

Diversity in Organizations and Cross-Cultural Work Psychology:**What If They Were More Connected?**

Bernardo M. Ferdman

Lilach Sagiv

Alliant International University

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Author Note

This paper was written in full collaboration; authorship is listed in alphabetical order. We would like to thank the co-chairs and other panelists (Maritza Salazar, Chris W. Coultas, Rebecca Grossman, Jennifer Feitosa, Georgia Chao, Susan Jackson, and Kizzy Parks), as well as the audience, at “Culture and Diversity: Current and Future Theoretical and Practical Approaches,” a panel discussion held at the SIOP 2011 conference, for the inspiration leading to this article. We are also grateful for the insightful comments provided by Maritza Salazar and three anonymous reviewers, which helped us improve the article. Lilach Sagiv’s work on this article was supported by a grant from the Recanati Fund of the School of Business Administration at the Hebrew University.

Abstract

In this article we discuss how the fields of diversity in organizations and cross-cultural work psychology can benefit from greater attention to and integration with each other as well as more clarity regarding the distinctions between them. We first present—each in our own voice and from our individual perspective—past and current issues in the two respective areas. We then jointly identify and discuss key areas of commonality and difference between diversity and cross-cultural work psychology in theory, research, and practice. Subsequently, we point to ways the two fields might learn and benefit from each other's approaches and perspectives. We consider issues such as the interplay between culture and diversity, the dual impact of individuals on groups and vice versa, and the role of identity as an organizing principle in group diversity. Overall, the paper provides illustrative examples of the benefits of more exchange and dialogue between the fields.

This paper was inspired by a panel discussion at the recent SIOP 2011 conference (Salazar et al., 2011) that focused on cross-cultural and diversity research. The panelists—including the two of us—discussed aspects of diversity and cross-cultural research and training. Building on that session, in this article we address commonalities and differences in theory, research, and practice on diversity in organizations on the one hand, and cross-cultural work psychology on the other. We further discuss some of the ways in which the two fields can benefit from greater attention to and integration with each other as well as more clarity regarding the distinctions between them.

Diversity in organizations and cross-cultural work psychology have much in common and are in many ways interconnected. Yet, these two fields of theory, research, and practice are distinguished by different frames, approaches, goals, and challenges. Both relate to and address important variations in and contextual influences on psychological constructs and processes but do so in varying ways and with distinct emphases. In this article, we raise focal questions and present a dialogue and collaboration of two scholars: one (Ferdman) primarily focused on diversity in organizations—an area in which he also practices—and one (Sagiv) primarily focused on cross-cultural psychology. Our aim is to discuss the differences and connections between the two fields, the benefits and challenges in integrating them, and the implications of these connections and possible integrations for both research and practice.

In doing this, we are rooted in our particular experiences and subjective perspectives, and so we make no claim to represent each field in its entirety. Rather, we seek to make a case for greater clarity regarding the distinctions between the two fields on the one hand, and greater interaction and communication between them on the other hand. Although the two fields address related issues and topics, they have developed and in many ways operate separately from each

other. We see great value in a more fluid exchange and dialogue and in more explicit connections between them, especially as work on diversity becomes more globalized, and cross-cultural work psychology moves beyond comparing nations. In preparing this article, we have each learned about our own perspective at the same time that we have expanded our individual horizons. Our reviews of past research as well as our interactions and dialogues have themselves in some ways illustrated both the differences and interconnections of the two fields, as well as the benefits of using our respective frames of reference, constructs, and perspectives to make better sense of social phenomena and to contribute to more effective practice.

Providing a thorough review of past research in each field is beyond the scope of what we set out to do, and has been done elsewhere (e.g., Ashkanasy, Wilderom, & Peterson, 2010; Erez, 2011; Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007; Zhou & Shi, 2011, for cross-cultural work psychology; and Jackson & Joshi, 2011; van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Konrad, Prasad, & Pringle, 2006; Roberson, forthcoming, for diversity in organizations). Instead, in the first two sections that follow, each of us—in our own voice—describes our view of important issues in our respective areas. We then jointly identify and discuss key areas of commonality and difference between the fields, and point to ways we might learn and benefit from each other's approaches and perspectives.

Diversity in Organizations: Past and Current Issues (Ferdman)

In 1992, in the second volume of SIOP's Professional Practice Series, Jackson and Associates highlighted the implications of the growing diversity of the U.S. workforce for organizations and discussed diversity management, strategic change related to diversity, race relations initiatives, and human resource approaches to diversity. Jackson et al.'s book reflected a relatively new and growing area of interest and focus for I-O psychology and related fields (see

e.g., Cox, 1993; Ferdman, 1992, 1994; Morrison, 1992; Thomas, 1990; Thompson & DiTomaso, 1998; Triandis, Kurowski, & Gelfand, 1994), an area that developed in the aftermath of civil rights movements and legislation and employment laws addressing equity and access for multiple groups. In the years since, diversity in organizations has greatly expanded as an area of both research and practice.

The Diverse Field of Diversity in Organizations

The field of diversity in organizations is quite broad and incorporates multiple strands, perspectives, and approaches. Overall, it emphasizes understanding and intervening in heterogeneous groups and workplaces to reduce or eliminate invidious bias and discrimination and to benefit from differences, so as to maximize the inclusion and contributions of individuals, increase social justice and equity, and provide for greater organizational success. In I-O psychology, work on diversity incorporates attention to ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, social class, (dis)ability, nationality, and other dimensions of difference, as these affect group and organizational dynamics (e.g., Jackson & Joshi, 2011; van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007) and the experiences of individuals who vary along one or more of these dimensions. This approach builds on and goes beyond work on prejudice and discrimination and involves addressing the management of diversity so as to realize its potential benefits to organizations and their members.

More recently, the field has developed to include attention to inclusion (Holvino, Ferdman, & Merrill-Sands, 2004; Mor Barak, 2011; Roberson, 2006; Shore et al., 2011; Wasserman, Gallegos, & Ferdman, 2008), which involves enabling individuals to be and experience themselves as complete and fully themselves—with their differences—as they engage in joint efforts, tasks, or endeavors (Ferdman, 2010), and in that way eliciting their full

contributions to the group or organization. When people experience inclusion they can be completely part of the whole and also maintain their authenticity and uniqueness (Ferdman, 2010). Inclusion, then, goes well beyond understanding and benefiting from diversity and incorporates attention to experiences of feeling engaged, involved, safe, valued, and authentic, at both at the individual and the group levels (Ferdman, Avigdor, Braun, Konkin, & Kuzmycz, 2010; Ferdman, Barrera, Allen, & Vuong, 2009), as well as to organizational and leadership antecedents, correlates, and consequences of these experiences.

In this context, diversity work also includes defining and building competencies for members of organizations, and particularly their leaders, to foster effective collaboration across differences so as to create and sustain inclusion. These competencies incorporate but go beyond intercultural skills, and are typically addressed in the context of diversity training, which has also been the focus of extensive research and some theory on the part of I-O psychologists (for recent reviews, see King, Gulick, & Avery, 2011; Kulik & Roberson, 2008). Diversity work encompasses the process of developing organizations to effectively incorporate and take advantage of differences, including implications for organizational processes and systems such as selection and recruitment, promotion, employee and leadership development and training, and talent management more generally. Attention to diversity climate is also part of this approach, with associated research areas addressing relational demography, stereotyping and discrimination, and assessment.¹ Additional strands of work (e.g., Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2008) examine the outcomes of alternative diversity interventions.

¹ In the practice arena, focal areas include supplier diversity; employee resource groups; organizational systems designed to attract, develop, and retain diverse employees; and leadership strategies and practices to foster inclusion. It is important to note that diversity in organizations extends well beyond I-O psychology and incorporates a range of disciplinary perspectives and

From the beginning, the field of diversity, while considering demographic differences, has explicitly addressed cultural variation as a key focus (e.g., Cox, 1993; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Ferdman, 1992). This is because often the diversity that is most relevant is substantive: It has to do with differences—rooted in social identities—in how people think about and approach work and situations (Ferdman, 1992; Thomas & Ely, 1996). At the same time—as documented by extensive work on social identity and other social categorization processes—categories, labels, and identities also matter, in and of themselves. A growing focus in diversity has been to consider the role of multiple and complex identities (e.g., Bodenhausen, 2010; Chao & Moon, 2005; Ferdman, 1995, 2003). Because people have multiple sources of cultural influence, understanding only some of them, particularly in isolation, does not suitably or fully address the dynamics of diversity (Chao & Moon, 2005; Ferdman, 1995, 1999). Moreover, a diversity perspective involves acknowledging, attending to, and addressing within-group as well as between-group differences (Ferdman, 1995; Gallegos & Ferdman, 2007).

Diversity can result in its own cultural patterns and formations, such that multicultural organizations—in contrast to more homogenous organizations—have particular and discernible values, ways of being, and preferred styles, having to do with acceptance and valuing of differences and working effectively with these differences (see, e.g., Holvino et al., 2004). Thus, work on diversity attends to alternative conceptual or ideological frames and their implications for incorporating diversity into groups and organizations, as well as how these frames are communicated (for example by leaders) or how they are integrated into organizational strategy (e.g., Thomas, 2004). This stream of theory and research (e.g., Avery, 2011; Ely & Thomas, 2001; van Knippenberg, Haslam, & Platow, 2007; Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks,

contributions. In this sense then, I-O psychology contributes only one strand of theory and research comprising the field of diversity in organizations as a whole.

2011) focuses on these perspectives (which van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007, refer to as “diversity mind-sets” and Ferdman & Brody, 1995, describe as alternative visions of the “ideal” organization), and their implications for variables such as group cohesion and identification, as well as support for and engagement with diversity efforts. This line of work incorporates deliberation about the proper and fair role and management of cultural and other differences; how such differences should be incorporated in relationships, groups, and organizations; and whether it is positive and desirable for individuals and groups to maintain their group-based cultural distinctiveness in the context of a larger social system.

Finally, the field of diversity in organizations can be construed broadly to encompass attention to basic processes as these are influenced by specific or multiple dimensions of diversity. In that context one can ask whether leadership models, motivation theories, and other I-O psychology constructs and processes can be conceptualized, apply, and function similarly in diverse contexts as they do in more homogeneous situations. Chin (2010), for example, decries the North American and masculinist bias of many leadership approaches and theories and points out that diversity requires shifting both the definitions and the expression of leadership. Wasserman et al. (2008) argue that a key role of leaders in diverse organizations and groups involves building inclusion, thus requiring new leadership competencies and practices, and Nishii and Mayer’s (2009) research documents the important role of inclusive leadership in reducing the relationship of demographic diversity and turnover.

What Do We Mean By “Diversity?” Diversity-General vs. Specific Approaches

A key issue for the field of diversity has to do with defining the construct: Should it be conceptualized relatively broadly or narrowly? To what extent does it make sense—theoretically, empirically, or practically—to generalize about diversity without reference to the specific

attributes or dimensions involved in a particular situation? Mor Barak (2011) distinguishes between three types of definitions: (1) “narrow category-based,” focusing on group-based dimensions typically related to discrimination (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, disability, age); (2) “broad category-based,” focusing on many kinds of differences or grouping such differences into larger categories (e.g., visible/invisible, deep/surface); and (3) “definitions based on a conceptual rule,” providing abstract conceptualizations, not necessarily grounded in specific categories. Harrison and Klein (2007) discuss diversity in terms of within-unit differences on a specific attribute, and distinguish between three types of diversity: variety, separation, and disparity.

These approaches lead to different assumptions and questions; depending on what we mean by “diversity,” we may be looking at different phenomena. Yet it is common to make propositions about diversity, as Page (2007) and Davidson (2011) seek to do, without necessarily distinguishing among different types of dimensions or attributes. Indeed, much of the literature on diversity seeks to make such broad generalizations, rather than focusing on one dimension at a time, even when the assumptions underlying this approach may not be validated. This is also a challenge for the practice arena, in which organizations seek approaches regarding diversity management that can apply to multiple types of diversity², and is further complicated by globalization, which adds the complexity that diversity can involve different conceptualizations and manifestations across societies and locations.

Some theorists and researchers take a similar approach but distinguish between types of attributes, such as “visible” and “invisible” or “surface” and “deep.” Other researchers address specific dimensions of diversity, such as gender, ethnicity, or race; as Shore et al. (2009) point out, research on the implications and dynamics of these dimensions has often developed

² Related concepts that can be considered from a diversity-general or diversity-specific perspective include acculturation, intergroup relations, and bias or stereotyping.

separately. This can make it more difficult to readily determine, for example, whether gender diversity operates in ways that are similar or different to racial, age, or other types of diversity. Yet, because dynamics are unlikely always to be the same across types of diversity, the assumption that diversity as a general concept functions similarly across dimensions can and should be tested. Kochan et al. (2003), for example, reporting on research exploring diversity and performance at four large businesses, point out that the effects of racial and gender diversity on performance varied within and across studies, tended not to be direct, and often interacted with HR practices, organizational culture, and business strategies.

Beyond diversity-specific phenomena, there are likely also dynamics that apply across multiple dimensions or with regard to multiple dimensions in combination. Discovering this is more likely when diversity is considered broadly, permitting investigation of phenomena such as *faultlines* (Lau & Murnighan, 1998), the degree to which multiple dimensions of difference are aligned within a group or organization. Yet even within this type of approach, research suggests that diversity does not function equally across attributes. In a meta-analysis of results from 39 studies, Thatcher and Patel (2011) found that faultlines tended to be stronger when they were based on gender and race, rather than functional or educational background, age, or tenure.

A key aspect—and complexity—of diversity is that it can be both a characteristic of organizational systems, and also represent the intersection and overlapping of multiple systems of other types. For example, if our goal is to understand the dynamics of a work unit that is diverse in terms of its members' ages, genders, ethnicities, and races, we would need to consider not only how the work unit fits into a larger organizational system, but also how the work unit members, as they come together and interact, also represent the meeting of multiple other social systems of which they are part. Isolating diversity from other organizational features and

dynamics, especially in the practice context, can lead to problematic and even ineffectual interventions and approaches. For example, diversity training is likely to be relatively unsuccessful (and to have vague objectives) if it does not consider the participants and their identities, their workplace requirements, and the organization's strategic needs.

Cross-Cultural Work Psychology: Past and Current Issues (Sagiv)

In a seminal chapter in the *Annual Review of Psychology*, Bond and Smith (1996) discussed the challenge of “universalizing” psychology research. They described the Western dominance in social and organizational psychology research and reviewed the emerging body of work that took a cross-cultural perspective to studying individuals and organizations. About a decade later, in a follow-up chapter, Gelfand et al. (2007) concluded that we are “entering a new era when culture research is beginning to be embraced in OB” (p. 482). Indeed, with increasing globalization and multiculturalism in the workplace, researchers and practitioners have become more and more interested in understanding the role of culture in work psychology (Erez, 2011).

There are numerous definitions of culture (see reviews in Boyacigiller, Kleinberg, Phillips, & Sackmann, 2004; Cohen, 2009; Gelfand et al., 2007; Triandis, 1994; for a review of earlier definitions see Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). Despite this large variety, there are some commonalities across most definitions. Culture is typically viewed as multi-faceted (consisting of values, norms, practices, and more) and meta-situational. It represents the way the physical and social environment is captured, understood, and shared by members of the group. Through socialization processes cultures affect the ways their members think and act (e.g., Hofstede, 2001; Schwartz, 2009; Triandis, 1994, 2001). Cross-cultural research focuses on two main issues: studying universals and differences in psychological constructs and organizational behavior, and identifying cultural dimensions that predict or moderate organizational processes.

Cross-Cultural Research: Universals and Differences

The last two decades have brought up diverse and varied research on the role of culture in forming and affecting organizational constructs and processes. Some studies focus on identifying universals, aiming to provide evidence for construct validity across cultures. Thus, for example, Oreg and his colleagues (2008) showed that the dispositional resistance to change scale exhibited construct equivalence (of both structure and item loading) across 17 nations from 4 continents. Moreover, they showed that resistance to change had the same relationships with personal values across cultures: It correlated positively with conservation values and negatively with openness values in all 17 nations. Finding that the meaning of a psychological construct (here, resistance to change) is equivalent across cultures validates the universality of its meaning and thus allows for comparing the extent of that construct among individuals from different cultures.

Other studies, in contrast, focus on identifying cross-cultural differences in organizational constructs or process, and in their antecedents or consequences. Thus, for example, Riordan and Vandenberg (1994) hypothesized and found that a measure of organizational commitment, which focuses on the relationships between the employee and the organization, was equivalent in meaning in samples of Americans and Koreans. In contrast, measures of self-esteem at work and of satisfaction with supervisors—both of which focus on the individuals and are therefore less likely to make sense to Koreans—differed in their meaning across the two cultures. Showing the cultural boundaries of a psychological construct (such as self-esteem) points to cross-cultural comparisons that are meaningless, because one might compare “apples to oranges.” But beyond the methodological contribution, such information deepens our understanding of the construct. For example, it highlights the individualistic focus on the construct of self-esteem.

Research that investigates the extent to which psychological constructs share the same meaning across cultures is usually construct-driven. Future research could aim to integrate the accumulating sets of evidence and draw some organizing principles for universality versus particularity of psychological constructs. Understanding why the meaning of resistance to change is universal whereas the meaning of self esteem is culturally bounded, for example, will upgrade our understanding of cross-cultural differences in work psychology and will be valuable for cross-cultural training of expatriates and global managers.

Introducing Culture to Organizational Research: A Venue to New Understanding

Showing that a psychological work construct is not universal—but rather varies in meaning, importance, or frequency across cultures—not only increases knowledge about that construct, but may also modify the understanding of that construct and derive researchers to find more comprehensive explanations. Consider the example of attribution. For many years, researchers studied attribution bias in Western contexts. The findings were extremely consistent, showing that when explaining behavior of others, individuals over-estimate dispositional explanations and under-estimate situational factors. The findings were so compelling that the bias was termed the “fundamental attribution error” (Jones & Harris, 1967). The explanations provided for this bias essentially focused on universal cognitive processes, such as the observer’s tendency to focus on the actor (and therefore attribute her action to dispositional factors; Jones & Nisbett, 1971). When attribution was studied among East Asians, however, findings showed that they do not over-estimate dispositional explanations (e.g., Miller, 1984). These findings not only indicated boundary conditions of the attribution error; they also derived a new set of explanations to the phenomena, suggesting that individualistic cultures—which focus on the individual and expect people to act on their personal attributes—encourage dispositional attributions. In contrast,

contextual, collectivistic cultures—which focus on the collectivity and expect people to act upon norms and expectations—encourage situational attributions that focus on the social context.

Research on cross-cultural work psychology provides similar insights. A notable example is the research on negotiation. Studying the role of cultural values in negotiation, research provides evidence for cross-cultural differences in negotiation tactics, as well as in the perception of the negotiation situation (see reviews in Gelfand et al., 2007; Sagiv, Schwartz, & Arieli, 2011). For example, Brett and her colleagues show differences in negotiation strategies of individuals from low- versus high-context cultures. Negotiators from low-context cultures gather information in a direct manner (e.g., stating and receiving information about interests and objectives). In contrast, negotiators from high-context cultures gather information indirectly, by making offers earlier in the negotiation, and relying on counter offers to learn about interests and goals of the opponent. Moreover, negotiators created more value (i.e., performed better) when they relied on culturally-congruent strategies (Adair & Brett, 2005; Adair, Okumura, & Brett, 2001). These studies have concrete implications for practitioners engaging in negotiation. But for researchers they do more than provide information about negotiation: They challenge and foster our understanding of the *meaning* of the negotiation processes, showing that individuals from various cultures differ not only in their behavior, but also in the mere experience that is negotiating with others.

Thus, investigating the role of culture is crucial for research on *any* work psychology construct and process: Whether the findings point to universals or whether they show differences across cultures in meaning or in frequency, the cultural perspective contributes to a broader and more comprehensive understanding of the studied phenomena. Introducing the cultural context may help deepen our understanding of the *personal experience* of I-O issues such as career choice, identification and commitment to work teams and organization, or organizational

citizenship behavior. It may also shed light on *organization-level* processes, such as selection, training and socialization, leadership, and performance evaluation. Some of these have already been studied taking a cross-cultural perspective; others still represent a Western dominance, and therefore pose a challenge to research of cross-cultural work psychology.

From Comparing Cultures to Cultural Dimensions As Underlying Mechanisms

With the growing research of cross-cultural work psychology, it may be surprising that many studies still focus on comparing a psychological construct across a small number of cultures. Comparing few countries is problematic because any two countries differ in many respects (e.g., size, affluence, legal systems, educational systems, media, etc.). It is therefore virtually impossible to attribute a difference in means found between the two to cultural differences. Moreover, cultures that differ on one cultural aspect or dimension (e.g., individualism versus collectivism) often differ in other cultural dimensions (e.g., power distance or hierarchy) as well.

This challenge could be partly overcome by studying a large number of societies and investigating the impact of cultural dimensions. Several large-scale projects proposed cultural dimensions of values that allow for comparison across cultures. The most known is Hofstede's seminal model (1980, 2001; see a review in Taras, Kirkman, & Steel, 2010). Other researchers have proposed cultural dimensions that affect organizational processes and behavior, among them the GLOBE project (House, Javidan, & Dorfman, 2001; reviewed in Kwantes & Dickson, 2011), Schwartz's theory of cultural values (1999; reviewed in Sagiv & Schwartz, 2007; Sagiv, Schwartz, & Arieli, 2011), and Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996).

These theories of cultural dimensions of values allow cross-cultural work psychology to move from comparing few cultures to studying a large set of cultures. Investigating the correlations of cultural dimensions with various organizational constructs or processes allows

researchers to reject at least some of the alternative explanations and fine-tune our understanding of the impact of culture—or specific aspects of the culture—on work and organizations.

Moreover, theories of cultural dimensions allow researchers to look not only for main effects of culture, but also to study culture as a moderator of observed relationships.

Studying how managers handle everyday work events, Smith, Peterson, and their colleagues asked middle managers from 56 countries how much they rely on various sources of guidance. The findings revealed that the cultural values emphasized in their society predicted the extent to which managers relied on specific sources for guidance. Thus, for example, a cultural emphasis on collectivism, power-distance, embeddedness, and hierarchy predicted greater reliance on formal rules and superiors and less reliance on own experience and subordinates (Smith, Peterson, & Schwartz, 2002). A recent study stemming from this project showed that in addition to their main effects on the use of guidance sources, cultural values moderate the relationships between managers' use of guidance sources and their success in handling work events. For example, the effectiveness of relying on one's own experience was stronger the more individualistic the culture (Smith, Peterson, & Thomason, 2011). Studying cultural dimensions as moderators in the impact of psychological constructs on cognition and action of organizational members is one of the main challenges in cross-cultural work psychology.

Diversity in Organizations and Cross-Cultural Work Psychology: Identifying

Commonalities and Differences as a Means to Better Understand Each Field

As two fields within I-O psychology that recognize and investigate human variance and its implications, diversity and cross-cultural work psychology share many commonalities. At the same time, the two fields differ substantially. We believe that recognizing some of these commonalities and differences can sharpen and deepen our understanding of key issues within

each area, as well as strengthen both and increase their applied utility and reach. In this section, we discuss principal areas of similarity and difference (see Table 1 for a summary).

Insert Table 1 about here

Nature of Phenomena

The two fields differ in the nature of the phenomena they address. Research on cross-cultural work psychology strives to make generalizations and find their boundary conditions. It aims to learn how cultures are similar and different in the psychological processes that they foster and promote in organizations. In contrast, work on diversity in organizations focuses on individual and group experiences and perspectives and intergroup relations in the context of the workplace. It addresses their organizational implications and manifestations together with the dynamics of heterogeneous groups and organizations.

The two fields are similar in that both concepts—diversity and culture—exist at a collective level (e.g., a team or group, an organization, a society) and at a certain degree of abstraction, and both have psychological implications and manifestations. The two fields also differ: Diversity work in I-O psychology typically reflects differences in *individual attributes* and *identities*, particularly those that are group-based, such as gender, ethnicity, or religion. In contrast, culture does not necessarily exist within the person; it is the social context in which people live and act. Culture provides individuals with a frame that guides their cognition and behavior and helps the process of sense-making. Cross-cultural work psychology considers social contexts and their implications for psychological, social, and organizational processes that affect individuals, groups, and organizations. Culture is a primary basis for diversity, but does not by itself constitute

diversity; in this sense, although cross-cultural work psychology theory and research can provide an important understanding of one of the key building blocks of diversity in organizations, they are not sufficient to address the full range of the dynamics and implications of diversity.

Goals and Focus

Both fields recognize that individuals differ in numerous important ways, that many of these differences originate in the social groups to which individuals belong, and that these differences affect interpersonal interactions in the workplace, as well as personal, group, and organizational performance. Within these general frameworks, however, the two fields differ in goals and focus. Diversity looks at what happens when people import their cultural influences into a new context, such as a work group or organization. Cross-cultural work psychology seeks to identify patterns that exist at a collective level and then influence individual behavior. Diversity research and training highlight many sources of diversity, often simultaneously. In contrast, cross-cultural psychology may acknowledge that there are many such sources of difference, but in practice, most research focuses on nation-level cultural differences (a notable exception is research on bi-cultural individuals, e.g., Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005, Benet-Martinez, Lee, & Leu, 2006; Berry, 1997; Tadmor, Tetlock, & Peng, 2009).

Both fields are concerned with the multi-level nature of the phenomena studied, although in different ways. Cross-cultural research investigates how culture affects individuals, teams, and organizations, and how these are nested within a domestic, international, or global context (Erez, 2011). Researchers in this field often advocate, however, a conceptual distinction among the individual, organization, and nation levels of analyses. For example, Hofstede (1980, 2001) stresses that his proposed cultural dimensions characterize cultures and not individuals, and Schwartz (2011; see also Sagiv et al., 2011) developed different theories of values at the

individual and societal levels. In contrast, work on diversity integrates multiple levels of analysis, frequently simultaneously, and can thus address issues such as diversity management strategies, group dynamics, and intergroup relations. An integration of the two fields is suggested in the notion of “cultural mosaic” (Chao & Moon, 2005), which aims to understand individual experience by taking into account the combination of multiple cultural identities (see also Ferdman, 1995, 2003), as manifested in specific social and organizational contexts.

Another important difference has to do with the relative attention given to content versus process. Traditionally, much of the work in cross-cultural work psychology tends to focus on content, in the sense that it describes patterns of cultural variation and the nature of cultural difference, more than the dynamics of intercultural interaction. Less attention has been devoted to what Gelfand et al. (2007) termed the “cross-cultural interface”—the *dynamics* of culture in cross-cultural contexts. In contrast, work on diversity tends to focus on the processes involved when people from different identity groups or with different attributes work together in one team or organization. Such interactions are not simply interpersonal, but reflect intergroup processes as well (Alderfer, 1986; Ferdman, 1992). Thus, for many diversity specialists, particularly in applied settings, the dynamics of group-based power and privilege—including systems of domination and subordination—and of oppression (e.g., racism, sexism, heterosexism) are quite focal.

Both fields, perhaps to varying degrees, are concerned with the implications of cultural differences when they are represented among people working together in one context, and with the concept of *multiculturalism*, which has to do with describing the attitudes, values, behaviors and organizational processes and systems best suited to effective integration of cultural differences in a group, organization, or society. In this sense, both fields—to some degree—

consider views and attitudes about difference in the intergroup context. Diversity work looks at mindsets and ideologies for diversity (e.g., views about multiculturalism), while cross-cultural work psychology considers acculturation attitudes and other views about how best to address cultural differences, especially in situations where they come into contact.

Underlying Values

Another important way in which diversity and cross-cultural work psychology are similar and different is in the values underlying each field. Both fields strive to overcome the Western dominance of research on work psychology. Both are committed to giving voice to multiple values and ways of thinking. The two fields also differ, however, in some of their underlying values. The field of diversity does not simply study the realities of diversity in the workplace; diversity work is typically not neutral, and usually sees diversity positively or as a desired goal. Research in this field aims to identify the ways in which diversity can benefit individuals, work groups, and organizations, and to more effectively implement what is known about eliminating or reducing discrimination and bias. Diversity research also attends to the difficulties and challenges of diversity in the workplace, in order to overcome them—not only as a means to improve organizational success, but also because personal, social, and cultural diversity is viewed as a positive phenomenon, one that, given the right conditions, can contribute to any organization or social collective. Most researchers and practitioners who focus on diversity are unlikely to have the goal of eliminating diversity or proving that, in principle, it is problematic.

Cross-cultural researchers investigate both universals and differences across cultures, with no systematic preference for either. Ample research strives to identify dimensions that distinguish among cultures. These cultural dimensions contrast societies with opposing preferences, views, and structures. For example, societies that view the individual as an independent, bounded entity

versus those that view the individual as an integral part of the collectivity (Schwartz, 1999); societies that accept the unequal distribution of power as legitimate or not (Hofstede, 1980; 2001) and societies with loose versus tight social constraints (Gelfand et al., 2011). Research on cross-cultural psychology—in the work context and in other contexts—aims to investigate and understand the full spectrum of values, norms, and thought systems. Thus, cross-cultural research seeks to give voice to cultures that endorse different, even opposing values and ideologies, including, for example, those that may object to gender-, ethnic-, or cultural diversity in the workplace or resist organizational change.

Explicitly recognizing and articulating the values underlying their own field could help diversity and cross-cultural researchers and practitioners to better comprehend implicit assumptions and potential limitations. Recognizing how the two fields differ in their values may deepen researchers' understanding of the other field, as well as enrich their own perspective.

Connecting Research and Practice

While both fields have a strong research focus and an interest in describing and understanding basic processes, they are also both concerned with and contribute to practice, in similar and different ways. A challenge for both involves the “translation” of research findings into organizational applications. In the applied context, variables cannot usually be isolated or controlled in the same way as in the laboratory. Moreover, whereas what is important in the practice and training arena is the holistic experience of individuals and groups, researchers seek to isolate and identify the effects of particular variables, often one at a time.

As a field, diversity in organizations has a strong grounding in practice. Thus, diversity researchers often seek to connect their findings to the needs of practitioners and to conduct research to specifically assess whether, how, and why some of the diversity-related practices

adopted in organizations (e.g., diversity training) have the effects that are claimed for them.

Diversity researchers take this approach when they seek to investigate the effects of diversity on performance or to assess the effects of different types of diversity training. Paradoxically, in spite of its applied goals, such research may sometimes seem distant from the needs and concerns of practitioners because it is usually limited to investigating only particular aspects of diversity, which may or may not be generalizable to the realities of particular organizations.

Cross-cultural work psychology tends to be more theoretical and grounded in research, compared to diversity in organizations. The practical applications of studying cultural patterns or dimensions—for example in intercultural interactions—are not always readily apparent, without additional attention to the dynamics of the interactions themselves. Ultimately, both fields face the challenge of making sure that research and theory take into account the realities of practice (Ferdman, 2011), while avoiding the trap of designing studies so focused on specific applications that they do not contribute to advancing a broader understanding of the respective fields.

Summary

The differences and similarities reviewed above can have important implications. For example, the two fields can be confounded, and people working on cultural differences may believe that they are addressing diversity in a relatively complete and sophisticated way, while those working on diversity may believe they have incorporated sufficient attention to cultural variations, when in fact there is more depth and knowledge in these other areas than what they have incorporated. By recognizing the strengths and particular expertise of the other field, and applying its perspective in the context of one's own field, it may be possible to better achieve one's own goals. For example, Fowler (2006) points to the differences in goals between intercultural and diversity training, and shows how intercultural trainers add—relative to

diversity trainers—greater emphasis on and understanding of “culture, behavior, perception, and communication” (p. 401). In a similar manner, cross-cultural training may draw on diversity research to go beyond differences in national culture and consider how those are affected by and interact with other sources of individual and group differences.

Cross-Cultural Work Psychology and Diversity in Organizations: What Can We Learn from Each Other?

After discussing each field, as well as the commonalities and differences between the two, in this section, we combine our voices to discuss various ways in which the two fields—and I-O psychology more generally—can benefit from more fluid and frequent connections between diversity in organizations and cross-cultural work psychology (see Table 2 for a summary.)

Insert Table 2 about here

When Diversity Is Cultural Diversity—And When It Is Not

One key way in which diversity and cross-cultural work psychology can benefit from a firmer integration is in the conceptualization of culture, diversity, and cultural diversity. Below we discuss this issue, considering both perspectives and aiming to integrate the two. We argue that by more clearly distinguishing cultural from other types of diversity both fields would be better able to contribute to each other, as well as to apply insights gleaned from the other field.

Diversity in organizations. What is not always clear or precise in diversity work is the particular nature of the variation addressed by the concept, especially from a psychological perspective. As a feature of a social collective, diversity can be about the various social identities represented in the group, about the relative standing of these identities in the larger society, about

the cultural features or dimensions associated with those identities, or about the ways those cultural features may or may not be manifested among the group's members. Theoretical statements about diversity are often relatively imprecise in terms of the particular processes involved. A challenge for the field is maintaining a sense of integration across multiple definitions and perspectives on what diversity is and how it matters for people and organizations, while at the same time being clearer about the range of processes and dynamics involved.

A cross-cultural perspective can help address this issue, at least in terms of the cultural aspects of diversity.³ A core component of diversity has to do with the cultural aspects of heterogeneity. Attending to the cultural facets of diversity has been a core component of the field since its origins, and so the field would be enhanced by more precise attention to the range of culturally-based values, attitudes, beliefs, and perspectives represented in diverse groups. In this sense, a cross-cultural perspective can be useful to diversity research and practice by providing a particular way to describe, assess, and intervene with regard to differences.

Pedersen's (2000; Connerley & Pedersen, 2005) concept of the Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Cultural Grid, for example, encourages managing conflict through an analysis of the behaviors, expectations, and values that are related to the various identity groups characterizing participants in a situation. Through this type of analysis, one can develop a better understanding of the cultural aspects contributing to the dynamics of the situation and to the experiences and perspectives of its participants. Moreover, acknowledging the multicultural nature of diverse groups has potential implications for diversity research. Typically, diversity work has taken a rather simplistic approach to cultural dimensions, and could benefit from

³ Other important aspects of diversity that are not cultural (but which may involve cultural differences in how they are seen or treated) include status differences, differences in identities, and divergent group experiences or histories.

considering the theories cross-cultural work psychology provides for learning about and addressing cultural diversity in more complex ways. Specifically, diversity research could benefit from distinguishing the multiple ways in which cultures vary, including the values that they endorse, the thought systems that they foster, and the social constraints that they impose.

Additionally, when people live in a diverse heterogeneous context or society and are in ongoing cross-cultural contact, they are likely to be regularly developing or even changing their cultural perspectives; such developmental and dynamic processes also need to be addressed in the context of work on diversity. Finally, cultural diversity involves attitudes about difference and the integration of multiple cultures. In the cross-cultural field, work on acculturation attitudes (e.g., Berry, 1997) is related to this. In work on diversity, this concept is less focused, and indeed practitioners often borrow from related work on intercultural relations; an example of this is the use of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, 1993) and its associated measure, the Intercultural Development Inventory, both of which focus not so much on specific cultural dimensions or differences, but rather on the perspective adopted by individuals with regard to the appropriateness, normality, and acceptance of cultural differences.

Cross-cultural work psychology. Despite the numerous definitions of culture, researchers agree that culture exists at multiple levels (e.g., Gelfand et al., 2007). Reviewing the studies published in the last decade reveals, however, that most studies on cross-cultural work psychology focus on studying culture at the *nation* level. Understanding when constructs or processes are similar or different cross-nationally is important from the theoretical as well as practical point of view. However, the near equation of culture with nation not only creates a gap between theory and operationalization of the culture construct but also risks limiting our

understanding of culture's role in and at work. Drawing on diversity research may provide insights to this challenge of going beyond national culture.

Research on diversity considers almost any source of individual differences rooted in social identities as a source of diversity. Diversity researchers study differences in gender, age, profession, ethnic group, social class, religion, cultural background, and more (see reviews in van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Kwanten, Bergeron, & Kaushal, 2005). Heterogeneity on any, some, or all of these attributes creates diverse groups. Past studies provide evidence for commonalities across the different sources of diversity, as well as the uniqueness of particular sources of diversity. For example, in a study of perceived diversity trainer effectiveness, Liberman, Block, & Koch (2011) found that race of the trainer affected how he or she was rated (prior to training) but gender did not. Kochan et al. (2003) showed differences in the effects of racial versus gender diversity on organizational-level performance. Similarly, studies of the relationship of firm performance with representation of women in the workforce (Frink et al., 2003) and representation of ethnic minorities on the top leadership team (Roberson & Park, 2007) found an inverted U-shaped relationships for the former and an opposite U-shaped relationship for the latter.

National culture has been studied as one notable source of diversity. When people from different countries work together as part of a team or an organizational unit, they usually constitute a culturally diverse group. National culture is not the only source of cultural diversity, however. Thus, a group whose members vary in ethnicity or religion, for example, could be viewed as a culturally diverse group as well, because those dimensions are associated with collective differences in values, norms, and preferred behavior, which may be manifested within the group. But does any source of difference constitute a cultural difference? Probably not.

What, then, creates *cultural* diversity? In other words, what makes a group into a cultural group? Members of cultural groups share values, norms, and thought systems. We reason that any group of individuals who share such elements could be regarded as a cultural group. Consider the example of professions. Trice and Beyer (1993), in their work on organizational culture, describe occupational groups as forming cultures (or subcultures). Indeed, research shows that professions differ in the values that their members share (e.g., Knafo & Sagiv, 2004). Thus, a multi-professional team, consisting of managers, engineers, and psychologists, could be considered as culturally diverse, in the sense that members of each of the three professions share values, goals, and thought processes that distinguish them from members of the other two professions. When grouped together, they have to find ways to manage their different preferences and actions, which reflect differences in what is important (i.e., values) and in how things are being done (i.e., thought systems). In this sense, a multi-professional team can be viewed as a multi-cultural team, even if all its members reside in the same country and share the same ethnicity. Relatedly, Cox and Beale (1997) cite evidence for looking at work specialization and professional identities as identities that can be differentiated using cultural lens.

Thus, cross-cultural work psychology can draw on diversity research to consider other sources of diversity that represent cultural differences. Teams, departments, and organizations can be studied as cultural groups that share values, norms, rituals and practices. Moreover, individuals within those units may share and vary in other culture-like attributes, such as professions, ethnic groups, religions, and even gender or age. To the extent that its members share values, norms, or thought systems, any of these dimensions of diversity may reflect a cultural difference, and could encourage research on the implications of the multicultural nature of such diverse groups. In contrast, when people differ in ways that are not translated to or do not

stem from shared attributes and processes, these differences may create diversity, but they do not reflect a cultural difference.

Building Effectiveness and Skill for Working across Differences

The two areas have much to learn from and contribute to each other with regard to developing individual and collective skills for working across differences. At the level of individuals and small groups, diversity training provides one approach and intercultural training another. Even though the two often borrow from each other, they tend to have different components and emphases.

Cross-cultural training. In general, intercultural training focuses on preparing individuals to work more effectively in new cultural contexts or with co-workers from other cultures. For example, business executives transferred to other countries, students going abroad, diplomats, and others needing to work or study in a new cultural context can benefit from intercultural training, as would a manager who has to supervise people from cultures different than his or her own. Cross-cultural training provides trainees with information about differences across cultures. It also often aims to foster a general sensitivity to such differences (e.g., Brislin, 1981).

Diversity training. Organizations that are diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, or profession often provide their members,—or their management—with diversity training. This training typically addresses issues of identity, power and privilege, stereotyping, leadership, conflict management, and inclusive behavior. Importantly, diversity work in organizations is not solely about interaction among individuals or groups. It also addresses models and values regarding difference (e.g., alternative visions for the future), strategies for change, inclusion and performance, and notions of heterogeneity. Although diversity training may incorporate

intercultural training (Anand & Winters, 2008), in practice—especially in domestic contexts—it is often done in ways that gloss over cultural aspects or oversimplify them.

Integration. Both fields provide perspectives on effective processes for learning and interaction, for dealing with conflict, for embracing difference and collaboration, and for incorporating and addressing difference in groups and organizations. This latter issue is a place where the two fields often meet, as shown, for example, in Maznevski and DiStefano's (2000) work on cultural mapping and bridging or work on cultural intelligence (e.g., Thomas et al., 2008; Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2009). These approaches provide frames and tools grounded in concepts of culture and cultural dimensions that can be useful in supporting diverse groups with the knowledge, skills, and processes needed to work together and create inclusion.

These approaches are not often sufficiently integrated into diversity training. Diversity training could benefit from a clearer integration of intercultural perspectives and approaches, together with a more articulated cultural perspective, in terms of learning about and addressing the content of the differences that exist in groups. Once cultural differences are addressed, the perspective can then be generalized, as in culture-general approaches such as those used by Gardenswartz and Rowe (2010; Gardenswartz, Rowe, Digh, & Bennett, 2003) and others (e.g., Lloyd & Härtel, 2009). Whereas providing organizational members with a specific list of cultural rules or dos and don'ts is probably not particularly helpful in terms of creating diversity competencies, it could be useful to develop cultural competency in a broader sense—sensitivity to the nuances and dynamics of intercultural communication and interaction that avoids overly simplistic or overgeneralized applications of broad cultural dimensions.

At the same time, intercultural training can benefit from incorporating attention to other factors in interactions beyond cultural dimensions. For example, Bennett and Bennett (2004)

integrate global and domestic perspectives on diversity and argue for the need to develop what they call an “intercultural mindset and skillset,” which is in part done by moving from ethnocentric to more ethnorelative perspectives, in the process of developing intercultural sensitivity. The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity that they describe takes an intercultural perspective that is applicable to multiple types of dimensions of diversity.

Additionally, cross-cultural work psychology can benefit from considering the implications of aspects of diversity that may not be cultural but that nonetheless may play a role in intercultural interactions and intercultural adaptation, such as patterns of group-based power and privilege. Finally, such integration can allow clearer applications of globalization in domestic contexts, because globalization processes are not restricted to migrants or global companies; they also have important implications even among people who themselves are not moving.

Individuals Make Groups; Groups Make Individuals: The Role of Social Identity in Prioritizing Sources of Diversity

There are numerous sources for diversity in organizations. Almost any work group is diverse in some respects (e.g., gender, age, profession, role) and many groups—especially work groups in multinational organizations—are diverse in many respects simultaneously. These sources of diversity are sometimes aligned, creating clear faultlines. In other cases, sources of diversity intermix, creating complex environments in which an ingroup member in one respect (e.g., religion) is an outgroup member in another respect (e.g., profession). Researchers and practitioners are aware of these multiple sources of diversity. However, it is often difficult and perhaps even impossible to consider all of them simultaneously. Moreover, in the context of globalization, the salience or the importance of dimensions may vary. We reason that the importance of the group to social identity is an organizing principle for selecting the most

important sources of diversity to address. In this sense, social identity provides a key point of integration for the two fields.

Both diversity and cross-cultural work psychology research investigate individuals and the groups in which they are nested. Researchers often assume that individuals precede groups: that a number of individuals come together to create a group—be it a project team or an organizational department—and that consequently, the group reflects an aggregation of the personal attributes of its members—including their knowledge, skills, beliefs, goals, and ways of thinking, as well as their background attributes—including their ethnic, social, or national backgrounds.

At the same time, however, researchers acknowledge that groups sometimes precede, and in a sense “create,” individuals. Both fields, albeit in different ways, highlight the idea that to fully understand individuals and groups one has to consider the ways in which individuals are shaped by the groups they are born into, grow into, or join. Thus, for example, research on social identity focused on the minimal group paradigm has shown how a mere recognition that one belongs to a group, even a group based on random assignment and lacking any meaning (e.g., “blues” versus “greens”) is sufficient to produce identification with the group and preference for one’s own group over the other group (see a review in Hogg & Abrams, 2003).

Drawing on research on social identity can help researchers in both fields develop refined understandings of the complex dynamics through which individuals make groups and groups make individuals. Thus, Huo, Smith, Tyler, & Lind (1996) found that attitudes towards management (e.g., decision acceptance, procedural justice) depended on the dynamics of the multiple identifications in the organization. Identification with sub-groups correlated with evaluating the management instrumentally, for example—but only when it was not accompanied by strong superordinate identification. Another example is provided by the concept of the

“cultural mosaic” (Chao & Moon, 2005), which advocates integration of one’s multiple cultural identities to fully grasp the experience of diversity in the workplace. A current related theme in work on inclusion is the notion of supporting individuals to integrate their multiple identities and create organizational climates that allow and even encourage them to bring and express more of those identities at work. A cross-cultural lens can provide a way to articulate and investigate the nature of some of the differences represented by these identities, as well as help distinguish those elements, such as group pride and social identity, that are separate from cultural features (see Ferdman, 1992; 1995), while diversity (across and within people) provides insight into the management and blending of differences. Does one dominate? Is there a blended approach? Is there switching? How are differences combined?

Identification with a group refers to the relationships between individuals and the groups they belong to. Research on identification with organizations usually focuses on the cognitive perception of the organization as part of one’s social identity and on the affective attachment one feels towards the organization (see reviews in Riketta, 2005; Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, Halevy, & Eidelson, 2008). But people do not identify with all their groups to the same extent: Some groups are perceived as central to one’s social identity. The person believes that this group defines who she is, and that she would be a different person were she not part of it. People are emotionally attached to the groups they identify with—they wish to contribute and help their group (Roccas et al., 2008). The more important a group is as part of one’s identity, the more likely it is to drive perceptions, decisions, and action. Groups that are important to individual’s identities, then, are more likely to be influential as sources of diversity in work teams or organizational units.

Consider the case of John, an I-O psychologist in a business school. To the extent that being a psychologist is an important part of John’s identity, it is likely to affect him in his

interactions with the majority of non-psychologists in the business school. He is likely to be constantly aware of this source of difference between himself and his fellow faculty. In addition, he may differ in the values he endorses (e.g., the importance of nurturing students or the value of team cooperation versus competition); in his interpretation of the social environments (e.g., students' goals or behavior; the relationships between the business school and the university) and in his actions (e.g., the emphases in teaching). Thus, the more important John's identity as a psychologist, the more important is professional background as a source of diversity in the business school he is part of. In contrast, to the extent that being a psychologist is not an important part of John's identity (because being a researcher, an African-American, or a man is more important to him), then it is less likely to affect him in his interpersonal interactions with his fellow faculty. In this case, professional background will be a less important source of diversity to be handled. Many factors affect the extent of identification with a group, both personal and contextual. Recognizing the groups that are most important to individuals' identities as well as how individuals combine multiple identities to create a coherent and integrated whole is an important key to managing diversity in a group.

At the same time, however, research on diversity highlights that the phenomenon of diversity is affected not only by one's own self- and identity construal, but also by the ways others in the environment (e.g., the workplace) construe group-based identities. Beyond how we see ourselves, the way we are perceived by others also plays an important role in intergroup relations. Diversity research draws on the vast literature on prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination to study these aspects of interpersonal and intergroup relations.

A cross-cultural perspective also permits studying and noting how cultural patterns characterize individual and group behavior even in ways that may not be apparent to or

conscious on the part of the individuals involved. Someone who is the child of immigrant parents, for example, without necessarily identifying with or even giving much importance to those particular ethnic roots, may display patterns of values and behavior that can nonetheless be connected culturally to those roots. Indeed, intercultural and diversity training often focus on helping people to “see” cultural influences, in themselves as well as in others. Moreover, a cross-cultural psychology perspective allows us to raise the possibility that the ways and the degree to which social identity matters can themselves be culturally grounded. Identification with groups and social categories is typically more important in collectivistic than in individualistic cultures whereas the opposite pattern is likely for person-based identities (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

In addition to the *extent* of their identification with groups, individuals also differ in the way they manage and represent the multiple groups that constitute their social identity. People range from employing simple solutions that focus on a single dominant or intersected identity to developing complex solutions that recognize the multifaceted nature of relationships and the partial overlaps among their various identities (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). The importance of social identities and their management has been long acknowledged in cross-cultural psychology (Berry, 1997). Research on bi-cultural individuals shows, for example, that the *integration* acculturation strategy is related to cognitive complexity (Tadmor et al., 2009). Bi-cultural identity integration (BII, Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002) was found to relate to an inclusive and intensive social network (Mok, Morris, Benet-Martínez, & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 2007) and to exhibiting creativity in problem solving (Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, & Lee, 2008; Mok & Morris, 2010). Thus, whereas all people belong to multiple groups and have multiple social identities, the way they organize, manage, and integrate these identities substantially affects their performance and interactions with others. Drawing on cross-cultural research on identification

with organizations in particular, and with groups in general, may contribute to fine-tuning the focus of diversity research and training and to providing evidence-based frameworks that provide individuals with choices regarding the management of their multiple identities.

Conclusion

In this article, we have juxtaposed the fields of diversity in organizations and cross-cultural work psychology with the goal of contributing to improving both by exploring their differences and similarities and the possibilities presented by closer connections between them. We have not addressed all possible integrations or points of connection. Rather, we have provided illustrative and we hope inspiring examples of the benefits of more exchange and dialogue between the fields. Our hope is to stimulate dialogue and responses. In the spirit of diversity, we look forward to the commentaries and to extensions of as well as challenges to our thinking.

References

- Adair, W.L., & Brett, J. M. (2005). The negotiation dance: time, culture, and behavioral sequences in negotiation. *Organizational Science*, *16*, 33–51.
- Adair, W. L., Okumura, T., & Brett, J. M. (2001). Negotiation behavior when cultures collide: The United States and Japan. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 371-385.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1986). An intergroup perspective on group dynamics. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 190-222). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Anand, R., & Winters, M.-F. (2008). A retrospective view of corporate diversity training from 1964 to the present. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*(3), 356 -372.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F. (2011). *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Avery, D. R. (2011). Support for diversity in organizations: A theoretical exploration of its origins and offshoots. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *1*(3), 239-256.
doi:10.1177/2041386611402115
- Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality*, *73*, 1015-1050.
- Benet-Martinez, V., Lee, F., & Leu, J. X. (2006). Biculturalism and cognitive complexity: Expertise in cultural representations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *37*, 386-407.
- Benet-Martínez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. W. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*, 492-516.

- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (2nd ed., pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, J. M. & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed., pp. 147-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5-68.
- Bodenhausen, G. V. (2010). Diversity in the person, diversity in the group: Challenges of identity complexity for social perception and social interaction. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 1-16. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.647
- Bond, M. H., & Smith, P. B. (1996). Cross-cultural social and organizational psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 205–235.
- Boyacigiller, N.A., Kleinberg, M.J., Phillips, M.E., & Sackmann, S. A. (2004). Conceptualizing culture: Elucidating the streams of research in international cross-cultural management. In B.J. Punnett and O. Shenkar, (Eds.), *Handbook for international management research* (pp. 99-167). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Brislin, R. W. (1981). *Cross-cultural encounters: Face to face interaction*. New York: Pergamon.
- Chao, G. T., & Moon, H. (2005). The Cultural Mosaic: A metatheory for understanding the complexity of culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 6, 1128–1140.

- Cheng, C.-Y., Sanchez-Burks, J., & Lee, F. (2008). Connecting the dots within. *Psychological Science, 19*, 1178-1184.
- Chin, J. L. (2010). Introduction to the special issue on diversity and leadership. *American Psychologist, 65*(3), 150-6. doi:10.1037/a0018716
- Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many forms of culture. *American Psychologist, 64*, 194 –204.
- Connerley, M. L. & Pedersen, P. B. (2005). *Leadership in a diverse and multicultural environment: Developing awareness, knowledge, and skills*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cox, T. J. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Cox, T. J., & Beale, R. L. (1997). *Developing competency to manage diversity: Readings, cases & activities*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Davidson, M. N. (2011). *The end of diversity as we know it: Why diversity efforts fail and how leveraging difference can succeed*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- 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. doi:10.2307/2667087
- Erez, M. (2011). Cross cultural and global issues in organizational psychology. In S. Zedeck (Ed), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 807-854). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1992). The dynamics of ethnic diversity in organizations: Toward integrative models. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Issues, theory and research in industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 339-384). Amsterdam: North Holland.

- Ferdman, B. M. (Ed.). (1994). *A resource guide for teaching and research on diversity*. St. Louis: American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1995). Cultural identity and diversity in organizations: Bridging the gap between group differences and individual uniqueness. In M. M. Chemers, S. Oskamp, & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace* (pp. 37-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1999). The color and culture of gender in organizations: Attending to race and ethnicity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ferdman, B. M. (2003). Learning about our and others' selves: Multiple identities and their sources. In N. A. Boyacigiller, R. Goodman, & M. Phillips (Eds.), *Crossing cultures: Insights from master teachers* (pp. 49-61). London: Routledge.
- Ferdman, B. M. (2010). Teaching inclusion by example and experience: Creating an inclusive learning environment. In B. B. McFeeters, K. M. Hannum, & L. Booyesen (Eds.), *Leading across differences: Cases and perspectives—Facilitator's guide* (pp. 37-50). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Ferdman, B. M. (2011, April 15). Linking research and practice in diversity and inclusion training: Insights and suggestions from the field. In K. M. Thomas & M. Goren (Chairs), *Diversity training: Linking theory and practice*. Symposium presented at the 26th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.
- Ferdman, B. M., Avigdor, A., Braun, D., Konkin, J., & Kuzmycz, D. (2010). Collective experience of inclusion, diversity, and performance in work groups. *Revista de Administraçao Mackenzie*, 11(3), 6-26. doi: <http://10.1590/S1678-69712010000300003>

- Ferdman, B. M., Barrera, V., Allen, A., & Vuong, V. (2009, August 11). Inclusive behavior and the experience of inclusion. In B. G. Chung (Chair), *Inclusion in organizations: Measures, HR practices, and climate*. Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago.
- Ferdman, B. M., & Brody, S. E. (1996). Models of diversity training. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 282-303). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fowler, S. (2006). Training across cultures: What intercultural trainers bring to diversity training. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 401-411.
- Frink, D. D., Robinson, R. K., Reithel, B., Arthur, M. M., Ammeter, A. P., Ferris, G. R., ... Morrisette, H. S. (2003). Gender demography and organization performance: A two-study investigation with convergence. *Group and Organization Management, 28*, 127-147. doi: 10.1177/1059601102250025.
- Gallegos, P. V., & Ferdman, B. M. (2007). Identity orientations of Latinos in the United States: Implications for leaders and organizations. *Business Journal of Hispanic Research, 1*(1), 27-41.
- Gardenswartz, L. & Rowe, A. (2010). *Managing diversity: A complete desk reference & planning guide* (3rd ed.), Alexandria, VA: Society For Human Resource Management.
- Gardenswartz, L., Rowe, A., Digh, P., & Bennett, M. (2003). *The global diversity desk reference: Managing an international workforce*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 479-514.

- Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332, 1100-1104. doi: 10.1126/science.1197754
- 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, 1199–1228.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.)*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hogg, M.A., & Abrams, D. (2003). Intergroup behavior and social identity. In M.A. Hogg and J. Cooper (Eds.), *Sage handbook of social psychology* (pp. 407-431). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holvino, E., Ferdman, B. M., & Merrill-Sands, D. (2004). Creating and sustaining diversity and inclusion in organizations: Strategies and approaches. In M. S. Stockdale & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* (pp. 245–276). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- House, R., Javidan, M., & Dorfman, P. (2001). Project Globe: An introduction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50, 489-505.
- Huo, Y. J., Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: Is assimilation the answer? *Psychological Science*, 7, 40-45. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1996.tb00664.x
- Jackson, S. E. & Associates (1992). *Diversity in the workplace: Human resources initiatives*. New York: Guilford.

- Jackson, S. E., & Joshi, A. (2011). Work team diversity. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 1* (pp. 651-686). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Jones, E. E., & Harris, V. A. (1967). The attribution of attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 3*, 1–24.
- Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1971). The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In E.E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelly, R.E. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner, (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior* (pp. 79-94). Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press.
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2008). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review, 71*, 589-617.
- King, E. B., Gulick, L. M. V., & Kravitz, D. A. (2011). Emerging evidence on diversity training programs. In M. A. Paludi, C. A. Paludi, Jr., E. DeSouza (Eds.), *Praeger handbook on understanding and preventing workplace discrimination (Vol. 2): Best practices for preventing and dealing with workplace discrimination* (pp. 61-67). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- van Knippenberg, D., Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2007). Unity through diversity: Value-in-diversity beliefs, work group diversity, and group identification. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 11*, 207-222. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.11.3.207
- van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 515-541. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085546

Knafo, A., & Sagiv, L. (2004). Values and work environment: Mapping 32 occupations.

European Journal of Education and Psychology, 19, 255-273.

Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., ... Thomas, D. A. (2003).

The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network.

Human Resource Management, 42(1), 3-21. doi:10.1002/hrm.10061.

Konrad, A. M., Prasad, P., & Pringle, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of workplace diversity.*

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions.*

Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology.

Kulik, C. T. & Roberson, L. (2008). Diversity initiative effectiveness: What organizations can (and cannot) expect from diversity recruitment, diversity training, and formal mentoring programs. In A. P. Brief (Ed.), *Diversity at work* (pp. 265-317). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kwantes, C. T., Bergeron, S., & Kaushal, R. (2005). Applying social psychology to diversity. In

F. W. Schneider, J. A. Gruman and L. M. Coutts (Eds.). *Applied social psychology:*

Understanding and addressing social and practical problems (pp. 331-354). Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kwantes, C. T., & Dickson, M. W. (2011). Organizational culture in a societal context: Lessons

from GLOBE and beyond. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson

(Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (2nd ed., pp. 494-514). Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. (1998). Demographic diversity and faultlines: The compositional

dynamics of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review, 23, 325-340.*

- Liberman, B. E., Block, C. J., & Koch, S. M. (2011). Diversity trainer preconceptions: The effects of trainer race and gender on perceptions of diversity trainer effectiveness. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 33*, 279-293. doi: 10.1080/01973533.2011.589327
- Lloyd, S., & Härtel, C. (2010). Intercultural competencies for culturally diverse work teams. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*(8), 845-875. doi:10.1108/02683941011089125
- Maznevski, M. L., & DiStefano, J. J. (2000). Global leaders are team players. *Human Resource Management, 39*, 195-208.
- Miller, J.G. (1984). Culture and the development of everyday social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 961-978.
- Mok, A., & Morris, M. W. (2010). Asian-Americans' creative styles in Asian and American situations: Assimilative and contrastive responses as a function of bicultural identity integration. *Management and Organization Review, 6*, 371-390.
- Mok, A., Morris, M. W., Benet-Martínez, V., & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (2007). Embracing American culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*, 629-635.
- Mor Barak, M. E. (2011). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morrison, A. M. (1992). *The new leaders: Guidelines on leadership diversity in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader-member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1412-26. doi:10.1037/a0017190

- Oreg, S., Bayazit, M., Vakola, M., Arciniega, L., Armenakis, A., Barkauskiene, R., ... van Dam, K. (2008). Dispositional resistance to change: Measurement equivalence and the link to personal values across 17 nations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 935-944.
- Page, S. E. (2007). Making the difference: Applying a logic of diversity. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*(4), 6-20.
- Pedersen, P. B. (2000). *A handbook for developing multicultural awareness (3rd ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about me?" Perceptions of exclusion and Whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 337-353. doi:10.1037/a0022832
- Riordan, C. R., & Vandenberg, R. J. (1994). A central question in cross-cultural research: Do employees of different cultures interpret work-related measures in an equivalent manner? *Journal of Management, 20*, 643-671.
- Ricketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 358-384.
- Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group and Organization Management, 31*, 212-236.
- Roberson, Q. M. (Ed.) (Forthcoming). *The Oxford handbook of diversity and work*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roberson, Q. M. & Park, H. J. (2007). Examining the link between diversity and firm performance: The effects of diversity reputation and leader racial diversity. *Group and Organization Management, 32*, 548-568. doi: 10.1177/10596011006291124

- Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 88-106.
- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S. H., Halevy, N., & Eidelson, R. (2008). Towards a unifying model of identification with groups: integrating theoretical perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 280-306
- Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Cultural values in organizations: Insights for Europe. *European Journal of International Management*, 1, 176-190.
- Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S. H., & Arieli, S. (2011). Personal values, national culture and organizations: Insights applying the Schwartz Value Framework. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (2nd ed., pp. 515-537). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Salazar, M. R., Coultas, C., Grossman, R., Olivera, J. P. F., Jackson, S. E., Chao, G. T., ... McDonald, D. P. (2011, April 16). *Culture and diversity: Current and future theoretical and practical approaches*. Panel discussion presented at the 26th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1999). Cultural value differences: Some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, 23-47.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2009). Culture matters: National value cultures, sources and consequences. In R. S. Wyer, C. Y. Chiu, & Y. Y. Hong (Eds.), *Understanding culture: Theory, research and application* (pp. 127-150). New York: Psychology Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2011). Values: Individual and cultural. In F. J. R. van de Vijver, A. Chasiotis, S. M. Breugelmans (Eds.), *Fundamental questions in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 463-493). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Shore, L. M., Chung-Herrera, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., Jung, D. I., Randel, A. E., & Singh, G. (2009). Diversity in organizations: Where are we now and where are we going? *Human Resource Management Review, 19*(2), 117-133. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.10.004
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1262-1289. doi:10.1177/0149206310385943
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and managerial values: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27*, 252-285.
- Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F., & Schwartz, S. H. (2002). Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behavior: A 47-nation study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*, 188-208.
- Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F., & Thomason, S. J. (2011). National culture as a moderator of the relationships between managers' use of guidance sources and how well work events are handled. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 42*, 1101-1121.
- Tadmor, C., Tetlock, P. E., & Peng, K. (2009). Acculturation strategies and integrative complexity: The cognitive implications of biculturalism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 40*, 105-139.
- Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P. (2010). Examining the impact of *Culture's Consequences*: A three-decade, multi-level, metaanalytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 405-439.
- Thatcher, S.M.B. & Patel, P.C. (2011). Demographic faultlines: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1119-1139.

- Thomas, D. A. (2004, September). Diversity as strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 98-108.
- Thomas, D. A. & Ely, R. J. (1996, September-October). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, 79-90.
- Thomas, D. C., Elron, E., Stahl, G., Ekelund, B. Z., Ravlin, E. C., Cerdin, J.-L., ... Lazarova, M. B. (2008). Cultural intelligence: Domain and assessment. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8, 123-43. doi: 10.1177/1470595808091787
- Thompson, D. E., & DiTomaso, N. (Eds.). (1998). *Ensuring minority success in corporate management*. New York: Plenum.
- Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, (March-April), 107-117.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 907.
- Triandis, H.C., & Gelfand, M. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 118-128.
- Triandis, H. C., Kurowski, L. L., & Gelfand, M. J. (1994). Workplace diversity. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Volume 4* (pp. 769-827). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. (2009). Cultural intelligence: Measurement and scale development. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 233-254). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wasserman, I. C., Gallegos, P. V., & Ferdman, B. M. (2008). Dancing with resistance: Leadership challenges in fostering a culture of inclusion. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Diversity resistance in organizations* (pp. 175-200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zhou, W. & Shi, X. (2011). Culture in groups and teams: A review of three decades of research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *11*, 5-34. doi: 10.1177/1470595811398799

Table 1***Diversity in Organizations and Cross-Cultural Work Psychology: Commonalities and Differences***

Topic	Commonalities	Differences	
		Diversity Research	CCWP Research
Nature of phenomena	Constructs exist at a collective level	Looks at individual attributes and identities (especially group-based)	Culture creates a social context for individuals; fosters sense-making
	Have psychological implications and manifestations	Individual and group experiences of heterogeneity; intergroup relations; organizational manifestations	Similarities and differences across cultures
Goals/focus	Individual differences matter; social groups matter	Study process of bringing (multiple) cultural influences into new contexts	Identify patterns at the collective level and study their effects on individuals
	Multi-level research	Integration of multiple levels/types of diversity (including attention to intergroup power dynamics)	Emphasis on correctly distinguishing levels of analysis
	Focus on multiculturalism and views/attitudes about difference	Focus on process	Focus on content
Underlying values	Strive to overcome Western dominance of research	Diversity viewed as desirable	No preference for a specific value system
	Committed to giving voice to multiple values and ways of thinking	Motivation to identify and reap the benefits of diversity	Important to understand and give voice to full spectrum of values, norms, and thought systems
Research vs. practice	Concerned with connecting research and practice	Stronger practice grounding/emphasis	Stronger theoretical grounding/emphasis

Table 2***Cross-Cultural Work Psychology and Diversity in Organizations: What Can We Learn from Each Other?***

Topic	Diversity Research	CCWP Research
Identifying when diversity is cultural diversity	Can draw on CCWP to gain a deeper and better understanding of culture and cultural dimensions	Can draw on diversity to go beyond national culture and study additional types of culture (e.g., ethnic, professional, organizational)
Developing skills for working across differences	Can draw on cross-cultural training to develop general competencies of cultural sensitivity	Can draw on diversity training to go beyond cultural dimensions to prepare organizational members to work in multicultural environments
Using social identity concepts to prioritize sources of diversity	<p>Drawing on research on social identity to integrate the fields:</p> <p>to identify the types of group-related diversity that are especially important for research and training</p> <p>to better understand the ways individuals manage multiple social identities and their implications</p>	to help individuals combine and integrate their various social identities and aim for inclusiveness