classified as affiliated with a “very heavy research institution”, were *international* (Tung, 2005). It should be noted that peer-reviewed journals in many of the social sciences are heavily dominated by American publications and by American and UK publishers and that the table above does not take into consideration the population of different countries. Based on interviews with participants in the Academy of Management conferences, Symon et al. (2008) have recently argued that there is a strong institutionalized bias against European research and many Americans have been said to regard European management research as “sloppy café conversations” (Fiol and O’Connor, 2008: 251). Sippola (2007) claims that diversity management studies represent a US positivistic research tradition and the divide between the continents has been articulated by numerous scholars the past few years (e.g. Fiol and O’Connor, 2008). March (2005) has also pointed out a strong bias in favor of Anglophone research; the few studies that do get published in other languages, such as German, French or Chinese, are rarely read by people outside of these communities. The different research paradigms that Europe and North America represent also influences the job markets for academics (Koza and Thoenig, 1995). Given their nationality and representative tenure systems, scholars tend to value articles published in their respective countries and languages (e.g., Germany and France). Thus, the English speaking academic community is not exposed to other views, should they differ. Authors such as Rosenzweig (1998) and Simons (2002, p. xix) have noted a lack of diversity literature in other languages.

Informational diversity

Informational diversity has been considered important for some years and has been used in numerous studies by different scholars (e.g., Homan et al., 2007). It is defined by differences in group members’ knowledge database, as a function of education and experiences (Jehn et al., 1999). Informational diversity can potentially create benefits for a group or an organization because of the need for “requisite variety,” (Ashby, 1956) wherein the complexity of the environment and the ambiguity of strategic issues must be matched by internal complexity (i.e. types of knowledge available and different perspectives). However, Ferguson (1994, p. 82) has raised the question of “who counts as knowers?” (in addition to “what counts as knowledge?”).

Do we have informational diversity in our own field of diversity research? We investigated the educational background (post-graduate studies) of the authors of the most influential diversity articles – defined by those with more than 100 cites according to Web Of Science databases (January, 2009) (The list of studies and authors can be found in Appendix III). We found that 66% of the authors held degrees in psychology (including social psychology and work/organizational psychology) and 62% held degrees in management (including organizational behavior and theory). Some held both of these degrees. Backgrounds such as anthropology, history, sociology and biology were largely absent. Psychology and business studies are excellent backgrounds for researching, measuring and publishing diversity studies, but should they constitute a de facto license to dominate our field? Are we perhaps running the risk of satisfying the needs of psychologist departments (and psychologists) at the expense of business needs? A study from Agarwal and Hoetker (2007) illuminated the strong linkage (albeit decreasing over time) between psychology and management in academia, by documenting citations and using the *Academy of Management Journal* as a proxy for management literature. Granted we have a focus here on group-level research (in line with most of the diversity studies published in A-journals) and using a less than societal perspective. Nevertheless we hoped to find transdisciplinarity embedded in diversity research, but have experienced mostly bidisciplinarity.

Taking Stock of Diversity

Reviews have concluded that findings of diversity studies are inconsistent (Harrison et al., 1998; Jayne and Dipboye, 2004; Kochan et al., 2003; Mohammed and Angell, 2004). Many studies have found significantly strong positive correlations between diversity and performance (e.g., Earley and Mosakowski, 2000; McLeod et al., 1996; Thomas et al., 1996). This contrasts with significantly negative correlations found in just as many studies (e.g., Jehn and Mannix, 2001; Kirkman et al., 2004; Thomas, 1999; Watson et al., 1993). The balance of the inconsistency has been confirmed by meta-analyses that have found no overall relationship between diversity and performance (Bowers et al., 2000; Webber and Donahue, 2001) or a very small negative effect (Stewart, 2006). For example, Stahl et al. (forthcoming) concluded in their meta-analysis based on more than 10,000 teams, that cultural diversity leads to process losses through task conflict and decreased social integration, but to process gains through increased creativity and satisfaction. These processes balance each other out to a zero-effect on performance. We also have very limited knowledge when it comes to the national (cultural and institutional) context impact on diversity (e.g. Özbilgin, 2009; Jonsen et al., forthcoming). Nevertheless we keep

measuring whether heterogeneity is *better* than homogeneity (e.g., Horwitz and Horwitz, 2007) in narrow contexts.

Thus, while hundreds of studies and meta-analyses have addressed diversity and its performance effects, we are still unclear about what conclusions to draw and how to best advise companies and public institutions on how to approach diversity (in many cases researchers and research articles do not make credible links to managerial implication of their findings). In essence, there is a solid empirical background for the seasoned and often cited claims of Milliken and Martins (1996) and Williams and O'Reilly (1998) that diversity in organizations presents a “double-edged sword” and a “mixed blessing.” This can explain, to some extent, the quandaries for organizations discussing how to approach diversity as a potential strategic issue. After all, as Noon (2007, p.778) clearly asks in his article about the fatal flaws of the business case for diversity, “If the business case for diversity were so compelling, why are not all firms adopting it?” The flaws that Noon refers to are (a) that employers have a more short-term view than the benefits of diversity need in order to take full effect, and (b) that some benefits are either less beneficial than might first appear, or that they are not easily measured.

This is one of the first assumptions that are different when seen from a multicultural lens. The focus on the business case in the first place may be culturally influenced, insofar that a “monetary” or calculative approach is not equally compelling in all societies. In Japan, for example, companies tend to emphasize corporate social responsibility as a justification for diversity, rather than competitiveness (Özbilgin and Tatli, 2008). Assuming that there must be a business case for diversity may have driven the research too far in the direction of searching for performance differentials, when there may in fact be other questions that should be pursued as well. Or, it would be worth examining diversity management further in different cultures as it would, perhaps, provide different justifications for diversity measures – and with it a different understanding, or labeling, of the “business case”.

Comments on the Diversity Literature Review Findings

We analyzed the literature reviewed above to identify gaps and assumptions arising from a single cultural perspective. We also asked leading scholars in the field with specific experience and knowledge about diversity, and from different regions of the world, to reflect upon and contribute their understanding of what (a) the past diversity research contributes and (b) what cultural differences are important to take into account in order to make future research more relevant. We were not seeking a post-colonial view by attempting to “provincialize” proclaimed

Western universalities (Prasad, 1997). Rather we seek a pragmatic view on what diversity research is missing so we can move forward.

It has been claimed that the values, assumptions and approaches from North America are not necessarily appropriate for European business environments (e.g., Grove and Hallowell, 1995; Hofstede, 2001), or for other regions for that matter (e.g. Magoshi and Chang, 2009). According to Markus and Kitayama (2003). Most of what we know from psychology and social psychology has been assumed to be universal, even though it often characterizes North Americans living in particular sets of cultural meanings and practices.

Thus many global diversity initiatives of US companies have failed outside the US (Nishii and Özbilgin, 2007). Other nations may not share the same overall concern for diversity as in North America (Özbilgin, 2008). European countries, for example, have a distinct historical, philosophical, political and religious legacy which may have contributed to a suppression of diversity to avoid the dislikes or hatreds lurking beneath the surface and a reluctance to celebrate difference as has been done in the US (Simons, 2002). This, in conjunction with its business context, gives rise to different approaches to diversity management and thus, a different study context (see Crane and Matten, 2007: 29).

The fact that we have very limited research knowledge from outside the United States (and Canada) is important because national culture influences the interpretation and response to strategic issues (Schneider and De Meyer, 1991); the nature and meaning of diversity may also be driven by country context and cannot, as such, be transferred without being reshaped (Ferner et al., 2005). Diversity and its management simply have different meanings in different countries and cultures (e.g., Francesco and Gold, 2005; Magoshi and Chang, 2009). For example, the mix of instruments used to promote diversity, and the understanding thereof, varies not only between industries but across borders and cultures. In some countries, such as Germany, learning by doing (project work experience in diverse settings and the creation of diverse networks) seems to be widely used, whereas English and American work environments tend put more weight on task forces, information and training efforts (Koppel et al., 2007). Holladay and Quiñones (2005) found different reactions to diversity training across cultures and that trainer culture and gender interact to influence perceptions of training utility and trainer effectiveness.

Discourse analyses (e.g. Bellard & Rühling, 2001) have shown a variety of responses between nations in terms of how diversity is legitimized. For example, German companies legitimized diversity concerns by a closer link to performance and related rationales as identified in the instrumental perspective in this article, whereas French companies took a more normative

and holistic approach. Some of the underlying cultural assumptions behind such differences have been pointed out by several scholars (e.g. Ling, Floyd & Baldrige, 2005; Schneider, 1989).

Some of the more fundamental discussions and assumptions concerning diversity may simply have been suppressed or neglected. For example, Boxenbaum (2006) suggests that dominant Nordic homogeneity, values and democratic principles conflict with the principles diversity management. She crystallizes this issue by quoting a Danish project manager, "It is rather appalling to mention the fact that people are different. We are trained to equalize." In practical terms, Scandinavia has witnessed a puzzlingly low level of board diversity in terms of gender³ and nationality compared with US-UK markets, despite a strong political emphasis on diversity (Randøy et al., 2006). These countries demonstrate a high level of occupational sex segregation (Blackburn et al., 2000). Importing the discourse and practice of diversity from the US has raised the question of how practices and beliefs regarding diversity will be modified as they travel and diffuse across organizational fields (Boxenbaum, 2006). Her study showed that a strategic reframing is necessary and possible, insofar as a translation from American diversity practices has to include legitimate local practices. In a similar vein, Egan and Bendick (2003) reported that their survey showed that US companies should take a less aggressive diversity approach in their operations outside North America and that the business case, as well as training, would have to be Europeanized in both style and content (the same would apply to Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East).

By analyzing these different approaches, the gaps and assumptions in the literature can be systematically identified. We find five specific and important flaws in the current literature that can be seen as coming from a single country.

First, levels of analysis: Most of the more recent diversity research has been conducted on a team and individual level, rather than on an organizational one (DiTomaso et al., 2007; Magoshi and Chang, 2009; Wise and Tschirhart, 2000). This is important because we cannot automatically make inferences across levels and assume that the same finding may apply at different levels, e.g., from teams to organizations. When the diversity literature (heavily North American), does examine the organizational level of analysis, it seems to suffer from a selection bias. Diversity and diversity management have been studied in organizations that took action (e.g., Ely and Thomas, 2001), while largely neglecting those organizations that did not and the

³ Legislation has recently been put in place in Norway to increase the number of women serving on corporate boards to a minimum of 40%.

reasons why they did not (with the exception of the attention paid to lawsuits regarding discrimination).

Second, context; Many diversity studies have been carried out in controlled cross-sectional environments while using artificial situations – lab studies using student samples, in particular (albeit for a variety of good reasons, such as proving causality). Not only do results often differ from lab settings to field settings (e.g., Stahl et al., forthcoming) but much of the context is lost. And when contextual variables have been included, they have often been “controlled away” (Johns, 2006) rather than explicitly accounting for their influence. A recent exception is Joshi and Roh (2008) who have argued that the reasons for inconsistent findings may be due to a range of contextual factors such as organizational climate, country locations, task complexity, virtuality, resource pressures on team members. Joshi and Roh (2009) found that occupation- and industry-level moderators explained significant variance in effect sizes.

Despite the potential insights to diversity and diversity management that context can bring, we have a limited base of research examining the organizational context as a moderator of the diversity-performance relationship, as recently pointed out by Richard et al. (2007). Similarly, much of the work concerning diversity and diversity management has been carried out in single-nation settings (reflect a US-centric research agenda, as mentioned earlier) which is insufficient for the complexities that multinational corporations are dealing with. For example, racial diversity as an independent variable has been in focus in US research perhaps more than it would have been in other parts of the world. In India, for example, caste or religious background would perhaps be more relevant. In France, racial minority groups are simply not measured out of concern of treating them as “minorities” and thereby reinforcing inequality (Patel, 2009). In essence, we do not know to what extent US- centric diversity research is applicable to other regions.

Third, tokenism: Many teams that have been studied and measured by their types of diversity are characterized by tokenism (Kanter, 1977). That is, they have less than 15%-20% representation of a specific demographic minority. Typically, diversity studies were conducted in settings dominated by white males, where women and ethnic minorities have had little voice or access to resources, or where they were present yet not included (e.g., Zelechowski and Bilimoria, 2003; see also Schmitt et al., 2009 for overview). Token status theory (see Lee and James, 2007) argues that those holding token positions are adversely affected in terms of amount of attention and how they are perceived by others. Inzlicht and Ben-Zeev (2000) found that females’ deficits (in math) were proportional to the number of males in their group and a recent

study by Konrad et al. (2008) shows that it takes at least “the magic number of three,” for women on a corporate board to change the dynamics in the group and make a significant impact.

Tokenism can affect perceptions of intergroup inequality at many levels, yet very few researchers have examined this (Schmitt et al., 2009). Moreover, as argued by Jehn et al. (2008), many studies have overlooked the disproportionate representation of some identity groups. Social dominance theory (Sidanius et al., 2004) would explain social group oppression of minority groups. For example, if there are imbalances in the power differences between groups and the larger organizational context, or suprasystem, dysfunctional relations are likely occur (Alderfer and Smith, 1982). Most measures of effects take place, unavoidably, under these circumstances; however, the circumstances themselves are not taken into account in the studies. In line with this group of “neglected proportions,” most studies until recently have also neglected fault lines (see Lau and Murnighan, 1998), namely the alignment of team members’ characteristics which, potentially, could have better explanatory power than the traditional heterogeneity approaches in predicting effects on team outcomes (Garcia-Prieto et al., 2003; Li and Hambrick, 2005).

Fourth values and beliefs: The effects of diversity may vary due to how it is valued and utilized (rather than just contained) and the way a group approaches differences may determine positive and negative outcomes (Merril-Sands et al., 2000). For example, by seeking mechanisms of control that match the preferences of its nationality mix, a group or a company can positively influence its workforce diversity. Only a few scholars have taken an interest in how diversity is valued, for example by examining openness to experiences and *diversity beliefs*, with the most noticeable work by Ely and Thomas (2001); Homan et al., (2007); Jonsen et al. (forthcoming), van Knippenberg (2007); and Strauss et al. (2003). The lack of focus on beliefs and values is surprising because belief structures (attitudes) are to some extent antecedents to our behavior (e.g., Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) and there is no reason to believe that diversity management is any exception to this. However, the single-culture dominance of the literature has held this variable relatively constant, thus disguising its importance.

Fifth, management of diversity: Reasons for the inconsistencies discussed above may lie in variations of how diversity is managed by policies, work design, structural integration, corporate culture and top management commitment to the cause and communication of its importance (Cox, 1991; Dass and Parker, 1999; Richard et al., 2002). A few studies (e.g., Maznevski, 1994) have shown how diverse teams perform better when managed well but surprisingly little emphasis has been placed on researching how various managerial interventions can positively moderate the diversity-performance relationship (see also Dietz and Petersen,

2006). Possibly this can be related to the complexity and non-linearity of this matter, causing large corporations to apply different approaches (e.g. Dietz and Petersen, 2006; Jonsen et al., forthcoming) with similar results.

A Case in Point: European Demographics and Cultural Context of Diversity

Examining the case of diversity management in Europe more closely can show how our assumptions must be questioned and we can then begin to address gaps in the literature. Many countries in Europe have been slower to implement diversity and inclusion initiatives than most academic observers would expect. One important reason is that a diverse workforce itself is a prerequisite, and demographic diversity (or perceived diversity) has not been significant enough (Mor Barak, 2005: 212). Nevertheless, demographic changes such as low birth rates, immigration and an aging population have indeed taken place in Europe, especially in the past three decades, although they differ significantly among countries. Ethnic diversity is expected to increase substantially in virtually all modern societies over the next several decades (Putnam, 2007). In Great Britain, in 2007, 40% of all new jobs were filled by immigrants (BBC, October 29, 2007). It is also projected that 80% of new jobs over the next decade in the UK will be filled by women (www.diversityatwork.net, 2006). These changes seem to have made an impact on the HR community; for example, “managing demographics” has been declared one of the top HR issues across the continent (BCG/www.eapm.org, 2007). Yet, diversity management, as such, is not among the top items.

The unfolding scene of majority–minority relations leaves European scholars with interesting differences compared to the studies of intergroup dynamics in the US, many of which are based on racial diversity. Only a few studies compare attitudes on a wider range of variables across countries; the general conclusion being that there is a more negative attitude toward diversity in Europe than in the US (e.g., Sawyerr et al., 2007). One issue is that Europeans have had less contact with “the other” (e.g. race/ethnicity) in daily life and limited minority political representation. Different understandings of human values, however, in non-European countries compared to European countries are key factors that have provoked tensions among different social groups. These events have led to disturbances in some European countries for example, the riots among immigrants (France 2005 onwards) and the Danish cartoon crisis (2006). These actions not only potentially undermined the image of France and Denmark around the world but also generated an intense debate in the EU about its social cohesion policy (Ramirez and Dieck-Assad, 2008).

Another issue is that immigrants in Europe have often been viewed as “not belonging” (or considered second-class citizens), with citizenship difficult to obtain or not granted in many cases (see Pettigrew, 1998); in recent years restrictions have become even tighter (Gannon, 2008). Many immigrants across the continent were described as “guest workers” and were never considered part of a nation’s “stock.” The lack of belonging (sometimes linked to citizenship) has contributed to blatant discrimination, prejudice and even violence (Pettigrew, 1998).⁴ The US workforce has always consisted of immigrants and their descendants (Kurowski, 2002), with citizenship provided automatically to those born in the US.⁵

Studies of European attitudes (blatant and subtle) toward immigrants and “others” have shown remarkable consistency across countries over the years. Europeans often adopt an “us and them” attitude, even generations after immigrants have moved to the continent. A rising number of Europeans believe there are too many non-EU foreigners in their countries and an increasing number of non-national migrants continue to augment the level of ethnic exclusionism in all countries (Pettigrew, 1998). Moreover, residential segregation is an increasingly widespread phenomenon, in part due to people’s preference for living near those who are like them. A substantial number of Europeans wish to reside in areas without ethnic minorities (Semyonov et al., 2007). Half the population across Europe is resistant to ethnic diversity (unequally distributed by social class) and a growing majority of people (two out of three) hold the view that “there are limits to a multicultural society” (Coenders et al., 2003).

One problem with the cultural context and inferences relevant to diversity may be what Donaldson & Dunfee, (1994; 1999) call the *moral free space*. The moral free space ties into the debate of ethics, morality and societal obligations. According to these authors, this happens when “hypernorms” and local norms “almost collide.” Hypernorms are by definition acceptable to most cultures and most organizations. The local norms, however, vary from country to country, e.g. between Germany and France. When local norms are in line with universal norms, they are considered consistent. When they are in opposition, they are labeled illegitimate. But since local norms vary, this may lead to a *moral free space* for multinational corporations in which they can navigate relatively freely. Whilst this space allows for the highest common denominator to prevail, it also allows for the lowest followed by minimum efforts and commitment. As a consequence, companies that reject diversity as a strategic issue (but stay reasonably within the

⁴ It is worthwhile noting that this picture is not the same among European nations, e.g., the UK presents a very different case than does France.

⁵ The authors are mindful of the changing laws in the US and discussions in the past decades within the country regarding Mexican immigrants, in particular, and their status and right to “belong.”

laws of each country), may have a poor reputation in some countries, but in the wider space of operations (e.g. Europe, Middle-East, Africa) they are not held morally responsible for the development and inclusion of diverse groups.

In summary, the previous sections capture some of the contextual issues relevant to this review and to the diversity research agenda and show that American diversity research and practice may not be universally relevant. By taking into account how the socio-demographic dynamics, historical and cultural legacies of Europe, we see how important it is to question assumptions and to close the gap between diversity research and its literature, and diversity management needs in a European or an international context. In the following section, we seek directions for future research on diversity that will enhance its applicability and relevance to international business practice.

Moving on, what's up?

South Africa provides a unique study context where accelerated processes and dynamics are taking place, yet it is rather under-studied in relation to diversity and diversity management. The effects of great shifts within diversity and social psychology research, e.g. social identity changes, are mostly studied in controlled lab settings, as mentioned earlier. We are thus foregoing opportunities to study these phenomena in context-rich “real life” as they happen (see for example Booysen, 2007, regarding spill-over effects from societal changes into work life, and vice versa). We could potentially draw valuable lessons from the experiences in South Africa to changes that are, or will, take place in teams and in organizations around the globe, including the Western world. Of course this is only one example of many international contexts, all different, yet enlightening.

In addition to simply questioning assumptions, our analysis and discussions with regional diversity experts uncovered three important themes that are largely missing from diversity and diversity management literature or have been dealt with other or more generic purposes in mind. These themes deserve to be addressed in future research, although we acknowledge that the list of potential relevant themes is much larger than what we have chosen to include here.

The first theme is language diversity, the second theme deals with cultural contextualization of diversity and the final understudied theme we raise regards social class diversity.

Theme One: Lingua Franca

Languages are disappearing faster than ever before (Bernard, 1992). Language preservation is an important, and current, issue for 95% of the world's languages, as well as being a part of cultural diversity from an anthropological perspective (Lockwood, 2005). The increasing dominance of English may lead to the collapse of the European Union's official language policy (Economist, 2009) which supports language diversity, and 15-24 years olds in Europe are now five times more likely to speak English as a foreign language than either German or French (as cited in the Economist, 2009). English has clearly become a de facto standard and the lingua franca of business (Beyene, 2009; Beyene, Hinds and Crampton, 2009; Crystal, 2007; Fredriksson et al., 2006).

The "choice" of English has been largely determined historically by the colonial, economical and echnological power of English speaking countries (Crystal, 2007). Its use has been reinforced by increased English training in many countries, English as the dominant language in IT and on the internet, increased numbers of international business students being trained in English and the spread of English via film, television and music (Welch et al., 2001).

Business and academia are no exceptions to this (Crystal, 2007), yet language diversity itself is considered a neglected area in management literature (Henderson, 2005; Marschan et al., 1997; Piekkari, 2006). When dealt with, language is often bundled into "psychic distance" (Welch et al., 2001), included as an independent variable when measuring cultural heterogeneity (Mortensen and Hinds, 2001) or tackled as a barrier to effectiveness and to doing international business due to communication problems (e.g. Marschan et al, 1997).

In addition to the above, which provides perhaps an obvious positive impact on communication flows, networks and the career prospects for those people with English as a mother tongue (e.g. Marschan-Piekkari et al., 1999), language-related issues can significantly impact interpersonal relations and trust (DiStefano and Maznevski, 2000) and socialization processes and team building (Henderson, 2005) and thus cannot be considered a simple matter. The larger issues seem to be the following:

(a) a common language gives people the illusion of communicating effectively and sharing the same context and interpretation (Henderson, 2005), even when this may not be the case. The same words can be used to mean different things in different local settings (i.e. "fag" meaning a cigarette or a male homosexual), or have meanings created in places where English is a second common language (i.e. "joint families" in India for extended families living under one roof, or Hong Kong students dating their professors when they want to make an appointment). Moreover, words in two different languages that seem to be exact translations of each other can have very different sets of culture-specific conceptual associations (Kroll and De Groot, 1997).

(b) the national, regional or ethnic identity which is supported by a minority language is often suppressed (e.g. Vaes and Wicklund, 2002) and this causes the thriving of national dominance (Piekkari, 2006).

(c) in line with item b, people who speak English as a mother tongue are automatically in a position of power (Crystal, 2007; Piekkari, 2006) and this can create a language-based status hierarchy (Beyene, 2009) with lower status accorded to non-native English speakers who may feel excluded and devalued (Beyene, Hinds and Crampton, 2009). There is a potential social inequality effect of speaking a (any) lingua franca, namely that it tends to favor members of societies that belong to the upper levels, or certainly not the lowest educated classes (Meierkord and Knapp, 2003).

(d) languages are cues that activate different culture-specific frames (Hong et al., 2000). Therefore, the different thinking styles that are related to languages (the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis, e.g. Whorf, 1956) will not be able to surface and organizations will not be able to benefit from a potentially broader base of ideas and perspectives.

(e) We cannot assume that linguistic and cultural competencies are the same (see Peltokorpi & Schneider, 2009). People may have linguistic competencies but not cultural competencies (e.g. an American born Chinese sent to China as expat) or be culturally competent but not linguistically competent (expats living a long time in France but not speaking French). As there may be complex interaction effects between language and culture competencies, future research needs to integrate the two.

The assumed efficiency gains from relying on a common language in multinational companies (English) come, perhaps, at a price. This price, and how to overcome its negative effects, is an area for future cross-cultural and diversity research.

Theme Two: Cultural Contextualization of Diversity Itself

A close cousin to the lack of diversity and diversity management studies in international settings, seems to be the Western modern welfare-state perspective from which diversity is studied (e.g. Özbilgin and Tatli, 2008; Sippola, 2007), in which reality is constructed in ways that attribute lesser value to various others (Ailon, 2008). There is an old dichotomy which has been well described in psychology literature, which speaks to the individual's need for belonging and the need for differentiation (identity). The theory of individuation (Ziller, 1964), for example, assumes that the social environment is structured around the self as a point of orientation. These norms fit well with the basic idea of diversity where differences are often seen as “good” and where we can benefit from the creativity of diverse views. However, this fundamental perspective

contrasts the more collectivistic cultures in which “diversity” may not be regarded with the same eyes as in the West and in which the “self” is predominantly interdependent, as opposed to independent (Markus and Kitayama, 1991).

Collectivistic cultures in general (and some in particular) tend to draw sharper distinctions between in-group and out-group affiliations. This seems to have implications for how they would view diversity as well as how flexible they might be in accommodating those who are not part of the group. Conformity is strongly encouraged, deviations from norms (unless committed by foreigners) are regarded as unacceptable and punishable (Francesco and Gold, 2005; Markus and Kitayama, 2003; Northcraft and Gutek, 1993) and differences are downplayed (Wiersema and Bird, 1993). With this (stereotypic) view on being different in mind, how can we expect diversity management to be accepted as a tool in these cultures? Moreover, some diversity issues (e.g. homosexuality) are clearly unacceptable, and sometimes even illegal, in certain countries and societies. Thus, the extent to which diversity can be universally promoted may be restricted.

Another example of Western influence is the strong separation of public and private spheres in diversity initiatives. This separation is not so clear in many cultures, and it is a subject of interest for individuals as well as groups and organizations. The so-called work-life balance (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2000; Ilies et al., 2009), or work-family interference (e.g. Geurts et al., 2009), which is often incorporated into Anglo diversity initiatives, is a typical example of a universal problem that needs cultural understanding and sensitivity (Beauregard, 2009). Moreover, career perspectives are influenced and moderated differently in collectivist and Confucian societies than in Western cultures for example, by family and social roles expectations. In fact, the entire career literature has been characterized as Western or American and culturally insensitive (see Pekerti, 2008, for overview).

In yet another sphere, urban perspectives (2008 was the first year in the history of humankind when the number of people living in urban areas exceeded that of rural areas) have left little room for rural diversity investigations, and the tension between rural and urban life has remained somewhat neglected – apart from the sociology literature and more gender-related perspectives (e.g., Ayub and Jehn, 2009; Nolan, 2009). “Culture,” in some cultures (e.g., Kenya), means “traditional,” such as the pastoralist and other rural cultures; how this interplays with urban life has largely been overlooked by generic diversity studies.

Finally, we are slowly realizing we are in an era in which we can no longer use nation as a proxy for culture as often done in the past (e.g. by Hofstede, 2001; Jehn, 1995). Not only does it cause cultural attribution errors (Leung et al., 2005), but the reasoning for doing so seems to be

fading gradually. Major sub-cultures' approaches to management may be similar in a US corporate context as claimed by Peppas (2002) but we can not extrapolate this assumption to other cultures and regions of the world.⁶ China is an important recent example. As the world's largest emerging economy, it holds more than 60 ethnicities. Some are living in rather isolated, mostly rural, areas and others, like the largest ethnic group Han, are spread across coastal areas and provinces. In addition to this variety, the way business is done varies between regions and cities (e.g., Beijing vs. Shanghai vs. Chongqing). Russia is another important recent example of an emerging economy that is often considered to be one nation with a rather homogeneous culture. However, the various regions/oblasts have very different historic backgrounds and values, e.g., the Western regions such as St. Petersburg/Leningrad and Pskov, the Heartland regions like Ryazan and Nizhnii Novgorod, and the predominantly Muslim regions of Tatarstan and Bashkortostan who also have their own languages.

Many countries in the world have experienced a large inflow of immigrants and temporary flows of people over the past decades and many are living in multicultural societies with numerous sub-cultures from different nations; it seems increasingly difficult to speak about "the French" or "the Germans" in a single stroke. In graphical terms, the culture curve of each nation is not a bell anymore (also see Lenartowicz and Roth, 2001). We therefore have intra-national and regional variance (and identities) that are sometimes close to, or exceed, international variance, many countries simply cannot be considered homogeneous (see also Tung, 1993; 2008). As there are important differences associated with the dynamics and processes of managing the interface between members of different national groups and people of different subcultures within a given country (e.g. Stahl et al, forthcoming), future diversity research must be more sensitive to this increased cultural complexity.

Theme Three: Social Class Diversity

While social category diversity has been widely used as a broad concept (e.g. Jehn et al., 1999), the largely "invisible" level of differences related to social class is an understudied phenomenon, outside the specific fields of hiring and selection – perhaps because of the assumption that this is less important in some cultures than others. Yet scholars such as Ferguson (1994, p. 96) have claimed that "*class* is the basis upon which organizational discriminations are conducted." Whether castes in India, the African diaspora, or socio-economic classifications in the United

⁶ This matter is affected by factors such as awareness and recognition of ethnic groups within a country and the mobility of people (including immigration, expatriation and travelling for work or leisure).

Kingdom. There are some exceptions of course: Conlon and Jehn (2009) found distinct effects of diversity on socioeconomic class. Wright and Crockett-Tellei (1993) found that upper-class women are more likely than lower class women to have paid employment in professional, civil service or family businesses, and other authors have pointed out the managerial impact of prestige universities in countries such as Japan and France (e.g., Wiersema and Bird, 1993). But these are rare exceptions and future research needs to investigate the potential effects and dynamics related to social class diversity in teams and organizations.

Power⁷ and status⁸ are related to social class diversity insofar that any individual's status or power, as perceived by others, can be associated with social background and "class." However, this also remains relatively understudied *as an explanatory variable* in connection with the functioning and dynamics of diverse groups (see DiTomaso et al., 2007 for overview). In fact, these matters are most often presented in connection with an inequality-focus in the critical diversity literature or the sociology literature, including for example Bourdieu (1986). Of course there are exceptions to the lack of attention to power and status. In particular, there are indeed several theoretical frameworks that underpin their importance. Most notable is the social identity work (Tajfel and Turner, 1986) addressing issues of power and legitimacy. Status characteristics theory suggests that we are always assessing each other's status and making judgments of each based upon that (Berger et al., 1972; 2002). Expectation states theory also further argues that status differences become salient across settings (that is between spheres of private versus organizational) when it either differentiates the players or is culturally linked to the task at hand (e.g. Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin, 1999). A rare example that has applied some of the above to the sphere of diversity in organizations is when Umphress et al., (2007) investigated the degree to which birds of a feather flock together. The authors found new ways of combining social dominance theory (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999) with similarity-attraction notions (Byrne, 1971) to explain the complex relationship between demographic similarity and attraction.

Concluding Remarks

Diversity matters because individuals give social significance to the categories or groups they associate with various people (DiTomaso et al., 2007). From an instrumental point of view,

⁷ Power involves the capacity of an individual to modify other's states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishment (Keltner et al., 2003).

⁸ Status in (face-to-face) groups involves prominence, respect and influence (Anderson et al., 2001).

different perspectives can increase performance of groups, work units and organizations – if managed well. Today’s global organizations must consider sophisticated approaches to diversity management and policy-making that recognize local requirements and the need for standardization (Özbilgin and Tatli, 2008). They can only get limited help from the diversity literature on how to find an optimal mix. Occasionally descriptive measures are provided which are culturally sensitive with rich local examples (e.g., European Communities, 2008), but like much of the management research, the novel descriptive findings are not turned into useful prescriptions (Bazerman, 2005).

We must also question our assumptions about *what* we research and how. In order to complement existing research, comprehensive frameworks that consider the complexity of factors in play at the macro-institutional level, meso-level, micro-level and individual level, may be required (Özbilgin and Tatli, 2008, see also Leung et al. 2005). All levels are equally important for future research, yet the macro-level requires a deep understanding and appreciation for social mechanisms that can be very different across countries, in particular, paying attention to the state-society relations (e.g., Yukleyen, 2009), which are central to the cultural context of countries like Turkey, Russia, China, and to entire regions such as Central and Eastern Europe (Martin, 2002). Recent responses to the global financial crisis have shown that no society can claim “immunity” to government interventions. Some authors have pointed out that strong legal mechanisms, such as those of US, do not deliver equality unless they are underpinned by embedded social mechanisms. On the other hand, it has been claimed by business ethics scholars (e.g., Crane and Matten, 2007: 32), that the strong role of governments in Europe, and the ensuing collective control norms, has taken the responsibility and action for diversity away from corporations. This constitutes a need to include a more institutional approach and, in particular, a societal context and understanding in diversity research, as called for by Adler and Harzing (2009). The societal level itself calls for inclusion of multi-cultural contexts and to be cautious about the generalization and universality claims of findings across countries (and often within countries as well). An example is Putnam’s (2007) findings of the negative effects of diversity on communities in the US; we do not yet know to what extent this applies to other regions of the world but it is a debate that mindful managers across the globe cannot ignore and must translate into their strategic environments. Research like the example above can help us question our assumptions and, perhaps, pave the way for future large-scale changes (see also Ferguson, 1994; Martin and Meyerson, 2008).

We conclude that the field of diversity with all its fascinating contributions to “managerial science” is not so diverse itself and if requisite variety (Ashby, 1956) is in any way

applicable in this context, then we have been *cocooning* and likely to miss out on perspectives, connections and contributions that could potentially make diversity research a more solid and accepted pillar of international and cross-cultural management.

References (needs updating)

- Adler, N. J., & Harzing, A. W. 2009. When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(1): 72-95.
- Agarwal, R. & Hoetker, G. 2007. A Faustian Bargain? The growth of management and its relationship with related disciplines. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6): 1304-1322.
- Ailon, G. 2008. Mirror, mirror on the wall: Culture's consequences in a value test of its own design. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4): 885-904.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. 1980. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Alderfer, C. P., & Smith, K. K. 1982. Studying intergroup relations embedded in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27(1): 35-65.
- Anderson, C., John, O. P., Keltner, D., & Krings, A. M. 2001. Who attains social status? effects of personality and physical attractiveness in social groups. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 81(1): 116-132.
- Arrendondo, P. 1996. *Successful diversity management initiatives: A blueprint for planning and implementation*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Ashby, W. R. 1956. *An introduction to cybernetics*. New York: J. Wiley.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. 2000. All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3): 472-491.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J., & Daus, C. S. 2002. Diversity and emotion: The new frontiers in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Management*, 28(3): 307-338.
- Ayub, N., & Jehn, K. A. 2009. The diversity scenario in Pakistani organizations. In M. Özbilgin (Ed.), *Equality, diversity and inclusion at work*. Cheltenham and New York: Edward Elgar Press.
- Bazerman, M. H. 2005. Conducting influential research: The need for prescriptive implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1): 25-31.
- Beauregard, A. 2009. Sex differences in coping with work-home interference. In M. Özbilgin (Ed.), *Equality, diversity and inclusion at work*. Cheltenham and New York: Edward Elgar Press.
- Bellard, E., C.C. Rüling. 2001. *Importing Diversity Management: Corporate Discourses in France and Germany*. Cahier De Recherche De l'Université De Genève. Genève.
- Bernard, H. R. 1992. Preserving language diversity. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, Fall: 15-18.

- Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch, M. Jr. (1972). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 241-255.
- Berger, J., Ridgeway, C. L., & Zelditch, M. (2002). Construction of status and referential structures. *Sociological Theory*, 20(2), 157-179.
- Beyene, T., (2009) Language Matters: Lingua Franca Mandates and Status Hierarchies in Global Organizations. Working Paper.
- Beyene, T. , Hinds, P. J., and Cramton, C. D. (2009) Walking Through Jelly: Language Proficiency, Emotions, and Disrupted Collaboration in Global Work. Harvard Business School Working Paper, No. 09-138, June 2009.
- Blackburn, R. M., Jarman, J., & Brooks, B. 2000. The puzzle of gender segregation and inequality: A cross-national analysis. *European Sociological Review*, 16(2): 119-135.
- Bond, M. A., & Pyle, J. L. 1998. The ecology of diversity in organizational settings: Lessons from a case study. *Human Relations*, 51(5): 589-623.
- Booyesen, L. 2007. Societal power shifts and changing social identities in South Africa: Workplace implications. *Sajems NS 10 (1): 1-20.*
- Bourdieu, P. 1986 'The forms of capital.' In Richardson, J.G. (ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, New York, London: Greenwood: 241-258.
- Bowers, C. A., Pharmed, J. A., & Salas, E. 2000. When member homogeneity is needed in work teams: A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research*, 31(3): 305.
- Boxenbaum, E. 2006. Lost in translation: The making of Danish diversity management. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(7): 939-948.
- Byrne, D. E. 1971. *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Catalyst. 2004. *The bottom line: Connecting corporate performance and gender diversity*. New York: Catalyst.
- Coenders, M., Lubbers, M., & Scheepers, P. 2003. *Majority populations' attitude towards migrants and minorities*. Nijmegen: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.
- Conlon, D. E., & Jehn, K. A. 2009. Behind the music: Conflict, performance, longevity, and turnover in punk and new wave rock bands. In M. A. Rahim (Ed.), *Current topics in management*, vol. 14. Transaction Publishers.
- Cox, T. 1991. The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(2): 34-47.
- Cox, T. 1994. *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

- Cox, T. 2001. *Creating the multicultural organization : A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crane, A., Matten, D., & Crane, A. 2007. *Business ethics: Managing corporate citizenship and sustainability in the age of globalization* (2nd ed.). Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. 2007. *English as a Global Language* (2nd edition). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dass, P., & Parker, B. 1999. Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From resistance to learning. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13(2): 68.
- Dietz, J. & Petersen, L.E. 2006. Diversity management. In Stahl, G.K. & Björkman, I. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in International Human Resource Management*: 223-243. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- DiStefano, J. J., & Maznevski, M. L. 2000. Creating value with diverse teams in global management. *Organizational dynamics*, 29(1): 45-63.
- DiTomaso, N., Post, C. & Parks-Yancy, R. 2007. Workforce diversity and inequality: Power, status, and numbers. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33: 473-501.
- Dobbs, M. F. 1996. Managing diversity: Lessons from the private sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 25(3): 351.
- Donaldson, T., T.W. Dunfee. 1999. When ethics travel: The promise and peril of global business ethics. *California Management Review* 41(4) 45-63.
- Donaldson, T., T.W. Dunfee. 1994. Toward a unified conception of business ethics: Integrative social contracts theory. *Academy of Management Review* 19(2) 252-284.
- Earley, P. C., & Mosakowski, E. 2000. Creating hybrid team cultures: An empirical test of transnational team functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(1): 26-49.
- Economist. 2009. *Charlemagne - English is coming*. London: The Economist. 14th of February.
- Egan, M. L., & Bendick Jr., M. 2003. Workforce diversity initiatives of U.S. multinational corporations in Europe. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 45(6): 701-727.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. 2001. Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2): 229-273.
- European Communities. 2008. *Mapping the maze: Getting more women to the top in research*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Ferguson, K. E. 1994. On bringing more theory, more voices and more politics to the study of organization. *Organization*, 1(1): 81-99.

- Ferner, A., Almond, P., & Colling, T. 2005. Institutional theory and the cross-national transfer of employment policy: The case of 'workforce diversity' in US multinationals. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(3): 304-321.
- Filler, E., Liebig, B., Fengler-Veith, M., & Varan, K. 2006. *Diversity in Switzerland*. Switzerland: Heidrick & Struggles.
- Fiol, C. M., & O'Connor, E. J. 2008. Nurturing the divide: Toward maximizing the value of management research from both sides of the Atlantic. In D. Barry & H. Hansen (Ed.), *New approaches in management and organization*: 251-254. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fredriksson R., Barner-Rasmussen, W. & Piekkari, R. 2006. The multinational corporation as a multilingual organization: The notion of a common corporate language. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 11(4): 406-423.
- Francesco, A. M., & Gold, B. A. 2005. *International organizational behavior : Text, cases, and skills* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Gagnon, S., & Cornelius, N. 2000. Re-examining workplace equality: The capabilities approach. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 10(4): 68-87.
- Gannon, M. J. 2008. *Paradoxes of culture and globalization*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Garcia-Prieto, P., Bellard, E., & Schneider, S. C. 2003. Experiencing diversity, conflict, and emotions in teams. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(3): 413-440.
- Geertz, C. 1986. The uses of diversity. *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 25(1): 105-123.
- Geurts, S., Beckers, D., Taris, T., Kompier, M., & Smulders, P. 2009. Worktime demands and work-family interference: Does worktime control buffer the adverse effects of high demands? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84: 229-241.
- Grove, C., & Hallowell, W. 1995. Can diversity initiatives be exported? *HRMagazine*, 40(3): 78.
- Harrison, D.A., & Klein, K.J. 2007. What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1199-1228.
- Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavin, J. H., & Florey, A. T. 2002. Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(5): 1029-1045.
- Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., & Bell, M. P. 1998. Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1): 96-107.
- Henderson, J. K. 2005. Language diversity in international management teams. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 35(1): 66-82.

- Hofstede, G. H. 2001. *Culture's consequences : Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Holladay, L.C. & Quiñones, M.A. 2005. Reactions to diversity training: An international comparison. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(4): 529-545.
- Homan, A. C., Hollenbeck, J. R., Humphrey, S. E., van Knippenberg, D., Ilgen, D. R., & Van Kleef, G. A. 2008. Facing differences with an open mind: Openness to experience, salience of intragroup differences, and performance of diverse work groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6): 1204-1222.
- Homan, A. C., Van Knippenberg, D., Van Kleef, G. A., & De Dreu, Carsten K. W. 2007. Bridging faultlines by valuing diversity: Diversity beliefs, information elaboration, and performance in diverse work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5): 1189-1199.
- Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. 2000. Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55: 709-720.
- Horwitz, S. K., & Horwitz, I. B. 2007. The effects of team diversity on team outcomes: A meta-analytic review of team demography. *Journal of Management*, 33(6): 987-1015.
- Ilies, R., Wilson, K. S., & Wagner, D. T. 2009. The spillover of daily job satisfaction onto employees' family lives: The facilitating role of work-family integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(1): 87-102.
- Inzlicht, M. & Ben-Zeev, T. 2000. A threatening intellectual environment: Why females are susceptible to experiencing problem-solving deficits in the presence of males. *Psychological Science*, 11(5): 365-371.
- Jackson, S. E., Joshi, A., & Erhardt, N. L. 2003. Recent research on team and organizational diversity: SWOT analysis and implications. *Journal of Management*, 29(6): 801.
- Jackson, S. E., May, K. E., & Whitney, K. 1995. Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision-making. In R. A. Guzzo & E. Salas (Ed.), *Team effectiveness and decision-making in organizations*: 204-261. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jayne, M. E. A., & Dipboye, R. L. 2004. Leveraging diversity to improve business performance: Research findings and recommendations for organizations. *Human resource management*, 43(4): 409-424.
- Jehn, K. A. 1995. A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(2): 256-282.
- Jehn, K. A., Greer, L., & Rupert, J. 2008. Diversity, conflict, and their consequences. In A. Brief & J. Bradley (Eds.), *Diversity at work*: 127-174. Cambridge University Press.
- Jehn, K. A., & Mannix, E. A. 2001. The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2): 238-251.

- Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. 1999. Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(4): 741-763.
- Johns, G. 2006. The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *The Academy of Management Review*, 31(2): 386-408.
- Jones, K. 2004. Mission drift in qualitative research, or moving toward a systematic review of qualitative studies, moving back to a more systematic narrative review. *The Qualitative Report*, 9(1): 95-112.
- Jonsen, Maznevski and Schneider. In press. Gender differences in leadership: Believing is seeing. Implications for managing diversity. *Equal Opportunities International*.
- Joshi, A., & Roh, H. 2009. The role of context in work team diversity research: A meta-analytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3): 599-627.
- Joshi, A., & Roh, H. 2008. A contextualized framework for work team diversity research: Theoretical and empirical considerations. In E. Mannix & M. Neale (Ed.), *Research on managing groups and teams*.
- Kandola, R. S., Fullerton, J., Kandola, R. S., & Institute of Personnel and Development. 1998. *Diversity in action: Managing the mosaic* (2nd ed.). London: Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Kanter, R. M. 1977. *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. 2003. Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, 110, 265-284.
- Kirkman, B. L., Tesluk, P. E., & Rosen, B. 2004. The impact of demographic heterogeneity and team leader -- team member demographic fit on team empowerment and effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, 29(3): 334-368.
- Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Levine, D., & Thomas, D. 2003. The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human resource management*, 42(1): 3-21.
- Konrad, A. M., Kramer, V., & Erkut, S. 2008. Critical mass: The impact of three or more women on corporate boards. *Organizational dynamics*, 37(2): 145-164.
- Koppel, P., Yan, J., & Ludicke, J. 2007. *Cultural diversity management in deutschland hinkt hinterher*. Gutersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Kossek, E. E., Lobel, S. A., & Brown, J. 2006. Human resource strategies to manage work force diversity: Examining 'the business case'. In P. Prasad & J. K. Pringle (Ed.), *Handbook of workplace diversity*: 53-74. London: Sage.

- Koza, M. P., & Thoenig, J. 1995. Organizational theory at the crossroads: Some reflections on European and United States approaches to organizational research. *Organization Science*, 6(1): 1-8.
- Kroll, J. F., & de Groot, A. 1997. Lexical and conceptual memory in the bilingual: Mapping from meaning in two languages. In J. F. Kroll & A. de Groot (Ed.), *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives*: 169-199. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Kuklinski, J. H., Sniderman, P. M., Knight, K., Piazza, T., Tetlock, P. E., Lawrence, G. R., & Mellers, B. 1997. Racial prejudice and attitudes toward affirmative action. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(2): 402.
- Kurowski, L. L. 2002. Cloaked culture and veiled diversity: Why theorists ignored early US workforce diversity. *Management Decision*, 40(1): 183.
- Kwak, M. 2003. The paradoxical effects of diversity. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 44(3): 7-8.
- Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. 1998. Demographic diversity and faultlines: The compositional dynamics of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2): 325-340.
- Lee, P. M., & James, E. H. 2007. She's-e-os: Gender effects and investor reactions to the announcements of top executive appointments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(3): 227-241.
- Lenartowicz, T., & Roth, K. 2001. Does subculture within a country matter? A cross-cultural study of motivational domains and business performance in Brazil. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(2): 305.
- Leung, K., Bhagat, R. S., Buchan, N. R., Erez, M., & Gibson, C. B. 2005. Culture and international business: Recent advances and their implications for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4): 357-378.
- Li, J., & Hambrick, D. C. 2005. Factional groups: A new vantage on demographic faultlines, conflict, and disintegration in work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5): 794-813.
- Liff, S., & Wajman, J. 1996. "Sameness" and "difference" revisited: Which way forward for equal opportunity initiatives? *Journal of Management Studies*, 31(1): 79-95.
- Liff, S. 1999. Diversity and equal opportunities: Room for a constructive compromise? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9(1): 65-75.
- Ling, Y., Floyd, S. W., & Baldrige, D. C. 2005. Toward a model of issue-selling by subsidiary managers in multinational organizations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36: 637-654.
- Lockwood, R. 2005. Language diversity in the global village. *MultiLingual Computing & Technology*, 16(6): 35-38.
- Lorbiecki, A., & Jack, G. 2000. Critical turns in the evolution of diversity management. *British Journal of Management*, 11(3): S17.

- Magoshi, E., & Chang, E. 2009. Diversity management and the effects on employees' organizational commitment: Evidence from Japan and Korea. *Journal of World Business*, 44(1): 31-40.
- Mannix, E., & Neale, M. A. 2005. What differences make a difference? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 6(2): 31-55.
- March, J. G. 2005. Parochialism in the evolution of a research community: The case of organization studies. *Management & Organization Review*, 1(1): 5-22.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. 1991. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2): 224-253.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. 2003. Culture, self, and the reality of the social. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14(3): 277-283.
- Marschan, R., Welch, D., & Welch, L. 1997. Language: The forgotten factor in multinational management. *European Management Journal*, 15(5): 591.
- Marschan-Piekkari, R., Welch, D., & Welch, L. 1999. In the shadow: The impact of language on structure, power and communication in the multinational. *International Business Review*, 8(4): 421.
- Martin, J., & Meyerson, D. 2008. Gender inequity and the need to study change. In D. Barry & H. Hansen (Ed.), *New approaches in management and organization*: 552-553. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Martin, R. 2002. Politicized managerial capitalism: Enterprise structures in post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe. *The Journal of Management Studies*, 39(6): 823.
- Mavin, S., & Girling, G. 2000. What is managing diversity and why does it matter? *Human Resource Development International*, 3(4).
- Maxwell, G., McDougall, M., Blair, S., & Masson, M. 2003. Equality at work in UK public-service and hotel organizations: Inclining towards managing diversity? *Human Resource Development International*, 6(2): 243.
- Maxwell, G. A., Blair, S., & McDougall, M. 2001. Edging towards managing diversity in practice. *Employee Relations*, 23(4): 468.
- Maznevski, M. L. 1994. Understanding our differences: Performance in decision-making groups with diverse members. *Human Relations*, 47(5): 531-552.
- McDougall, M. 1996. Equal opportunities versus managing diversity. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9(5): 62.
- McLeod, P. L., & Lobel, S. A. 1996. Ethnic diversity and creativity in small groups. *Small Group Research*, 27(2): 248.

- Meierkord, C. & Knapp, K. 2003. Approaching lingua franca communication. In K. Knapp and C. Meierkord (eds), *Lingua franca communication – Frankfurt*, Lang M.A.: 9-28.
- Merril-Sands, D., Holvino, E., & Cumming, J. 2000. *Working with diversity: A focus on global organizations*. Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations.
- Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. 1996. Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(2): 402-433.
- Mohammed, S., & Angell, L. C. 2004. Surface- and deep-level diversity in workgroups: Examining the moderating effects of team orientation and team process on relationship conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8): 1015-1039.
- Mor-Barak, M. E. 2005. *Managing diversity : Toward a globally inclusive workplace*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Mortensen, M., & Hinds, P. J. 2001. Conflict and shared identity in geographically distributed teams. *International Journal of Conflict Management (1997-2002)*, 12(3): 212.
- Nishii, L. H., & Özbilgin, M. F. 2007. Global diversity management: Towards a conceptual framework. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(11): 1883-1894.
- Nolan, J. 2009. Gender and equality of opportunity in china's labour market. In M. Özbilgin (Ed.), *Equality, diversity and inclusion at work*. Cheltenham and New York: Edward Elgar Press.
- Noon, M. 2007. The fatal flaws of diversity and the business case for ethnic minorities. *Work, Employment & Society*, 21: 773-783.
- Northcraft, G. B., & Gutek, B. A. 1993. Discrimination against women in management: Going, going. In E. A. Fagenson (Ed.), *Women in management: Trends, issues, and challenges*: 219-245. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Overell, S. 1996. Ouseley in assault on diversity. *People Management*, 2(9): 7.
- Özbilgin, M. (2008) *Global Diversity Management*, in Peter B. Smith, Mark F. Peterson & David C. Thomas (eds.), *Handbook of Cross Cultural Management Research*, US: Sage.
- Özbilgin, M., & Tatli, A. 2008. *Global diversity management : An evidence-based approach*. Basingstoke England ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Patel, T. 2009. Managing diversity through affirmative action in India: Playing the right music with the wrong instrument. In M. Özbilgin & J. Syed (Ed.), *Diversity management in Asia: A research companion*. Cheltenham and New York: Edward Elgar Press.
- Pekerti, A. A. 2008. The interdependent family-centric career: Career perspective of the overseas Chinese in Indonesia. (cover story). *Career Development Quarterly*, 56(4): 362-377.
- Pelled, L. H. 1996. Demographic diversity, conflict, and work group outcomes: An intervening process theory. *Organization Science*, 7(6): 615-631.

- Peltokorpi, V. & Schneider, S.C. 2009. Communicating across cultures: The interaction of cultural and language proficiency. Paper presented at *EGOS conference*, Barcelona, 2009.
- Peppas, S. C. 2002. Subcultural approaches to management: A comparative study of African - and euro-american values. *Cross Cultural Management*, 9(2): 45-64.
- Pettigrew, T. F. 1998. Reactions toward the new minorities of Western Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1): 77.
- Pfeffer, J. 1983. Organizational demography. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 5: 299-357.
- Piekkari, R. 2006. Language effects in multinational corporations: a review from an international human resource management perspective. In Stahl, G.K. & Björkman, I. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in International Human Resource Management*: 536-550. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Prasad, A. 1997. Provincializing Europe: Towards a post-colonial reconstruction: A critique of Baconian science as the last stand of imperialism. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations & Societies*, 3(1): 91-117.
- Prime, J., Jonsen, K., Carter, N., & Maznevski, M. L. 2008. Managers perception of women and men leaders. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8(2): 171-210.
- Putnam, R. D. 2007. E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte prize lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2): 137-174.
- Ramirez, J., & Dieck-Assad, M. L. 2008. *Mexico's war on/of violence and its economic impacts*. Paper presented at Comparative Perspectives on Leadership, RISC -Regional Integration and Social Cohesion, Université du Luxembourg. Luxembourg.
- Randøy, T., Thomsen, S., & Oxelheim, L. 2006. *A Nordic perspective on corporate board diversity*. Oslo, Norway: Norden - Nordic Innovation Centre.
- Richard, O. C., Kochan, T. A., & McMillan-Capehart, A. 2002. The impact of visible diversity on organizational effectiveness: Disclosing the contents in Pandora's black box. *Journal of Business & Management*, 8(3): 265.
- Richard, O. C., Murthi, B. P. S., & Ismail, K. 2007. The impact of racial diversity on intermediate and long-term performance: The moderating role of environmental context. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(12): 1213-1233.
- Ridgeway, C.L. & Smith-Lovin, L. 1999. The gender system and interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 191-216.
- Roberson, Q. M. 2006. Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(2): 212-236.
- Rosenzweig, P. 1998. Managing the new global workforce: Fostering diversity, forging consistency. *European Management Journal*, 16(6): 644.

- Rynes, S. L., Giluk, T. L., & Brown, K. G. 2007. The very separate worlds of academic and practitioner periodicals in human resource management: Implications for evidence-based management. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5): 987-1008.
- Sawyer, O. O., Strauss, J. P., & Oke, A. 2007. *Universal diverse orientation in the united kingdom and the united states: A comparative analysis*. Paper presented at Academy of Management, Philadelphia, PA, United States.
- Schmitt, M.T., Spoor, J., Danaher, K. & Branscombe, N.R. 2009. In M. Barreto, M.K. Ryan & M.T. Schmitt (Eds.), *The glass ceiling in the 21st century*: 49-72. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Schneider, S.C. 1989. Strategy formulation: The impact of national culture. *Organization Studies* 10(2) 149-168.
- Schneider, S. C., & De Meyer, A. 1991. Interpreting and responding to strategic issues: The impact of national culture. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(4): 307-320.
- Semyonov, M., Glikman, A., & Krysan, M. 2007. Europeans' preference for ethnic residential homogeneity: Cross-national analysis of response to neighborhood ethnic composition. *Social Problems*, 54(4): 434-453.
- Shapiro, G. 2000. Employee involvement: Opening the diversity Pandora's box? *Personnel Review*, 29(3): 304.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. 1999. *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., van Laar, C., & Levin, S. 2004. Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology*, 25(6): 845-880.
- Simons, G. F. 2002. *Eurodiversity: A business guide to managing difference*. Woburn: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Singh, V., & Point, S. 2004. Strategic responses by European companies to the diversity challenge: An online comparison. *Long range planning*, 37(4): 295-318.
- Sippola, A. 2007. *Essays on human resource management perspectives on diversity management*. Universitas Wasaensis, Finland.
- Stahl, G., M. L. Maznevski, A. Voigt and K. Jonsen. In press. Unravelling the diversity-performance link in multicultural teams: Meta-analysis of studies on the impact of cultural diversity in teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*.
- Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. 2008. Unlocking the benefits of diversity. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(1): 116-133.
- Stewart, G. L. 2006. A meta-analytic review of relationships between team design features and team performance. *Journal of Management*, 32(1): 29-55.

- Strauss, J. P., Connerley, M. L., & Ammermann, P. A. 2003. The 'threat hypothesis,' personality, and attitudes toward diversity. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(1): 32.
- Symon, G., Buehring, A., Johnson, P., & Cassell, C. 2008. Positioning qualitative research as resistance to the institutionalization of the academic labour process. *Organization Studies*, 29(10): 1315.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. 1986. The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Ed.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*: 33-47. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Thomas Jr., R. R. 1990. From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard business review*, 68(2): 107-117.
- Thomas, D. C. 1999. Cultural diversity and work group effectiveness: An experimental study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(2): 242.
- Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. 1996. Making differences matter. *Harvard business review*, 74(5): 79.
- Tung, R. L. 2008. The cross-cultural research imperative: The need to balance cross-national and intra-national diversity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(1): 41-46.
- Tung, R. L. 2005. Reflections on engendering a sustainable community within the academy. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(2): 239-244.
- Tung, R. L. 1993. Managing cross-national and intra-national diversity. *Human resource management*, 32(4): 461-477.
- Umphress, E. E., Smith-Crowe, K., Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., & Watkins, M. B. 2007. When birds of a feather flock together and when they do not: Status composition, social dominance orientation, and organizational attractiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2): 396-409.
- Vaes, J., & Wicklund, R. A. 2002. General threat leading to defensive reactions: A field experiment on linguistic features. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41: 271-280.
- van Knippenberg, D. 2007. *Understanding diversity*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Research Institute of Management (ERIM).
- van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. 2007. Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58(1): 515-541.
- Watson, W. E., Kumar, K., & Michaelsen, L. K. 1993. Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3): 590.
- Webber, S. S., & Donahue, L. M. 2001. Impact of highly and less job-related diversity on work group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 27(2): 141.
- Welch, D. E., Welch, L. S., & Marschan-Piekkari, R. 2001. The persistent impact of language on global operations. *Prometheus*, 19(3): 193-209.

- Whorf, B. L. 1956. *Language, thought, and reality; selected writings*. Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Wiersema, M. F., & Bird, A. 1993. Organizational demography in Japanese firms: Group heterogeneity, individual dissimilarity, and top management team turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(5): 996-1025.
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly III, C. A. 1998. Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20: 77.
- Wilson, E. M., & Iles, P. A. 1999. Managing diversity - an employment and service delivery challenge. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 12(1): 27.
- Wise, L. R., & Tschirhart, M. 2000. Examining empirical evidence on diversity effects: How useful is diversity research for public-sector managers? *Public administration review*, 60(5): 386-394.
- Wright, L., & Tellei, V. C. 1993. Women in management in indonesia. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 23(4): 19.
- Yukleyen, A. 2009. Islamic civil society and social capital in turkey: The gulen community. In M. Özbilgin & J. Syed (Ed.), *Diversity management in Asia: A research companion*. Cheltenham and New York: Edward Elgar Press.
- Zanoni, P., & Janssens, M. 2004. Deconstructing difference: The rhetoric of human resource managers' diversity discourses. *Organization Studies (01708406)*, 25(1): 55-74.
- Zelechowski, D. D., & Bilimoria, D. 2003. The experience of women corporate inside directors on the boards of fortune 1,000 firms. *Women in Management Review*, 18(7): 376-381.
- Ziller, R. C. 1964. Individuation and socialization. *Human Relations*, 17: 341-360.

Appendix I

To be completed...

Appendix II

Nationality (nation born in) of Authors of Diversity Articles⁹

<i>Country</i>	<i>Record Count</i>	<i>% of Records</i>
<i>USA</i>	<i>3468</i>	<i>66 %</i>
<i>England</i>	<i>610</i>	<i>12 %</i>
<i>Canada</i>	<i>293</i>	<i>6 %</i>
<i>Australia</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>4 %</i>
<i>Netherlands</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>2.1 %</i>
<i>France</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>1.9 %</i>
<i>Germany</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>1.8 %</i>
<i>Japan</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>1.0 %</i>
<i>Scotland</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>0.9%</i>
<i>Italy</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>0.9 %</i>

Source: Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), Web of Science, ISI Web of Knowledge, Thomson Reuters

⁹ 1177 records out of the analyzed 6433 (September, 2007) did not contain enough data on author origin.

Appendix III

Diversity articles extracted with more than 100 cites (Web of Science, January 2009)

Cox, T.H., S.A. Lobel, P.L. McLeod. 1991. Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*

***De Dreu, C.K.W., L.R. Weingart. 2003.** Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*

Eagly, A.H., B.T. Johnson. 1990. Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 108(2) 233.

Ely, R. J., D.A. Thomas. 2001. Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*

Fiol, C.M. 1994. Consensus, diversity, and learning in organizations. *Organization Science*

Harrison, D.A., K.H. Price, M.P. Bell. 1998. Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*

Harrison, D.A., K.H. Price, J.H. Gavin, A.T. Florey. 2002. Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*

Ibarra, H. 1995. Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *Academy of Management Journal*

***Jehn, K.A. 1997.** Qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in org. groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*

Jehn, K.A., G.B. Northcraft, M.A. Neale. 1999. Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*

Lau, D.C., J.K. Murnighan. 1998. Demographic diversity and faultlines: The compositional dynamics of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*

Lawrence, B.S. 1997. The black box of organizational demography. *Organization Science*

Milliken, F.J., L.L. Martins. 1996. Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*

Pelled, L.H. 1996. Demographic diversity, conflict, and work group outcomes. *Organization Science*

Pelled, L.H., K.M. Eisenhardt, K.R. Xin. 1999. Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict, and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*

Simons, T., L.H. Pelled, K.A. Smith. 1999. Making use of difference: Diversity, debate, and decision comprehensiveness in top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*

Watson, W.E., K. Kumar, L.K. Michaelsen. 1993. Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal*

Williams, K.Y., C.A. O'Reilly III. 1998. Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*

*) Strictly speaking these are not articles with diversity as primary focus, yet their findings and the fact that they are heavily cited by diversity authors qualified them for this purpose.