

CHAPTER 11

THE DYNAMICS OF

ETHNIC DIVERSITY IN ORGANIZATIONS:

TOWARD INTEGRATIVE MODELS

Bernardo M. Ferdman

As civil rights legislation, increased immigration and other demographic shifts have recast the composition of the United States workforce to make it increasingly heterogeneous (Johnston & Packer, 1987; U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1988), many organizations are beginning to consider more intently the question of how best to incorporate and manage ethnic diversity in the workplace (Adler, 1991; Cox, 1991; Kilborn, 1990a, 1990b; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Schmidt, 1988; Thomas, 1990; U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1988). In contending with the process of incorporating increasing numbers of people with diverse ethnic identities and cultures, organizations are also faced with dilemmas regarding the proper ways to handle such differences (Ferdman, 1988, 1990; Thomas, 1990). Much like ethnic integration in the larger society, integration in the workplace results in controversy in large part because of disagreements regarding the relevance and even existence of group-based differences as well as dissension regarding issues of collective versus individual rights (Ferdman, 1988, 1989b). Although controversy continues over the use and effects of affirmative action programs (e.g., Blanchard & Crosby, 1989; Crosby & Clayton, 1990; Ferdman, 1989a; Glasser, 1988; Glazer, 1988; Gold, 1990; *Harvard Law Review*, 1989; Kleiman & Faley, 1988; Levinger, 1987; Nacoste, 1989; Nalbadian, 1989; Schofield, 1986; Williams, 1990) geared towards overcoming previous racial inequities, there has been a shift among management specialists from an emphasis solely on issues of access towards building new, expanded perspectives (e.g., Brown, 1983; Business-Higher Education Forum, 1990; Jones, 1986; Katz, 1989; Katz & Miller, 1988; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Thomas, 1990) on

In K. Kelley (Ed.). (1992). *Issues, theory and research in industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 339-384). Amsterdam: North Holland.

Correspondence concerning this chapter may be directed to Bernardo M. Ferdman, Organizational Psychology Programs, California School of Professional Psychology, 6160 Cornerstone Ct. E., San Diego, CA 92121 U.S.A. (Tel. 619.623.2777 x362; Fax 619.552.1974; Internet: csppbmf@class.org).

This paper was awarded the 1991 Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Division 9 of the American Psychological Association.

diversity in organizations in which affirmative action is only one of a larger set of concerns. These new approaches seek to take into account various aspects of the intergroup dynamics that might be expected in already heterogeneous work environments, including the experience of members of ethnic and cultural minority groups once they have already entered organizations.

In line with some of these new approaches, many large corporations have begun to regard ethnic and cultural diversity as a feature that can bring positive benefits to the organization, and therefore to cultivate it actively (Bailey, 1989; Cox, 1991; Cox & Blake, 1991; Kilborn, 1990a; Maraniss, 1990; Thomas, 1990; Tully, 1990). Other organizations continue to focus on creating "color-blind" environments where there is no link between how people are treated and their ethnic backgrounds (e.g., Kantrowitz, 1988). Dramatically increased numbers of consulting firms and institutions now offer courses, workshops or strategic interventions focused on helping people of diverse backgrounds to work together more effectively, as more and more public and private organizations seek out such services. The integration of the European Economic Community in 1992, increasing international economic interdependence and the globalization of multinational businesses have also contributed to current interest in finding ways of helping people with diverse backgrounds to work together effectively within the same organization. Similarly, the question of diversity and how best to address it has become a burning issue on many U.S. university campuses (e.g., Goode, 1989). Thus, ethnic diversity has become a topic of major concern in organizational life in the United States.

These trends have paralleled a more general expansion of interest in the role of ethnicity in American life (Alba, 1988, 1990; Fishman, 1983, 1989; Marger, 1991; Simonson & Walker, 1988; Takaki, 1987). More and more groups identified on cultural and historical grounds claim a right to be recognized as distinct and legitimate entities within the broader United States society, and debates abound as to the proper role of ethnic differences in societal institutions (Ferdman, 1990; Glazer, 1983; Pettigrew, 1988; Triandis, 1988). While the primary emphasis in the past has tended to be on racial distinctions (e.g., Alderfer & Thomas, 1988; Cox & Nkomo, 1990), groups that were previously identified solely in such terms are now often identified using the concepts and language of ethnicity (Jones, 1988, 1990; Phinney, 1990; Sue, 1990). Thus, Black Americans have also become African Americans and their differences as well as similarities to Americans of European descent are noted; Hispanics are differentiated in terms of specific identities such as Puerto Rican, Mexican American, Cuban or Dominican; and

many White Americans identify themselves as being of Anglo, Irish, Italian, German or Polish American ethnicity.

ETHNICITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

This growth in ethnicity as an important phenomenon has not been matched by theoretical or research developments in organizational psychology (Alderfer & Thomas, 1988; Calás, 1986; Cox, 1990; Cox & Nkomo, 1990). Although an extensive literature relevant to the psychology of intergroup relations exists, it remains relatively dispersed and fragmented. For example, social psychologists who focus on social categorization processes have tended to work independently from communication scholars who consider the implications of cultural differences for interpersonal interactions. These groups have been mostly disconnected from personnel and organizational psychologists, who have tended to focus on issues of bias in selection or appraisal. More importantly, the psychological study of intergroup behavior has tended to concentrate on developing concepts that cut across group types and so has devoted little attention to illuminating the ways in which intergroup dynamics vary as a function of the basis for group differentiation (Ferdman, 1987b). For example, we might expect that explaining gender-related interactions will involve different notions and perspectives than explaining interactions based on race, occupational groups, or organizational affiliations. Yet social psychologists who study intergroup behavior have tended to use such social categories interchangeably (Ferdman, 1987b).

Although the situation seems to be changing slowly (note for example, Jones, 1988; Phinney, 1990; Sue, 1990), psychology has not yet come to terms with the concepts of ethnicity and ethnic diversity and their relationship to important psychological constructs (Berry, 1986; Bond, 1987). This is as true for organizational psychology (Alderfer & Thomas, 1988) as it is for other areas. Nevertheless, if it is to help meet the emerging needs of organizations in the area of ethnic diversity and to continue to provide useful perspectives for illuminating organizational behavior, organizational psychology must produce and support theoretical frameworks suitable for understanding ethnic dynamics as they actually occur. It must consider and test hypotheses likely to lead to recommendations that will help organizations and their members become more effective. Doing so calls for considering the full range of complexity inherent in the phenomena of interest. Developing a more complete picture of ethnic diversity in organizations entails considering the nature of ethnicity in an intergroup context -- including both between- and

within-group variation in degree of identification and adherence to group-level cultural features -- together with the organizational context in which these dynamics are played out.

Ethnicity and ethnic diversity present special issues that cut across levels of analysis and traditional disciplinary distinctions. Such boundary-crossing issues have not been sufficiently addressed within organizational psychology (Gioia & Pitre, 1990). For this reason, a focus on ethnicity as a unique phenomenon can lead not only to better action-relevant understanding of a pressing organizational issue but also to new perspectives on questions basic to organizational psychology. By considering the nature of ethnicity and ethnic diversity as they impact on people in organizations, psychologists can develop ways to address better the complexity of most organizational behavior.

The primary goal of this chapter is to contribute to an emergent and integrated understanding of the role of ethnicity and the dynamics of ethnic diversity in organizations by reviewing and linking several current empirical and conceptual streams in the literature and elaborating on some of the problems and prospects these present for theoretical integration. In doing so, I hope to point the way for more complex models of behavior in the workplace that can incorporate a fuller range of human variation.

In the rest of the chapter, I first explain what is meant by ethnicity and why it requires special attention. I then discuss current approaches useful for understanding the dynamics of ethnic diversity in organizations and discuss the problems these present for developing integrated models, as well as the prospects for doing so. The chapter closes with a discussion of additional factors I believe psychologists will have to consider as we construct more complete models of ethnic diversity in the workplace. Although the research and theory discussed here are primarily based on the situation in the United States, the hope is that those interested in ethnic diversity in other countries will find much that is useful. However, it is important to note that in spite of the emergence of diversity-related concerns in many other nations, most notably Canada, the Soviet Union, and the European Community, there are considerable differences among these societies that make it difficult to generalize immediately to all of them.

CONCEPTS OF ETHNICITY AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY

Although psychologists are only recently beginning to pay close attention to ethnicity and its psychological ramifications (e.g., Berry, 1985, 1986; Ferdman, 1990; Phinney, 1990), other social

scientists have been concerned with this variable for a long time. In particular, anthropologists, historians and sociologists have long debated the nature of ethnicity, of ethnic identification, and of their defining features (e.g., Alba, 1988, 1990; Barth, 1969; Bentley, 1981; Cohen, 1978; Despres, 1975, 1984; Fishman, 1983, 1989; Hirschman, 1983; Isajiw, 1974; Keyes, 1981, McCready, 1983; Petersen, 1982; Royce, 1982; Spickard, 1989; Yancey, Ericksen & Juliani, 1976).

Components of Ethnicity

Most treatments of ethnicity define it in terms of both group boundaries and the bases and implications of those boundaries. Ethnicity is marked by consciousness of kind and therefore a sense of groupness among the members of an ethnic group; members of the group share a social identification and recognize themselves and/or are recognized by others as having something in common. Fishman (1989) describes ethnicity as marking the distinctions between *us* and *them* and between *them* and *them* and so highlights its phenomenological nature. According to Fishman (1989), ethnicity exists only to the extent that collectivities of people actually use it to organize themselves and categorize others and so perceive and experience it as a meaningful basis for classification and interpretation.

An ethnic group is distinguished not only by a socially meaningful label, however, but also by its members' common ancestral heritage (Barth, 1969; Buriel, 1987) and by the resultant shared style (Royce, 1982). Scholars of ethnicity have jointly emphasized the boundaries implicit in the notion of ethnic groups and the associated behavior patterns. Thus, an ethnic group has associated with it both a *label*, demarcating it as a unique social category, as well as distinguishing *cultural features* -- patterns of behaviors, values and beliefs widely shared by its members.

These are linked to a sense of shared ancestry and continuity with the past; ethnic distinctions and their associated cultural differences are based to a large degree on real or perceived historical depth (Fishman, 1989). People do not join ethnic groups; they are born into them. A group of individuals does not simply meet to create a new ethnic group; rather, it is the antecedent existence of the ethnic group that defines the connectedness among the individuals. This sense of having something in common -- of groupness -- is enhanced and maintained through the group's shared culture. Because ethnicity is a collective manifestation of the continuity of culture across generations (Fishman, 1989), it is a source of inter-

group differentiation that is profound in both experience and meaning, at both the collective and the individual levels.

Heller (1987) provides a useful perspective on what constitutes culture. She points to the way in which the members of a given ethnic group, as they interact, construct shared lenses for interpreting their experiences and their environment. Usually, it is these collective understandings of the world and how it functions that are referred to as culture. However, Heller also emphasizes that culture goes beyond beliefs and values. Culture also includes the standard and typical behaviors that are shared by members of the group. According to this view, culture includes both specific behavioral characteristics typifying a group as well as the underlying views of social reality guiding those behaviors. Triandis (1972) has referred to the latter as a group's *subjective culture*, which is the group's typical or distinctive manner of understanding the social environment. Similarly, Jones (1983), basing himself on Van denBerghe (1977) and Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952), defines culture as a configuration of beliefs, values, symbols, and behaviors that are historically-based and that provide a framework for behavior in the future.

Multilevel Perspectives on Ethnicity and Ethnic Diversity

Ethnicity and ethnic diversity are particularly complex from a psychological point of view because they require attending simultaneously to individual, group and intergroup dimensions (Alderfer & Thomas, 1988; Ferdman, 1990; Hakuta, Ferdman & Diaz, 1987). Aspects of each of these dimensions are discussed below.

The Individual Level. At the individual level, ethnicity involves both cognitive and affective components. Because it can comprise a significant element of individual's social identity (Babad, Birbaum & Benne, 1983; Ferdman, 1990; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), ethnicity is an important basis for people's sense of who they are and who they are not. Individuals can vary in the extent to which they identify with an ethnic group and in how they feel about this identification (Berry, 1984; Edwards & Doucette, 1987; Ferdman, 1990; Herman, 1977; Keefe & Padilla, 1987) and this can change over time (Alderfer & Thomas, 1988). Each person also has his or her own cultural identity, an individual image of the cultural features -- the behaviors, beliefs, values and norms -- that are appropriate to members of the ethnic group(s) to which he or she belongs (Ferdman, 1990). This means that two people can identify equally strongly with a particular ethnicity, yet differ substantially in what they perceive to be the

attributes most central to this group membership and in the value they attach to these features. Similarly, there is individual variation in views about the role of one's ethnic group in society, its relations with other groups and the value and features of these other groups. Finally, individuals will differ in the degree to which they actually exhibit the cultural features that characterize the group as a whole (e.g., Boekstijn, 1988; Ferdman & Hakuta, 1985). Because in a multi-ethnic society there are varying degrees and types of contact among members of different groups, individuals have many options regarding how to relate not only to other groups but also to their own. Ethnic group members will express their choices in part through the behaviors they demonstrate in different types of situations (e.g., Salamone & Swanson, 1979). Especially in the case of minority group members or immigrants, the extent to which an individual follows the group's typical cultural pattern may be an indication of the degree of that person's psychological assimilation or acculturation (Berry, 1986; Graves, 1967). Jones (1988) points out how such variation may also reflect minority group members' perceptions regarding the instrumentality¹ of particular behaviors in different contexts, such that an individual may behave in accordance with the group's cultural patterns in some situations but not in others. The distinction between the group and the individual levels is important, in part because a group's acculturation will not be shared to the same degree by every individual member of the group (Berry, 1983, 1986) and conversely, because some individual group members may acculturate more rapidly than the group-as-a-whole.

The Group Level. Adding to the complexity of ethnicity is the nature of ethnic diversity at the group level. At the group level, ethnic groups are characterized by both common features and within-group diversity. While members of ethnic groups generally demonstrate shared cultural features -- leading to between-group differences -- in a multi-ethnic environment a good deal of variation within groups will also be present. These intra-group differences may be due, for example, to historical sub-group differences (Zenner, 1988), to the acculturation of some individuals but not others, or to differences in experience with a host culture. Within a particular social context, such as an organizational setting, a newcomer belonging to an ethnic minority group may behave according to her own culture's norms for that setting, while an old-timer from the same ethnic group may have been socialized to the majority's ways of doing things. Over time, acculturation processes can affect both what the cultural features are at the group level (Taylor & McKirnan, 1984) and whether or not particular individuals demonstrate them in their behavior

(Berry, 1986). Thus, in a heterogeneous society, variation within the group can be considered to be an important aspect of ethnicity.

Ethnic groups also vary in the features that are viewed as central or core to the group's culture. Elsewhere (Ferdman, 1990), I have described this as cultural identity at a group level, which involves a shared sense of the cultural features that help to define and to characterize the group as well as to distinguish it from other groups. Group cultural identity has to do both with the particular features of the ethnic group and with the significance that is attached to these features in a societal context. For one group, for example, language or dialect may be a distinctive and emblematic (Kochman, 1987) feature while another emphasizes its religious practices and a third, its views on family relationships. Such group-level cultural features are not static and can vary over time, as the group's contacts with the environment influence both these and the group's cultural identity. Groups can also vary in the overall importance that they give to collective cultural identity in the interpretation of individual behavior. While some ethnic groups emphasize the connection of the individual to the group, others tend to see these as very distinct (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). The implication of this is that the construct of culture can be differentially salient across groups.

The Intergroup Level. Ethnicity and ethnic diversity also involve intergroup aspects. Ethnic differences in culture and history, ethnic stratification patterns, the stereotypes and beliefs groups hold about each other, and patterns of intergroup behavior all play a role in influencing specific ethnic groups, their individual members, and the patterns of ethnic diversity as a whole. Salamone and Swanson (1979), in discussing Barth's (1969) theory of ethnic groups, point out that groups develop a sense of being separate and distinct from each other, and thus of their ethnicity, when they occupy a mutual social space. Power and status differentials can be especially important in this regard. For example, minority group status in the sociological sense is based on where an ethnic group falls within a societal hierarchy of group power and prestige (Feagin, 1989; Marger, 1991). One implication of this is that the members of an ethnic group considered to be a sociological minority -- i.e., having less power than the dominant group and whose members are treated unequally and in an inferior manner -- will be more likely than the members of a dominant ethnic group to have salient ethnic identities and be thought about in group terms. In a multiethnic society, the minority group member typically will be identified in group terms, while members of the dominant group will be more likely to see

themselves and to be seen by others in individual terms or as not being part of any definite category (Deschamps, 1982; see also Tajfel, 1978).

An ethnic group's status in society should also be related to the recognition and legitimacy given to its characteristic cultural patterns. Group-level cultural identity plays an important role in the nature and outcome of intergroup comparisons and thus in the way a group comes to evaluate itself (Ferdman, 1987b; Montero, 1987; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). When a group considers that its cultural features compare favorably with those of other groups, it should come to hold more positive images of itself. If, on the other hand, features central to the group's cultural identity are viewed negatively in the society, the group and its members will probably incorporate a negative component into their self-evaluation (Tajfel, 1978).

Finally, also at the intergroup level, ethnic diversity tends to be accompanied by controversy over the role of ethnicity in society and over the proper relationship among society's culturally diverse groups. Debate over the various alternatives has persisted throughout U.S. history (Feagin, 1989; Gleason, 1982; Hirschman, 1983) and indeed human history (Fishman, 1989) and is characteristic of plural societies (Babad, Birnbaum & Benne, 1983; Berry, 1984, 1986; Pettigrew, 1988; Schermerhorn, 1970). Ultimately, the choice is a value-laden one. Assimilation perspectives emphasize the dysfunctionality of differences and the maintenance of the dominant culture, and so demand that subordinate groups acculturate. Melting pot views, also referred to as amalgamation theories, maintain that the ideal society takes something from each of its component ethnic groups to create a new culture ultimately shared by all. In contrast, the pluralist position prizes diversity and so holds that it is preferable for the various ethnic groups in a society to co-exist in a kind of "vegetable soup" (Babad, Birnbaum & Benne, 1983) such that each group maintains its own culture to the extent and in the ways that its members wish to do so. In part, these perspectives can be linked to divergent attitudes regarding the value of ethnicity itself. Fishman (1989) traces two such contrasting ideas historically: In the negative view ethnicity is considered to be disruptive, irrational and peripheral; in the opposite, positive view ethnicity is considered to be a healing and creative force as well as a source of individual and collective joy.

In considering ethnic dynamics in organizations, therefore, we must take into account a number of variables that in the past have tended not to be considered together. After discussing two major streams of relevant research and theory in the next section, I suggest

ways of linking them with each other and with additional factors that play a role in ethnic diversity.

CURRENT APPROACHES

Traditionally, the dynamics of intergroup relations in organizations have been thought about in ways that do not directly address the multi-faceted nature of ethnicity and ethnic diversity. In most analyses of intergroup dynamics ethnicity is included as simply one of many types of group-based differentiations that can impact on organizational behavior. Other analyses address primarily the cultural differences brought about by ethnic diversity without considering factors such as status differences, individual variation in cultural identity, and the impact of the organizational context. In general, the study of intergroup relations has been characterized by a focus on the negative repercussions of differences. Two major streams that have been predominant in the literature are discussed here. While both are important in understanding the dynamics of ethnic diversity, each by itself is incomplete. The first approach, the older and more developed of the two, focuses on the boundaries between ethnic groups and on the effects of ethnic categorization and identification. A major example of this type of work has been the study of intergroup prejudice and discrimination. The second approach, which has recently become more prominent, is concerned with intergroup differences in cultural features and with the resultant interpersonal barriers or conflicts. The study of intercultural communication is the foremost example of this perspective. I now turn to a more detailed exploration of each approach.

The Effects of Group Membership: Categorization and Labeling Approaches

This approach focuses on intergroup differentiation and its implications for attitudes and behavior. It highlights boundary formation, labeling, stereotyping and other individual and collective cognitive and affective processes involving social categories, but it does not usually make major distinctions between different types of social categories. The general assumption from this perspective has been that most types of intergroup differentiation tend to result in similar dynamics. In line with this view, researchers have looked at all kinds of groups in their empirical work, ranging from work groups composed of college students and created in the laboratory, to members of different teams, to ethnically- and racially-based groups.

The predominant work within this approach -- that stemming from the social cognition paradigm (Hamilton, 1981; Sherman, Judd, & Park, 1989) and from social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) -- assigns a central role to the social categorization process. The question has generally been: how does thinking about another person in terms of his or her group membership influence the way in which information about that person is processed and evaluated? And how does this affect behavior towards that person and subsequent attitudes towards his or her group? (For reviews, see Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Hamilton, Sherman & Ruvo-lo, 1990; Hamilton & Troler, 1986; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Messick & Mackie, 1989; Sherman, Judd, & Park, 1989; Tajfel, 1981, 1982; Wilder, 1986a, 1986b.) In general, the social cognition approach posits that evocation of a social category will trigger a mental representation consisting of stereotypes and/or prototypes of group members. When this happens, biases may result because information is then processed primarily in terms of the mental category and its associated features and affect (Fiske & Pavelchak, 1986). Social identity theory emphasizes the broader symbolic aspects of group boundaries and their role in maintaining group members' self-esteem, in addition to the cognitive functions of stereotypes. Findings from empirical work in these traditions have been applied to assessing the implications of heterogeneous membership in organizations for intergroup relations and to describing the barriers that exist for creating diversity in the first place (e.g., Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986; James & Khoo, in press; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987).

Implications of Categorization for Understanding and Changing Intergroup Relations. The categorization perspective has been heavily influenced by Sherif's (1966) view of intergroup behavior: "Whenever individuals belonging to one group interact, collectively or individually with another group or its members *in terms of their group identification*, we have an instance of intergroup behavior" (Sherif, 1966, p. 12; author's emphases). Research within this framework considers, first, the determinants of the salience of group boundaries, and second, the implications of such salience for in-group and out-group perceptions and evaluations. Such research has been guided by an important assumption derived from Sherif's definition of intergroup behavior. It is that intergroup behavior can vary in degree, so that some interactions will be less influenced than others by the interactants' group identifications.

This assumption has played a central role in investigations of intergroup contact. A great deal of social psychological research has

sought to identify the conditions under which encounters between members of different groups will result in positive interactions and perceptions, and in the reduction of prejudice and bias against the out-group (Ferdman, 1985; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Katz & Taylor, 1988; Miller & Brewer, 1984). Various formulations of the *contact hypothesis* (e.g., Allport, 1954; Amir, 1976; Cook, 1984) generally suggest that the most favorable conditions are those that involve equal status for the participants, cooperation in the pursuit of superordinate goals, and institutional norms supporting equality.

There is a rich body of literature that documents the profound effects of social categorization. We know that simply creating group boundaries or highlighting existing ones can have strong effects on the perceptions, evaluations, and judgments of both members of in-groups and out-groups. People see members of out-groups as more similar to one another (Allen & Wilder, 1975, 1979; Linville, Fischer, & Salovey, 1989; Linville, Salovey, & Fischer, 1986; Quattrone, 1986; Wilder, 1978a, 1978b, 1981), give them more negative evaluations (Brewer, 1979; Hewstone, Bond & Wan, 1983; Pettigrew, 1979; Tajfel, 1981), and think about them in more stereotyped terms (Howard & Rothbart, 1980; Rothbart, 1981; Rothbart & St. John, 1985) than in-group members.

These findings have led researchers to recommend ways of improving intergroup relations that seek to reduce or weaken the importance or relevance of category boundaries. Worchel (1986), for example, in a discussion of why cooperation works to reduce intergroup conflict, concludes that "any activity that reduces the salience of group boundaries will have an ameliorating effect on intergroup relations" (Worchel, 1986, p. 299). Brewer and Miller (1984, 1988; Miller & Brewer, 1986) adopt this view when they distinguish among three levels of differentiation of out-group members, which they associate with depth of processing and quality of interaction. They refer to these as (1) category-based (2) differentiated, and (3) personalized responding. Moreover, they see personalized interactions, in which the intergroup boundary is virtually eliminated, as the most likely to lead to positive perceptions and interactions. To improve interethnic relations, Brewer and Miller would promote interactions in which ethnic group memberships are not at all evident. Similarly, social identity theory implies that reduction in the salience of group boundaries should lead in-group members to develop more positive perceptions and evaluations of out-group members.²

Attributional studies in intergroup contexts (e.g., Duncan, 1976; Mann & Taylor, 1974; Sagar & Schofield, 1980; Stephan, 1977) have supported the notion that behavior is differentially ex-

plained and evaluated depending on the group memberships of the actor and the perceiver. These studies typically have found that people will make different attributions for the same behavior exhibited by an in-group and an out-group member (for reviews see Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Fletcher & Ward, 1987; Hewstone & Jaspars, 1982; Jaspars & Hewstone, 1982; Pettigrew, 1979; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987). The patterns of attributions are such that negative images of the out-group can be maintained. When desirable behaviors are exhibited, they will be ascribed to stable personality traits or dispositions if by in-group members, but to situational influences or atypical efforts if by out-group members. Conversely, when undesirable behaviors are displayed, out-group members will be seen to have behaved that way for internal reasons, and in-group members for external or situational reasons. Thus, this line of research also suggests that an increase in the salience of group boundaries will result in more negative evaluations of out-group members by the in-group.

Proposals that call for eliminating category boundaries, such as Brewer and Miller's (1984, 1988), are problematic when applied to ethnicity. These suggestions do not take sufficiently into account the importance to individuals of their ethnic identification. Brewer and Miller's approach implicitly assumes that categorizations are usually made more or less salient by the authorities in a situation, i.e., that they are externally imposed. In line with the same assumption, other researchers also have varied categorization by simply attaching labels to stimulus persons without accounting for their source. While some interethnic situations may fit this model, not all social identifications are self-evident. In reality, it is often the interactants in an interethnic encounter who choose whether to make their social identification salient. This is especially the case when ethnic identification is not readily apparent from visual, linguistic or other cues.

Regardless of the position advocated by the authorities in a given context, people engaged in an interethnic encounter may be motivated to highlight rather than hide their identities. Under certain conditions this can be a useful strategy for maintaining a positive social identity (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Taylor & McKirnan, 1984). Berry (1984, 1986; Sommerlad & Berry, 1970) has investigated what he calls *acculturation attitudes*, which express the value given by the individual to the maintenance of ethnic identity, and has found that both groups and individuals vary in this regard.

In this spirit, and building on social identity theory, Hewstone and Brown (1986) take issue with Brewer and Miller's model of decategorization, and propose instead that positive intergroup relations

will be enhanced by *mutual intergroup differentiation*. Hewstone and Brown advocate that in order to improve intergroup relations, people should both see their own group positively and hold positive views of out-groups. Because Hewstone and Brown's view is based primarily on the role they see social identity playing in maintaining individuals' self-esteem, however, it is not tied explicitly to the interethnic situation nor to variation in the self-presentational choices made by individuals. Moreover, Hewstone and Brown (1986) do not consider the implications of group differences in the salience given to ethnicity for these choices or for their model as a whole. Their model nevertheless does point to the active role of individuals in choosing how they are categorized in social settings. Even though perspectives based on social identity theory, such as Hewstone and Brown's, diverge from social cognition approaches on the issue of how feasible it is to get rid of ethnic category boundaries altogether, they ultimately share the view that positive intergroup relations should be based on a de-emphasis of the boundaries, especially to the extent these are tied to differential and ethnocentric evaluations of the groups or of their members.

Organizational Applications. Conceptual frameworks derived from categorization and labeling approaches together with the related empirical findings have been used by a number of authors to explain various aspects of ethnic dynamics in organizations. In general, such applications have tended to focus on the problems facing members of "marked" groups, such as Blacks or other minorities, and attempt to account for group-based differences in how people are treated in organizations. Pettigrew and Martin (1987) for example, describe the "triple jeopardy" that African Americans face as they are recruited, enter and seek promotion in organizations. These barriers, which include negative stereotypes, being the only Black in a work group, and attributions of tokenism, have serious implications for the type of evaluations, feedback and support Blacks are likely to receive at work.

Indeed, Pettigrew and Martin's (1987) analysis is bolstered by persistent evidence of negative experiences on the part of Black employees and managers in largely White organizations (Alderfer, Alderfer, Tucker & Tucker, 1980; Davis & Watson, 1982; Fernandez, 1975, 1982; Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley, 1990; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986; Jones, 1986; Kraiger & Ford, 1985; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley (1990), for example, investigated the relationship of race to the organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes of managers in three organizations, and found that, consistent with

Kraiger and Ford's (1985) meta-analysis, approximately 4 percent of the variance in job performance ratings (given predominantly by White managers in their study) could be explained by the rates' race. On the average, Blacks tended to be systematically rated lower than Whites, and these effects were not mediated by differential organizational experiences. These researchers also found that Blacks, as compared to Whites, were rated by their supervisors as less promotable, were less satisfied with their careers, and had more often reached a career plateau.

Research of this type has generally focused on the evaluation or the treatment of members of minority groups by members of the dominant group (e.g., Ilgen & Youtz, 1986) and so has not considered the range of possible interethnic interactions or ethnically-based dynamics. A major assumption in this kind of analysis has been that factors such as race should be irrelevant to treatment or outcomes; thus, any group differences become evidence of the presence of bias, prejudice or discrimination. Approaching the same issues from an ethnic diversity perspective would mean also considering the implications of variation in the number of groups and in their relative status. Similarly, the distinction between Black and White groups would be considered as only one type of ethnic differentiation that could be made, albeit a highly salient one.

Alderfer's approach (e.g., Alderfer, 1986), termed *intergroup theory* and focused primarily at the group and intergroup levels of analysis, varies somewhat from the other approaches discussed so far in that it permits consideration of various types of intergroup patterns, not just minority-majority ones. It also recognizes minority status as being relative and dependent on which social system is being analyzed. For example, Alderfer develops the concept of embedded intergroup relations (Alderfer, 1986; Alderfer & Smith, 1982), which recognizes that any intergroup relationship is affected by the intergroup relationships present in the "supra-system" in which it is embedded. On the basis of his research on race relations in organizations (e.g., Alderfer, Alderfer, Tucker & Tucker, 1980; Alderfer, Tucker, Morgan & Drasgow, 1983) as well as work with other types of groups, Alderfer posits that intergroup relations within a given setting cannot be considered in isolation. For example, we could not explain or predict the racial dynamics in a given department of an organization that had been completely integrated at all levels until we recognize the importance of what is happening outside the department. Inside the department, there are Black and White managers and employees, with all roles containing members of both groups. There are no Blacks present in upper management, however, nor in other key departments of the organization. More-

over, even though the department head is a Black woman, she reports to a White junior vice-president, unlike the other, White, department heads, who all report to a White senior vice-president. Even though within the department race seems to be irrelevant to which jobs people have, that this is not the case at upper management levels should have significant implications for understanding the intergroup relations within the "integrated" department of the organization.

Intergroup theory also would predict that identity group distinctions, such as ethnicity, will always be relevant in an organizational context. Thus, we cannot assume that they will simply be ignored; rather, we must take them into account in understanding and planning interactions. Nevertheless, Alderfer's approach can be considered part of a general categorization view in that he does not make specific distinctions on the basis of the type of group under consideration. As in social identity theory, the relevance of group distinctions is determined by their meaning in context.

Summary. In sum, the categorization approach focuses in a general way on the implications that labels and group memberships have for intergroup relations. Theory and research within this tradition point to the ways in which highlighting differences in identities can lead to negative intergroup behavior. Thus, the predominant recommendations for improving relations between members of different ethnic groups typically involve finding ways of de-emphasizing interethnic boundaries.

The Role of Group Differences: Intercultural Approaches

The second major stream of research and theory important for understanding ethnic dynamics in organizations has focused on culture and on between-group cultural differences. This approach, characteristic of the study of intercultural communication, highlights the nature and implications of actual group-based cultural differences and their role in intergroup interactions. There is a vast literature documenting the ways in which ethnic cultures vary in terms of their members' behaviors, values, and beliefs, but there has been less work focusing on the organizational consequences of these differences (Adler, 1983; Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991). Nevertheless, this area of investigation is a growing one, as it is clear that there are substantial implications of culture for the workplace.

Research on Cultural Differences. The five volumes of the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (Triandis & Brislin, 1980) contain

many reviews of cross-cultural research in various areas of psychology showing cultural diversity on a number of psychological processes. Similarly, journals such as the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* and the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* regularly publish empirical articles documenting the nature and implications of cultural differences. Kagitcibasi and Berry (1989) recently provided an overview of current research in cross-cultural psychology.

One important domain of cultural difference has to do with values and attitudes. For example, Triandis (1975) documented differences in the subjective cultures of American Blacks and Whites. Miller (1984) found that Americans and Hindus differed substantially in how they determined moral responsibility and thus in how they attributed individual behavior. She was able to rule out cognitive, experiential or information differences as explanatory factors and thus provided evidence for the primary importance of shared cultural meanings. Laurent (1983) showed that managers in different countries had widely divergent views of what constitutes an appropriate response in typical work situations and of the managerial role. Hofstede (1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984), in an influential large-scale international study of managers within the same multinational organization, found notable differences across countries on a number of work-related values. He discovered four major dimensions along which national value systems could be arrayed, terming these power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity. Typically, such differences in values are considered to underlie many of the observed differences in behavior (e.g., Stewart, 1976). Adler (1991), Bhagat and McQuaid (1982), Barrett and Bass (1976), Bass and Bartlett (1981) and Tannenbaum (1980) provide extensive reviews of literature documenting cross-cultural differences in organizational behavior, including socialization, motivation to work, supervisory attitudes and leadership styles, job satisfaction, and job design.

Cultures differ as well in the way their members behave in social interactions. Triandis (1977, 1989) reviewed cross-cultural research on interpersonal relations, and characterized the dimensions along which societies seem to differ (Triandis, 1987). Principal among these is the dimension of individualism/collectivism, along which he has documented ethnic differences in the United States (e.g., Marín & Triandis, 1985; Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990; Triandis, Marín, Hui, Lisansky & Ottati, 1984; Triandis, Marín, Lisansky & Betancourt, 1984). Hall (1959, 1966) described in detail the way in which the use of space and time vary as a function of culture. Hanna (1984) discusses the differences in non-verbal behav-

ior between American Blacks and Whites, and Poyatos (1983) concentrates his analysis of non-verbal communication on the implications of cultural differences.

Similarly, Barnlund and Araki (1985) document differences between Americans and Japanese in how the giving of compliments is managed, and Ramsey and Birk (1983) as well as Barnlund (1975) discuss Japanese-North American differences in communication styles. DeFrank, Matteson, Schweiger and Ivancevich (1985) give evidence for differences in management styles and behaviors between U.S. and Japanese CEO's, and Doktor (1990) describes how culture influences the ways in which U.S., Hong Kong Chinese, Japanese and Korean top executives organize and carry out their work. Hecht and Ribeau (1984; Collier, Ribeau & Hecht, 1986) found that Black, Hispanic and White students in the U.S. had divergent conceptions of what constitutes a satisfying conversation. Ting-Toomey (1986) reports Black-White differences in the handling of communication conflicts. Erickson (1979) showed that Blacks and Whites handled pauses in speech differently, in such a way that more communication breakdowns occurred in intergroup than in intragroup conversations. Finally, Henderson and Argyle (1986) studied the ways in which British, Italian, Japanese and Hong Kong Chinese people varied in their perceptions of the rules of employment relationships.

While the literature cited above is by no means exhaustive of research documenting differences in group-level cultural features, it suffices to highlight the ways in which culture is an important influence on individual values, beliefs and behaviors relevant to organizations. Because culture is a major aspect of ethnicity, it is reasonable to expect that it should play a significant role in the dynamics of ethnically diverse organizations. Most research documenting cultural variations has tended to do so, however, by comparing the features of homogeneous groups in different places. There has been much less work focusing on the nature and impact of cultural differences among members of different ethnic groups working in the same context (Adler, 1983; Adler, Doktor & Redding, 1986; Bhagat & McQuaid, 1982; Cox, Lobel & McLeod, 1991; Shaw, 1990). Nevertheless, if we are to shed light on the dynamics of ethnic diversity it is these questions that must be investigated.

Research on Intercultural Contact. Although these issues have not been studied extensively in the context of ethnically diverse workplaces, there is a growing literature that explores the nature and dynamics of intercultural contacts. In general, however, this work tends to concentrate on broadly-defined differences and contacts

taking place across national boundaries. Brislin (1981), for example, summarizes literature on face-to-face contacts between people of different cultural backgrounds, but focuses primarily on encounters involving individuals from different countries. Shaw (1990) presents a model that seeks to explain the interactions of expatriate managers and their host country subordinates. He bases his analysis on cognitive categorization perspectives, tracing the effects that cultural differences can have on how people in organizations think about their own and others' behavior and thus on both managers' and employees' perceptions of and behavior towards each other. Ferraro (1990) discusses extensively the implications of culture for international business interactions, including the ways in which differences in language, nonverbal communication behavior and values can affect people who work in more than one country. He does not, however, address within-country ethnic differences, and so makes generalizations about "U.S. culture" as a whole, as well as about the cultures of other countries. Similarly, Adler (1991), in discussing the multicultural workforce and multicultural teams, uses examples and cites research based primarily on between-country comparisons. Even though she briefly mentions *domestic multiculturalism*, her emphasis is on multinational organizations and international contacts. In these conceptualizations, group-level accounts of cultural features are the primary basis for understanding individual differences. In other words, the differences between people belonging to groups with varying cultures as well as the problems that arise in their interactions are generally traced to the group-level differences.

Implications of Cultural Diversity for Understanding and Changing Intergroup Relations. As this work nevertheless demonstrates, a focus on culture suggests a view of intergroup contact that is quite different from that of the categorization perspective. Psychologists who concentrate on the intercultural aspects of interpersonal relations (e.g., Adler, 1991; Bochner, 1982; Brislin, 1981; Triandis, 1972) emphasize the role of cultural differences in leading to misunderstandings. In this perspective, it is ignoring the differences in values, beliefs and behaviors that are present in an intercultural situation that can lead to misperceptions and negative views of the outgroup, as well as to strained interactions. To promote positive relations, those who adopt this perspective recommend approaches such as attribution training (e.g., Albert, 1983, 1986; Albert & Adamopoulos, 1976; Triandis, 1984) that teach people of one culture to interpret the behavior of someone from another culture in the same way as would other members of that same culture. The goal of most intercultural training (e.g., Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Brislin, 1986;

Brislin, Cushner, Cherrie & Yong, 1986, Brislin, Landis & Brandt, 1983; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983; Hughes-Weiner, 1986) is to improve the process and outcome of interethnic encounters by sensitizing people to the differences between their own and other cultures, and to the ways in which these differences affect perceptions and interactions. From this perspective the problem is not that differences are noted; indeed this is a solution. Rather, it is when differences are negatively valued that is considered to cause obstacles in interactions. Thus, the emphasis is on helping people to learn about the actual differences that exist between groups and to induce them to avoid viewing them negatively. If a White Anglo-Saxon Protestant, for example, can learn to understand how a Hispanic might behave in a particular situation, then their interaction might be facilitated because the WASP would then be able to interpret and evaluate the Hispanic's behavior appropriately.

To be sensitive to cultural differences and take them into account in formulating judgments of other people and in deciding how to behave in interactions with them, however, one must know that particular individuals are likely to show them. To know this, one must be acutely aware of the other person's ethnic identification and of its relevance to the current situation. Thus, an intercultural approach implicitly favors the recognition and highlighting of group boundaries. Ignoring ethnic group membership in an intercultural interaction is likely to lead to misunderstandings and negative perceptions, rather than to mutually satisfying interactions. An attributional model also suggests that if ethnic group membership is de-emphasized or is non-obvious, perceivers in intercultural situations are likely to explain and evaluate behavior -- and in particular behavior considered to be deviant -- using in-group norms. Indeed, in highly decategorized situations, this tendency is likely to be heightened.

In intercultural situations, however, precisely such "deviant" behaviors are more likely to occur. In organizational contexts, for example, majority group members should tend to behave appropriately to the extent that the organizational norms are similar to those of their own culture. Members of an ethnic minority group -- especially newcomers -- are more likely to deviate from these norms, and this deviation can often be traced to cultural differences (Brown, 1983; Davis & Watson, 1982; Ferdman & Cortes, 1991; Hofstede, 1980; Smith & Tayeb, 1987). In an organizational context in which majority group members work with individual members of relatively unknown groups, a cultural difference may be indistinguishable, practically speaking, from a norm violation, unless the ethnic background of these minority co-workers is made salient. A related organ-

izational implication of considering cultural differences has to do with the criteria used by an organization for evaluating job performance. Because these are likely to be rooted in the dominant ethnic group's culture, highlighting ethnic and cultural differences can help to make evident the degree to which seemingly "poor" performances by members of ethnic minorities often may actually be based on adherence to different assumptions regarding the criteria for success.

Summary. In sum, then, the intercultural approach seeks to discover the ways in which members of different groups vary in values, beliefs and behavior and the consequences of these cultural differences for intergroup interactions. This perspective emphasizes culture as a major construct for understanding both individual behavior and interethnic relationships, and points to the ways in which highlighting and training people to handle cultural differences can lead to more positive intergroup interactions. Thus, the principal recommendations of this approach for improving relations between members of different ethnic groups typically involve finding ways of sensitizing people to interethnic dissimilarities. In contrast to categorization approaches, which suggest diminishing the salience of ethnic boundaries, the intercultural perspective suggests highlighting ethnic boundaries and understanding ethnic differences.

Problems and Prospects for Conceptual Integration

Although both of the current approaches discussed here are clearly quite relevant for understanding the dynamics of ethnic diversity in organizations, each perspective presents important problems when applied to multi-ethnic contexts. These concerns are related to the complex nature of ethnicity discussed in an earlier section. In an ethnically heterogeneous society, in which there is a great deal of within-group diversity as well as between-group differences, neither of these approaches suffices, especially if the goal is the facilitation of interpersonal relationships.

Categorization Approaches. When applied specifically to ethnic distinctions, a major shortcoming of the categorization approach, as mentioned earlier, is that it has not addressed individual, group and situational differences in the importance of ethnic identities and in the source and degree of their salience. Research in this stream has tended to compare, for example, how members of two groups, such as Blacks and Whites, may be differentially evaluated by either in-group or out-group members. A less-examined question has been that of the effect of differences in the perception of members of a

single group as a function of the salience of the target's ethnic identity and/or its importance to the target. Exploration of this type of variable would address more directly the impact of within-group variations in degree of ethnic identification.

Ferdman (1987a, 1989a), in an experiment touching on this issue, investigated the effect of type of ethnic categorization information on evaluations of a Hispanic manager's behavior by his Anglo peers. Anglo managers rated a Hispanic manager they had observed in a number of situations, after being presented with introductory information about him that included job-related details combined with individuating facts only, combined with facts highlighting ethnic identity only, or combined with both types of facts. Highlighting information about the Hispanic manager's ethnicity resulted in higher ratings when combined with individuating information, and did not lower ratings when presented alone, suggesting that the effects of boundary salience in interethnic situations are not necessarily negative as predicted by the social cognition and social identity approaches. Ferdman's study also suggests that the effects of ethnic boundaries may depend to a large extent on contextual factors, such as the meaning of ethnicity in an organization or in the context of a specific judgment task. For example, ethnicity may be seen as relevant for some types of comparisons and not others. The interpretations perceivers make regarding this should influence their ultimate judgments and evaluations.³

As the intercultural approach makes abundantly evident, the categorization perspective generally ignores cultural and other between-group differences. Because of this, it assumes that any variation in response to members of different groups is indicative of some type of bias. Even though it may be true that individuals are in many ways unique and should be evaluated primarily on individual terms, this does not mean that there are not important group-level differences that extend to individuals. Culture is a prime example of this. Relatedly, recommendations based on the de-emphasis of ethnic categories ignore the value that these group differences carry for individuals. People who consider their ethnic and cultural identity as an important and central feature of their selves are unlikely to want to hide them in interethnic situations.

Intercultural Approaches. While intercultural approaches address some of the concerns raised by categorization views, they create other problems. The major one is the confounding of the individual and group levels. Earlier, it was pointed out that ethnic diversity implied within-group variation in the degree to which individuals fit with group-level characterizations. Because cultural features tend to

be assessed and defined at a group level, it is difficult to know the degree to which individuals in a multi-ethnic context are characteristic or typical members of the group. This may be the case especially when cultural generalizations developed in one type of context are applied to another (Ferdman & Cortes, 1991). For example, cultural patterns of behavior observed in the family environment may or may not be displayed in a work situation. The attitudes of Puerto Ricans in San Juan are not the same as those of Puerto Ricans on the mainland U.S. (e.g., Comas-Díaz, 1989). Thus, caution is called for in assuming that, just because one understands aspects of the culture of a particular ethnic group, one can therefore clearly understand and more effectively interact with specific individual members of that group. While sometimes this may be a useful working assumption, it can be problematic when group-level generalizations are automatically and uncritically applied to individuals. Ferdman and Cortes (1991), for example, found that Hispanic managers working in a largely Anglo business displayed only some of the cultural features which other researchers had previously attributed to Hispanics as a group. Moreover, the ways in which collective cultural patterns were manifested varied greatly across individuals and situations, such that the connections between individual behavior and these group-level cultural features were not clearly evident if one examined only isolated behavioral incidents.

The other side of the individual/group confound is that conclusions about group-level features are often based on comparisons between samples of convenience (Bhagat & McQuaid, 1982; Jones, 1990; Thomas, 1986), leaving unclear the extent to which they generalize to the ethnic categories as a whole and are based on cultural, rather than other, differences (Kagitcibasi & Berry, 1989). Researchers often compare samples of respondents in two or more countries and then assume that any variations found are due to cultural differences. Although some studies have used comparisons between factors to rule out other explanations,⁴ most do not do this, relying simply on the presence of intergroup differences as sufficient evidence of the cultural source of the variation. In any case, because of both idiosyncratic and systematic within-group variations in degree of adherence to group-level cultural features, caution is called for in making generalizations about a group's culture from small or unique samples.

Prospects for Integration. Beyond the problems specific to each approach discussed above, there are a number of additional factors that further complicate the picture. Foremost among these is the multifaceted nature of individual identity, such that ethnicity is only

one of many aspects of people's sense of who they are. Because researchers from both streams work primarily at a group level as it applies to individuals, they usually look at the impact of one identity at a time. Nevertheless, within individuals, the multiple components of identity will function in conjunction or in interaction with each other (e.g., Babad, Birnbaum, & Benne, 1983; Taylor & Dubé, 1986). What this means, for example, is that African American ethnicity will have different implications for Black women than for Black men (e.g., Reid, 1988; Takaki, 1987). Older Chinese can be expected to differ from young Chinese, but these age differences will not be the same among Hispanics, Greeks, or Italians. It will be the composite of an individual's many identities that will most likely be the primary influence in interpersonal relationships and in individual behavior, values and attitudes. Thus, to better understand both the individual and the interpersonal aspects of ethnic dynamics, we need to develop a clearer sense of how ethnicity interacts with other aspects of individual identity, including, for example, work roles. The construct of individual cultural identity, as developed by Ferdman (1990), is one example of an attempt to begin to conceptualize the ways in which group-level cultural features take on psychological reality for individuals.

The two approaches -- categorization and intercultural -- that were discussed lead to contradictory recommendations regarding how best to handle interethnic relations. While findings based on the categorization approach suggest the importance of minimizing ethnic boundaries, the intercultural perspective suggests highlighting them. Nevertheless, because both approaches consider significant parts of the picture, it is not possible to rule out one or the other. Each perspective addresses an important aspect of ethnicity and so involves a certain degree of appropriateness and utility. People care about their group memberships, and this leads to marked effects of categorization when explicit or implicit comparisons are made between ingroup and outgroup members. People also care about their culture, which serves as a guide to behavior and provides a way of perceiving the social environment, and this leads to rough spots when meetings occur across cultures.

The best prospect for integrating these approaches probably lies in finding ways to consider simultaneously both the individual and the group levels and the relationships between the two. For example, while group-level cultural differences exist, we need to know the degree to which they fit particular individuals. Similarly, the significance of group labels can vary as a function of the importance of ethnicity for individual interactants in particular situations. Thus, attempts to rule out one or the other approach are likely to fail.

The better strategy will be to explore the conditions under which each gives useful guidance for explaining defined aspects of organizational ethnic dynamics.

TOWARD MORE INTEGRATED AND COMPLEX APPROACHES

Ultimately, to devise more fully integrated approaches to ethnic dynamics in organizations we will need to go beyond the two perspectives discussed above to consider the complete range of complexity that ethnicity and ethnic diversity present. In this section, I discuss further the need for complexity and then mention a number of factors that should be addressed to begin to develop new ways of understanding ethnicity's impact on organizations.

The Need for Complexity

In a recent paper on theory building in the study of organizations, Gioia and Pitre (1990) argue for the need to engage multiple paradigms as we seek to better comprehend organizational phenomena. In trying to understand ethnic dynamics in organizations, it seems especially fundamental to heed their call. Explorations of ethnic dynamics are directly related to issues of social change. Such explorations tend to call into question traditional perspectives on organizational behavior (Alderfer & Thomas, 1988) and often raise the issue of "whose point of view" is being represented and of who is defining social "reality" (e.g., Calás, 1986). In this line of work, objectivity and subjectivity are very much in question (e.g., Alderfer, 1983, 1986; Alderfer & Thomas, 1988; Berg, 1984; Calás, 1986; Cox, 1990; Merton, 1972; Rose, 1990). Furthermore, the study of ethnic relations in organizations raises issues regarding the larger societal dynamics within which they take place (Ferdman, 1989b, 1990; Fishman, 1989). For these reasons, it would seem that progress in this area will be most likely to occur within a multiparadigm framework.

Thus, an important premise of this chapter is that there is not one correct way to understand the dynamics of ethnic diversity in organizations. If the goal is to permit the development of knowledge on which to base successful interventions, the most effective approach is likely to be one that is complex and that uses a variety of lenses so as to create a more complete picture. In organizations, developing such a comprehensive and inclusive picture requires simultaneously taking different types of variables and different levels

of analysis into account. As the preceding discussion of current approaches suggests, focusing on only one aspect is less likely to be ultimately fruitful.

To some extent, this is true of most phenomena in organizational behavior. Developing a thorough accounting for any type of organizational dynamic involves attending at once to different levels of analysis (Alderfer, 1986), different types of variables (e.g., Katz & Kahn, 1978; Levinson, 1972; Offerman & Gowing, 1990; Robbins, 1988; Schein, 1988), and different analytical perspectives (e.g., Morgan, 1986). In a recent special issue of the *American Psychologist* devoted to organizational psychology, Offerman and Gowing (1990) introduce the varied set of articles by pointing to the challenges that changes in the workplace and in the workforce generate for industrial and organizational psychologists. They suggest that an important feature of success for I/O psychologists will be the openness they have to interdisciplinary approaches to organizational problems.

Ethnicity adds yet another dimension to the usual complexity inherent in studying organizations. Interethnic relations can complicate the picture further. As described earlier, the psychology of ethnicity is such that it incorporates individual-, group-, and intergroup-level aspects. Thus, developing a complete picture means paying attention simultaneously to variables at each of these levels. Below, a number of such factors are discussed. This listing is not meant to be exhaustive; rather, it is intended as an illustration of the type of stretching that will be required in the future.

Ethnic vs. Minority/Majority Perspectives. Typically, research relevant to ethnic relations has tended to equate ethnicity and minority status. These two variables need to be unconfounded (Berry, 1985). An exclusive focus on minorities tends to ignore important cultural variations among groups with this status, and can confuse effects due to ethnic and cultural identity with those due to relative power and status.

It also will not suffice to consider how members of dominant ethnic groups treat members of minority ethnic groups. Perspectives that look at the experience of members of different ethnic minorities in the context of organizations can help to shed more light on how differences are handled and how minority status interacts with ethnic and cultural factors. This type of approach will also permit consideration of intragroup diversity in adherence to group-level cultural features, experiences in adapting to organizational demands, and ways of coping with pressures to assimilate culturally. Many theorists and researchers, in considering the impact of ethnicity on organ-

izational processes, tend to implicitly place ethnic majority group members in charge and so describe the effects of majority perceptions on minority outcomes. More complete perspectives on ethnic dynamics in heterogeneous organizations will consider the full range of possible role combinations.

Organizational Factors. There are a number of organizational processes and variables that can be considered in developing more fully integrated perspectives on ethnic dynamics. These include organizational socialization, organizational culture, and the organization's relationship to its environment on issues of ethnicity and ethnic diversity. Because individuals function in organizational roles, we might expect important interactions of these with ethnicity. As people are socialized into organizations, we can expect that they will differentially adapt into their roles as a function of the messages they receive about the value of their ethnic identity and culture. Organizations can vary substantially in this regard (e.g., Cox, 1991; Thomas, 1990). Through their structures or cultures, organizations convey clear social expectations regarding the role of ethnicity in the workplace. Some, through programs such as Affirmative Action, High Potential Advancement Programs, or diversity training, communicate that ethnic differences are to be valued and highlighted. Others implement procedures and structures that seek to ignore or occlude individual ethnicities (e.g., Schofield, 1986).

Similarly, organizations can have varying relationships to their external environments on the issues of ethnicity and ethnic diversity. For example, a multinational organization that is subject to legal and societal pressures to diversify its workforce in the United States may engage in outreach programs, affirmative action and intercultural training in that country. In its operations elsewhere, it may not have the same concerns and so can function very differently vis-à-vis its efforts to consider multiple perspectives and include a variety of ethnicities among its personnel.

The Societal Context. As suggested above, the organization's environment is important to consider. In what kind of society does the organization operate and what are the prevalent attitudes regarding ethnic diversity? These can vary in both time and place. As U.S. society evolves, for example, we can expect corresponding changes in the ethnic dynamics within organizations. Similarly, we would not expect the same ethnic dynamics to take place in Japan as in France, given different degrees of societal ethnic diversity, different roles for ethnicity and different approaches for handling differences. Also, whether or not the organization functions in more than one

society is an important factor. Adler (1991) discusses the implications of increasing globalization on the degree to which organizations will need to more directly consider the impact of cultural and ethnic variations. Organizations that operate in many countries should, by their nature, tend to incorporate a larger degree of such variations.

The Particular Ethnic Composition. What the particular ethnic mix is in the organization together with its significance in the broader society are also important variables. We should expect different dynamics in an organization that is 50 percent Black and 50 percent Jewish than in one that is 50 percent Black and 50 percent Italian. The significance for an organization that 10 percent of its managers are Hispanic will be quite different in Miami, with its large proportion of Hispanics in the population, than in Minneapolis, where there are very few Hispanic residents. Similarly, the historical roles of ethnic group members versus their actual roles should also have an impact on an organization's ethnic dynamics. To the extent that major shifts have occurred in ethnic balance within an organization, this should bear on its intergroup relations. For example, the experience and perceptions of the various ethnic groups will most likely be different in a largely White organization that in the past had a large proportion of Black women in janitorial roles, but now has a sizable number of Black women managers than in an organization that Black women are now entering for the first time at all hierarchical levels.

Values Regarding Diversity. Individuals and organizations vary in the value they assign to ethnic and cultural diversity. In part, these differences are related to divergent perspectives and ideologies on what is fairness and how differences should be handled in the context of work (Ferdman, 1988). For example, an emphasis on the merit principle suggests that people should be evaluated solely on the basis of some objective criterion of success or achievement. Acceptance of cultural diversity, however, highlights the ways in which such criteria are developed in the context of specific cultures, thus implicitly valuing some ethnic groups over others. These values can be expected to play a role in how organizations address ethnic differences and in how individuals interact with their co-workers.

CONCLUSION

Ethnicity and ethnic diversity present both challenges and opportunities for organizational psychology. As we seek to understand better and influence perhaps the dynamics of ethnically

diverse organizations, we will need to jointly consider and better integrate divergent and even contradictory analytic frameworks and perspectives based on different levels of analysis. Doing this successfully will require adopting paradoxical perspectives (e.g., Ferdman, 1989b; Smith & Berg, 1987), considering new and complex variables, and better reflecting the nature of ethnicity and ethnic diversity. In this chapter, I have argued that a focus on group boundaries or a focus on cultural differences is each insufficient by itself as a framework from which to understand organizational ethnic dynamics, because each approach ignores important facets of ethnicity and ethnic diversity. A more complete understanding of ethnic dynamics will be obtained when we can find ways to combine these perspectives as well as others only briefly described above. In attempting to integrate diverse theoretical and research paradigms, we must be careful, however, to remember that integration is not the same as homogenization. In the same way that ethnic diversity can result in pluralism, such that groups maintain their distinctiveness as they participate together in society's institutions, analytic approaches can be informed, modified, and expanded by contact with other views without losing their unique flavor and character. Nevertheless, it is likely that theory and research that are inclusive and broad will provide better and more useful reflections of the complexity of society's ethnic diversity.

NOTES

1. By instrumentality, Jones (1988) refers to the utility of the behavior in obtaining desired outcomes.
2. In contrast to Brewer and Miller's (1984) position, Tajfel and Turner's (1986) social identity theory, however, does not suggest that the salience of social categories such as ethnicity can be easily minimized to such an extent that they become invisible to the perceiver, although their impact on behavior in specific encounters may be reduced. In part, this is due to social identity theory's emphasis on the motivational, rather than the purely cognitive, foundations of in-group biases found in intergroup evaluations. According to social identity theory, people are motivated to enhance their self-esteem by evaluating their own group favorably in comparisons with other groups. In many situations, this will also lead people to highlight intergroup boundaries.
3. This type of contextual influence has been demonstrated in work by Gaertner and Dovidio (1986; Dovidio, Mann & Gaertner, 1989), who found that Whites often behaved differentially towards Blacks depending on their perceptions of how relevant race was believed to be in the situation.

4. Hofstede (1980), for example, showed that national culture accounted for the variations he found among managers in 40 different countries better than did position in the organization, gender, age or profession.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. J. (1983). Cross-cultural management research: The ostrich and the trend. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 226-32.
- Adler, N. J. (1991). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Kent.
- Adler, N. J., Doktor, R., & Redding, S. G. (1986). From the Atlantic to the Pacific century: Cross-cultural management reviewed. *Journal of Management*, 12, 295-318.
- Alba, R. D. (Ed.). (1988). *Ethnicity and race in the U.S.A.: Toward the twenty-first century*. New York: Routledge.
- Alba, R. D. (1990). *Ethnic identity: Transformation of white America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Albert, R. D. (1983). The intercultural sensitizer or culture assimilator: A cognitive approach. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training. Vol. 2: Issues in training methodology* (pp. 186-217). New York: Pergamon.
- Albert, R. D. (1986). Conceptual framework for the development and evaluation of cross-cultural orientation programs. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 197-213.
- Albert, R. D. & Adamopoulos, J. (1976). An attributional approach to culture learning: The culture assimilator. *Topics in Culture Learning*, 4, 53-60.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1983). Intergroup relations and organizations. In J. R. Hackman et al. (Eds.), *Perspectives on behavior in organizations* (2nd ed.) (pp. 408-16). New York: McGraw-Hill. (Reprinted from *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer 1980.)
- 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.
- Alderfer, C. P., Alderfer, C., Tucker, L., & Tucker, R. C. (1980). Diagnosing race relations in management. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 16, 135-66.
- Alderfer, C. P. & Smith, K. K. (1982). Studying intergroup relations embedded in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 35-65.
- Alderfer, C. P. & Thomas, D. A. (1988). The significance of race and ethnicity for understanding organizational behavior. In C. L. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology, 1988* (pp. 1-41). Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons.
- Alderfer, C. P., Tucker, R. C., Morgan, D. R., & Drasgow, F. (1983). Black and white cognitions of changing race relations in management. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 4, 105-36.
- Allen, V. L. & Wilder, D. A. (1975). Categorization, belief similarity and intergroup discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 971-77.
- Allen, V. L. & Wilder, D. A. (1979). Group categorization and attribution of belief similarity. *Small Group Behavior*, 10, 73-80.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Doubleday.
- Amir, Y. (1976). The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp. 245-308). New York: Pergamon.
- Babad, E. Y., Birnbaum, M., & Benne, K. D. (1983). *The social self: Group influences on personal identity*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bailey, J. (1989, Nov.). How to be different but equal: A new breed of consultant teaches companies to play fair with all their employees. *Savvy Woman*, pp. 47,50.
- Barnlund, D. C. (1975). *Public and private self in Japan and the United States: Communicative styles in two cultures*. Tokyo: Simul Press.
- Barnlund, D. C. & Araki, S. (1985). Intercultural encounters: The management of compliments by Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16, 9-26.
- Barrett, G. V. & Bass, B. (1976). Cross-cultural issues in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Barth, F. (Ed.). (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Bass, B. M. & Barrett, G. V. (1981). Cross-cultural issues in industrial and organizational psychology. In *People, work, and organizations*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bentley, G. C. (1981). *Ethnicity and nationality: A bibliographic guide*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- Berg, D. N. (1984). Objectivity and prejudice. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 27, 387-402.
- Berry, J. W. (1983). Acculturation: A comparative analysis of alternative forms. In R. Samuda & S. Woods (Ed.), *Perspectives in immigrant and minority education*. New York: University Press of America.
- Berry, J. W. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: Alternatives to segregation and their sociopsychological implications. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 11-27). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Berry, J. W. (1985). Cultural psychology and ethnic psychology, a comparative analysis. In I. R. Lagunes & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *From a different perspective: Studies of behavior across cultures* (pp. 3-15). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Berry, J. W. (1986). Multiculturalism and psychology in plural societies. In L. H. Ekstrand (Ed.), *Ethnic minorities and immigrants in a cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 35-51). Berwyn: Swets North America.
- Bhagat, R. S. & McQuaid, S. J. (1982). Role of subjective culture in organizations: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 653-85.
- Black, J. S. & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 113-36.
- Blanchard, F. A. & Crosby, F. J. (Eds.). (1989). *Affirmative action in perspective*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Bochner, S. (1982). The social psychology of cross-cultural relations. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction* (pp. 3-44). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Boeckstijn, C. (1988). Intercultural migration and the development of personal identity: The dilemma between identity maintenance and cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12, 83-105.
- Bond, M. H. (Ed.). (1987). *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Boyacigiller, N. & Adler, N. J. (1991). The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 262-90.
- Braddock, J. H. & McPartland, J. M. (1987). How minorities continue to be excluded from equal employment opportunities: Research on labor market and institutional barriers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 43, 5-39.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal group situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307-24.
- Brewer, M. B. & Kramer, R. M. (1985). The psychology of intergroup attitudes and behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36, 219-43.
- Brewer, M. B. & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281-302). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B. & Miller, N. (1988). Contact and cooperation: When do they work? In P. A. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Towards the elimination of racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 315-28). New York: Plenum Press.
- Brislin, R. W. (1981). *Cross-cultural encounters: Face-to-face interaction*. New York: Pergamon.
- Brislin, R. W. (1986). A culture general assimilator: Preparation for various types of sojourns. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 215-34.
- Brislin, R. W., Cushner, K., Cherrie, C., & Yong, M. (1986). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Brislin, R. W., Landis, D., & Brandt, M. E. (1983). Conceptualization of intercultural training and behavior. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training. Vol. 1: Issues in theory and design* (pp. 1-35). New York: Pergamon.
- Brown, L. D. (1983). *Managing conflict at organizational interfaces*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Buriel, R. (1987). Ethnic labeling and identity among Mexican Americans. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 134-52). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Business-Higher Education Forum. (1990). *Three realities: Minority life in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Calás, M. B. (1986, Aug.). An/other silent voice: Organization theory and research on Hispanic populations. In T. Cox, Jr. (Chair), *Research on race effects: What have we learned and where do we go from here?*. Symposium presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Cohen, R. (1978). Ethnicity: Problem and focus in anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 7, 379-403.

- Collier, M. J., Ribeau, S. A., & Hecht, M. L. (1986). Intracultural communication rules and outcomes within three domestic cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 439-57.
- Comas-Díaz, L. (1989). Puerto Rican women's cross-cultural transitions: Developmental and clinical implications. In C. T. Garcia Coll & M. L. Mattei (Eds.), *The psychosocial development of Puerto Rican women* (pp. 166-99). New York: Praeger.
- Cook, S. W. (1984). Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 155-85). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Cox, T., Jr. (1990). Problems with organizational research on race and ethnicity issues. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 26, 5-23.
- Cox, T., Jr. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(2), 34-47.
- Cox, T., Jr. & Blake, S. (1991, in press). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive*.
- Cox, T., Jr. & Nkomo, S. M. (1990). Invisible men and women: A status report on race as a variable in organization behavior research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 419-31.
- Crosby, F. & Clayton, S. (1990). Affirmative action and the issue of expectancies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(2), 61-79.
- Davis, G. & Watson, G. (1982). *Black life in corporate America: Swimming in the mainstream*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- DeFrank, R. S., Matteson, M. T., Schweiger, D. M., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1985). The impact of culture on the management practices of American and Japanese CEOs. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(4), 62-76.
- Deschamps, J.-C. (1982). Social identity and relations of power between groups. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 85-98). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Despres, L. A. (Ed.). (1975). *Ethnicity and resource competition in plural societies*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Despres, L. A. (1984). Ethnicity: What data and theory portend for plural societies. In D. Maybury-Lewis (Ed.), *The prospects for plural societies* (pp 7-29). Washington DC: American Ethnological Society.
- Doktor, R. H. (1990). Asian and American CEOs: A comparative study. *Organization Dynamics*, 18(3), 46-56.
- Dovidio, J. F., Mann, J., & Gaertner, S. L. (1989). Resistance to affirmative action: The implications of aversive racism. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *Affirmative action in perspective* (pp. 83-102). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Duncan, B. L. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of blacks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 590-98.
- Edwards, J. & Doucette, L. (1987). Ethnic salience, identity and symbolic ethnicity. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 19, 52-62.
- Erickson, F. (1979). Talking down: Some cultural sources of miscommunication in interracial interviews. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Nonverbal behavior: Applications and cultural implications*. New York: Academic Press.
- Feagin, J. R. (1989). *Racial and ethnic relations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1985). *Interethnic and intercultural relations: Re-examining the contact hypothesis*. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University, New Haven.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1987a). *Evaluating people in intercultural interactions*. Doctoral dissertation, Yale University, New Haven.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1987b, Aug.). *Person perception in interethnic situations*. Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York at Albany.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1988, Aug.). Values and fairness in the ethnically diverse workplace. In F. Crosby (Chair), *Emancipation, justice and affirmative action*. Symposium conducted at the 2nd International Conference on Social Justice and Societal Problems, University of Leiden, Netherlands.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1989a). Affirmative action and the challenge of the color-blind perspective. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *Affirmative action in perspective* (pp. 169-76). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1989b, May). *The paradox of fairness in the multiethnic workplace: Toward alternative visions*. Paper presented at the 15th Congress of the International Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research, Boston.
- Ferdman, B. M. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60, 181-204.
- Ferdman, B. M. & Cortes, A. C. (1991, in press). Culture and identity among Hispanic managers in an Anglo business. In S. B. Knouse, P. Rosenfeld, & A. Culbertson (Eds.), *Hispanics and work*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Ferdman, B. M. & Hakuta, K. (1985, Aug.). Group and individual bilingualism in an ethnic minority. In K. Hakuta & B. M. Ferdman (Chairs), *Bilingualism: Social psychological reflections*. Symposium presented at the American Psychological Association. Los Angeles.
- Fernandez, J. P. (1975). *Black managers in white corporations*. New York: Wiley.
- Fernandez, J. P. (1982). *Racism and sexism in corporate life: Changing values in American business*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Ferraro, G. P. (1990). *The cultural dimension of international business*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fishman, J. (1983). The rise and fall of the 'ethnic revival' in the USA. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 4 (3), 5-46.
- Fishman, J. A. (1989). *Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Fiske, S. T. & Pavelchak, M. A. (1986). Category-based versus piecemeal-based affective responses: Developments in schema-triggered affect. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior* (pp. 167-203). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fletcher, G. J. O. & Ward, C. (1987). Attribution theory and processes: A cross-cultural perspective. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology* (pp. 230-241). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gioia, D. A. & Pitre, E. (1990). Multiparadigm perspectives on theory building. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 584-602.
- Glasser, I. (1988). Affirmative action and the legacy of racial injustice. In P. A. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Towards the elimination of racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 341-57). New York: Plenum Press.
- Glazer, N. (1983). *Ethnic dilemmas: 1964-1982*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glazer, N. (1988). The future of preferential affirmative action. In P. A. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Towards the elimination of racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 329-39). New York: Plenum Press.
- Gleason, P. (1982). American identity and Americanization. In S. Thernstrom (Ed.), *Concepts of ethnicity (Dimensions of ethnicity: A series of selections from the Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups)* (pp. 57-143). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Gold, M. E. (1990). Setback for civil rights? A spring of discontent. *ILR Report*, 27(2), 3-18.
- Goode, S. (1989, Oct. 9). By the numbers: The politics of diversity at Berkeley. *Insight*, pp. 8-15.
- Graves, T. D. (1967). Psychological acculturation in a tri-ethnic community. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 23, 337-50.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 64-86.
- Gudykunst, W. B. & Hammer, M. R. (1983). Basic training design: Approaches to intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training. Vol. 1: Issues in theory and design* (pp. 118-54). New York: Pergamon.
- Hakuta, K., Ferdman, B. M., & Diaz, R. M. (1987). Bilingualism and cognitive development: Three perspectives. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in applied psycholinguistics. Vol. 2: Reading, writing and language learning* (pp. 284-319). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hamilton, D. L. (Ed.). (1981). *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup relations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hamilton, D. L., Sherman, S. J., & Ruvolo, C. M. (1990). Stereotype-based expectancies: Effects on information processing and social behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(2), 35-60.
- Hamilton, D. L. & Trolier, T. K. (1986). Stereotypes and stereotyping: An overview of the cognitive approach. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 127-63). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Hanna, J. L. (1984). Black/white nonverbal differences, dance, and dissonance: Implications for desegregation. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Nonverbal behavior: Perspectives, applications, intercultural insights* (pp. 373-409). Lewiston, NY: C.J. Hogrefe, Inc.
- Harvard Law Review. (1989). Rethinking *Weber*: The business response to affirmative action. *Harvard Law Review*, 102, 658-71.
- Hecht, M. L. & Ribeau, S. (1984). Ethnic communication: A comparative analysis of satisfying communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 8, 135-51.

- Heller, M. (1987). The role of language in the formation of ethnic identity. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 180-200). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Henderson, M. & Argyle, M. (1986). The informal rules of working relationships. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 7(4), 259-75.
- Herman, S. N. (1977). *Jewish identity: A social psychological perspective*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hewstone, M., Bond, M. H., & Wan, K. C. (1983). Social facts and social attributions: The explanation of intergroup differences in Hong Kong. *Social Cognition*, 2, 142-57.
- Hewstone, M. & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the 'contact hypothesis.' In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1-44). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hewstone, M. & Jaspars, J. (1982). Intergroup relations and attribution processes. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 99-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirschman, C. (1983). America's melting pot reconsidered. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 397-423.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's culture dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's value survey. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 417-33.
- Howard, J. & Rothbart, M. (1980). Social categorization and memory for ingroup and outgroup behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 301-10.
- Hughes-Weiner, G. (1986). The "learning how to learn" approach to cross-cultural orientation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 485-505.
- Ilgen, D. & Youtz, M. A. (1986). Factors affecting the evaluation and development of minorities in organizations. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 4, 304-37.
- Isajiw, W. W. (1974). Definitions of ethnicity. *Ethnicity*, 1, 111-24.
- James, K. & Khoo, G. (in press). Identity-related influences on the success of minority workers in primarily non-minority organizations. *Hispanic Journal of the Behavioral Sciences*.
- Jaspars, J. & Hewstone, M. (1982). Cross-cultural interaction, social attribution and inter-group relations. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction* (pp. 127-56). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Johnston, W. B. & Packer, A. H. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the twenty-first century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.
- Jones, E. W., Jr. (1986). Black managers: The dream deferred. *Harvard Business Review*, 64(3), 84-93.
- Jones, J. M. (1983). The concept of race in social psychology: From color to culture. In L. Wheeler & P. Shaver (Eds.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 117-49). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Jones, J. M. (1988). Racism in black and white: A bicultural model of reaction and evolution. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 117-35). New York: Plenum.
- Jones, J. M. (1990, Aug.). *Psychological models of race: What have they been and what should they be?* Invited master lecture at the 98th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston.
- Kagitcibasi, C. & Berry, J. W. (1989). Cross-cultural psychology: Recent research and trends. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40, 493-531.
- Kantrowitz, B. (1988, Mar. 7). A tenuous bond from 9 to 5. *Newsweek*, pp. 24-25.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Katz, J. H. (1989). The challenge of diversity. In C. Woolbright (Ed.), *Valuing diversity on campus: A multicultural approach* (pp. 1-21). Bloomington, IN: Association of College Unions - International.
- Katz, J. H. & Miller, F. A. (1988). Between monoculturalism and multiculturalism: Traps awaiting the organization. *OD Practitioner*, 20(3), 1-5.
- Katz, P. A. & Taylor, D. A. (Eds.). (1988). *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy*. New York: Plenum.
- Keefe, S. E. & Padilla, A. M. (1987). *Chicano ethnicity*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Keyes, C. F. (Ed.). (1981). *Ethnic change*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Kilborn, P. T. (1990a, Oct. 4). A company recasts itself to erase decades of bias (Affirmative action: How to make it work. A special report). *New York Times*, pp. A-1, D-21.
- Kilborn, P. T. (1990b, July 30). Labor dept. wants to take on job bias in the executive suite. *New York Times*, pp. A-1, A-10.

- Kleiman, L. S. & Faley, R. H. (1988). Voluntary affirmative action and preferential treatment: Some legal and research implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 481-96.
- Kochman, T. (1987). The ethnic component in Black language and culture. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 219-38). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kraiger, K. & Ford, J. K. (1985). A meta-analysis of race effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 56-65.
- Kroeber, A. L. & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions. *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University*, 47(whole no. 1).
- Laurent, A. (1983). The cultural diversity of Western conceptions of management. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 8(1/2), 75-96.
- Levinger, G. (Ed.). (1987). Black employment opportunities: Macro and micro perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues*, 43(whole no. 1).
- Levinson, H. (1972). *Organizational diagnosis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Linville, P. W., Fischer, G. W., & Salovey, P. (1989). Perceived distributions of the characteristics of in-group and out-group members: Empirical evidence and a computer simulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 165-88.
- Linville, P. W., Salovey, P. N., & Fischer, G. W. (1986). Stereotypes and perceived distributions of social characteristics: An application to ingroup-outgroup perception. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 165-208). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Mann, J. F. & Taylor, D. M. (1974). Attribution of causality: Role of ethnicity and social class. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 94, 3-13.
- Maraniss, D. (1990, Mar. 8). Firm makes racial revolution from top down. *Washington Post*, pp. A1, A-22.
- Marger, M. N. (1991). *Race and ethnic relations: American and global perspectives* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-53.
- Marín, G. & Triandis, H. C. (1985). Allocentrism as an important characteristic of the behavior of Latin Americans and Hispanics. In R. Guerrero (Ed.), *Cross-cultural and national studies in social psychology* (pp. 85-104). North Holland: Elsevier.
- McCready, W. C. (Ed.). (1983). *Culture, ethnicity and identity: Current issues in research*. New York: Academic Press.
- Merton, R. K. (1972). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 9-47.
- Messick, D. M. & Mackie, D. M. (1989). Intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40, 45-81.
- Miller, J. G. (1984). Culture and the development of everyday social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 961-78.
- Miller, N. & Brewer, M. B. (Eds.). (1984). *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Miller, N. & Brewer, M. B. (1986). Categorization effects on ingroup and outgroup perception. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 209-30). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Montero, M. (1987). A través del espejo: Una aproximación teórica al estudio de la conciencia social en América Latina. In M. Montero (Ed.), *Psicología política latinoamericana* (pp. 163-202). Caracas: Editorial Panapo.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Morrison, A. M. & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist*, 45, 200-208.
- Nacoste, R. W. (1989). Affirmative action and self evaluation. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *Affirmative action in perspective* (pp. 103-10). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Nalbadian, J. (1989). The U.S. Supreme Court's "consensus" on affirmative action. *Public Administration Review*, 49, 38-45.
- Offerman, L. R. & Gowing, M. K. (1990). Organizations of the future: Changes and challenges. *American Psychologist*, 45, 95-108.
- Petersen, W. (1982). Concepts of ethnicity. In S. Thernstrom (Ed.), *Concepts of ethnicity (Dimensions of ethnicity: A series of selections from the Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups)* (pp. 1-26). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Pettigrew, T. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 461-76.

- Pettigrew, T. F. (1988). Integration and pluralism. In P. A. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Towards the elimination of racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 19-30). New York: Plenum Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Martin, J. (1987). Shaping the organizational context for Black American inclusion. *Journal of Social Issues*, 43, 41-78.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 499-514.
- Poyatos, F. (1983). *New perspectives in nonverbal communication: Studies in cultural anthropology, social psychology, linguistics, literature and semiotics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Quattrone, G. A. (1986). On the perception of a group's variability. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.) (pp. 25-48). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Ramsey, S. & Birk, J. (1983). Preparation of North Americans for interaction with Japanese: Considerations of language and communication style. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training. Vol. 3: Area studies in intercultural training* (pp. 227-59). New York: Pergamon.
- Reid, P. T. (1988). Racism and sexism: Comparisons and conflicts. In P. A. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Towards the elimination of racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 203-21). New York: Plenum Press.
- Robbins, S. P. (1988). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rose, P. I. (1990). *They and we: Racial and ethnic relations in the United States* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rothbart, M. (1981). Memory processes and social beliefs. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup relations* (pp. 145-81). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rothbart, M. & St. John, O. P. (1985). Social categorization and behavioral episodes: A cognitive analysis of the effects of intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 81-104.
- Royce, A. P. (1982). *Ethnic identity: Strategies of diversity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sagar, H. A. & Schofield, J. W. (1980). Racial and behavioral cues in black and white children's perceptions of ambiguously aggressive acts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 590-98.
- Salamone, F. A. & Swanson, C. H. (1979). Identity and ethnicity: Ethnic groups and interactions in a multi-ethnic society. *Ethnic Groups*, 2, 167-83.
- Schein, E. H. (1988). *Process consultation. Vol. 1: Its role in organization development* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Schermerhorn, R. A. (1970). *Comparative ethnic relations: A framework for theory and research*. New York: Random House.
- Schmidt, P. (1988, Oct. 16). Women and minorities: Is industry ready. *New York Times*.
- Schofield, J. W. (1986). Causes and consequences of the colorblind perspective. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 231-53). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Shaw, J. B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 626-45.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sherman, S. J., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1989). Social cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40, 281-326.
- Simonson, R. & Walker, S. (Eds.). (1988). *Multicultural literacy: Opening the American mind*. Saint Paul: Graywolf Press.
- Smith, K. K. & Berg, D. N. (1987). *Paradoxes of group life: Understanding conflict, paralysis, and movement in group dynamics*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, P. B. & Tayeb, M. (1987). Organizational structure and processes. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology* (pp. 153-64). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sommerlad, E. A. & Berry, J. W. (1970). The role of ethnic identification in distinguishing between attitudes towards assimilation and integration of a minority racial group. *Human Relations*, 23, 23-29.
- Spickard, P. R. (1989). *Mixed blood: Inter marriage and ethnic identity in twentieth-century America*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- Stephan, W. (1977). Stereotyping: Role of ingroup-outgroup differences in causal attribution of behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 101, 255-66.
- Stewart, E. C. (1976). *American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective*. Washington DC: SIETAR/Intercultural Press.
- Sue, S. (1990, Aug.). *Ethnicity and culture in psychological research and practice*. Invited master lecture at the 98th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston.

- Tajfel, H. (1978). *The social psychology of minorities*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup relations. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Takaki, R. (Ed.). (1987). *From different shores: Perspectives on race and ethnicity in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tannenbaum, A. S. (1980). Organizational psychology. In H. C. Triandis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*. Vol. 5: *Social psychology* (pp. 281-334). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Taylor, D. M. & Dubé, L. (1986). Two faces of identity: The "I" and the "we." *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(2), 81-98.
- Taylor, D. M. & McKirnan, D. J. (1984). A five-stage model of intergroup relations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 291-300.
- Thomas, D. R. (1986). Culture and ethnicity: Maintaining the distinction. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 371-80.
- Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(2), 107-17.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1986). Conflict communication styles in black and white subjective cultures. In Y. Y. Kim (Ed.), *Interethnic communication: Current research* (International and Intercultural Communication Annual, Vol. X) (pp. 75-88). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Triandis, H. C. (1975). Culture training, cognitive complexity, and interpersonal attitudes. In R. Brislin, S. Bochner, & W. Lonner (Eds.), *Cross-cultural perspectives on learning* (pp. 39-77). Beverly Hills CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1977). Cross-cultural social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 143-58.
- Triandis, H. C. (1984). A theoretical framework for the more efficient construction of culture assimilators. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 8, 301-30.
- Triandis, H. C. (1987). Cross-cultural contributions to theory in social psychology. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology* (pp. 122-40). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1988). The future of pluralism revisited. In P. A. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Towards the elimination of racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 31-50). New York: Plenum Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-20.
- Triandis, H. C. & Brislin, R. W. (Eds.). (1980). *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Triandis, H. C., Marín, G., Hui, C. H., Lisansky, J., & Ottati, V. (1984). Role perceptions of Hispanic young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 297-320.
- Triandis, H. C., Marín, G., Lisansky, J., & Betancourt, H. (1984). *Simpatía* as a cultural script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 1363-75.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1006-20.
- Tully, S. (1990, May 21). The hunt for the global manager. *Fortune*, 121(11), 140-44.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (1988). *Opportunity 2000: Creative affirmative action strategies for a changing workforce*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Van denBerghe, P. (1977). *Race and racism*. New York: Wiley.
- Wilder, D. A. (1978a). Homogeneity of jurors: The majority's influence depends upon their perceived independence. *Law and Human Behavior*, 2, 363-76.
- Wilder, D. A. (1978b). Perceiving persons as a group: Effects on attributions of causality and beliefs. *Social Psychology*, 1, 13-23.
- Wilder, D. A. (1981). Perceiving persons as a group: Categorization and intergroup relations. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup relations* (pp. 213-57). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wilder, D. A. (1986a). Cognitive factors affecting the success of intergroup contact. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.) (pp. 49-66). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Wilder, D. A. (1986b). Social categorization: Implications for creation and reduction of intergroup bias. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 291-355.

- Williams, R. E. (1990). The Supreme Court's 1989 employment decisions -- civil rights and illusions of Armageddon. *ILR Report*, 27(2), 19-26.
- Worchel, S. (1986). The role of cooperation in reducing intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.) (pp. 288-304). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Yancey, W. L., Ericksen, E. P., & Juliani, R. N. (1976). Emergent ethnicity: A review and reformulation. *American Sociological Review*, 41, 391-403.
- Zenner, W. P. (1988). Common ethnicity and separate identities: Interaction between Jewish immigrant groups. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Cross-cultural adaptation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.