

Chapter 8

Which Matters More? Effects of Surface- and Deep- Level Diversity on Team Processes and Performance

Mai P. Trinh

Case Western Reserve University, USA

ABSTRACT

This chapter reviews what we know about the effects of surface-level diversity (age, sex, and ethnicity) and deep-level diversity (personality characteristics such as conscientiousness, openness to experience, extraversion, emotional stability, and agreeableness) in organizational teams. It also outlines challenges to today's diversity management and Human Resource (HR) practices, such as the lack of definite conclusions from research results, the mismatch between team diversity research designs and organizations' needs, and the lack of research examining simultaneously different aspects of diversity. Drawing from analysis results of team data from 55 teams of volunteers from Shanghai, the author recommends that HR training and selection take specific team contexts into account and increase attention on functions that support important team processes such as communication and mutual support among team members.

INTRODUCTION

Managing workforce diversity is one of the most important tasks and challenges for today's organizations. Managers constantly face the questions of how to utilize diversity as a positive driving force within the organization, and how to resolve potential conflicts it may bring. As the nature of work shifted from being done by individuals to self-managing teams, managers and human resource (HR) professionals have increased attention to managing team diversity. At the same time, an extensive body of research has also been devoted to the various aspects of diversity, or heterogeneity, and their implied effects on team processes and performance (Bell, Villado, Lukasik, Belau, & Briggs, 2011; Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003; Joshi & Roh, 2009; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). On the one hand, research has found that teams with diverse talents positively contribute to team performance due to their different points

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-1933-1.ch008

Which Matters More?

of view, expertise, and experience (Cox & Blake, 1991; Hoffman & Maier, 1961). On the other hand, it has also been shown that heterogeneity in teams can provoke conflict, reduce communication, and result in dissolution (Chatman, 1989; Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Frustrated by these contradicting results, research has been conducted on the effects of multiple aspects of diversity on team process and performance variables (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Mohammed & Angell, 2004). Organizational scholars have also refined their theories and analyses based on the results of recent meta-analytic studies (Bell et al., 2011; Harrison & Klein, 2007; Milliken & Martins, 1996; Van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998).

One reason for this far-from-conclusive state of the art is that researchers have taken different, and separate, approaches to study different kinds of diversity variables. Some come from the similarity/attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971), some use social categorization theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), while others utilize the information-processing/decision-making perspectives (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Jehn et al., 1999; Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin, 1999). Consequently, some meta-analytic studies have not been very successful identifying the links between diversity and performance, not to mention the different weights of different types of diversity (Bowers, Pharmer, & Salas, 2000; Horwitz & Horwitz, 2007; Webber & Donahue, 2001). A growing trend of research attempts at simultaneously studying the effects of different types of diversity; however, these efforts have been limited within student teams and their semester projects (Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey, 2002; Mohammed & Angell, 2004) or lab studies (Phillips & Loyd, 2006; Phillips, Northcraft, & Neale, 2006).

This chapter reviews what we know about diversity management in work teams as well as some challenges still present within team diversity research and HR practices pertaining to how to effectively manage and utilize the diversity pool in work teams. Recommendations for practice and future research directions are discussed. Before we begin, it is important to note that research in diversity “has mainly been conducted in and influenced by a single cultural paradigm” (Jonsen, Maznevski, & Schneider, 2011, p. 37). As explained below, the history and development of diversity research are closely related to social diversity movements in the United States, hence much of our existing knowledge about diversity is limited to the U.S. culture.

BACKGROUND

What is diversity? It refers to “differences between individuals on any attribute that may lead to the perception that another person is different from self” (Van Knippenberg et al., 2004, p. 1008). More specifically, workforce diversity is “the composition of work units (work group, organization, occupation, establishment or firm) in terms of the cultural or demographic characteristics that are salient and symbolically meaningful in the relationships among group members” (DiTomaso, Post, & Parks-Yancy, 2007, p. 474). Diversity management in organizations refers to “a set of managerial actions aimed at either increasing diversity, and/or promoting amicable, productive working relationships” (Jonsen et al., 2011, p. 36).

Diversity management practice originated in North America (Özbilgin & Tatli, 2008), where it was rooted in the passage of the Civil Rights Act and the anti-discrimination movement of the 1960s (Ashkanasy, Härtel, & Daus, 2002). Early diversity research, from the 1960s to the 1980s, focused on whether there was bias and discrimination in important human resource functions, such as selection, training, performance evaluations, and promotions (Shore et al., 2009). Parallel to this research stream was the

25 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/which-matters-more/182086

Related Content

Deconstructing Cultural Stereotypes to Improve International Students' Interculturality: A Short-term Experimental Approach in a Malaysian Pre-France Programme

Regis Machartand Atafia Azzouz (2016). *International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education* (pp. 39-52).

www.irma-international.org/article/deconstructing-cultural-stereotypes-to-improve-international-students-interculturality/156497

Nurturing and Empowering of Women in Leadership Positions: A Study With Special Reference to the Indian Subcontinent

Oindrila Chakraborty (2023). *Stabilizing and Empowering Women in Higher Education: Realigning, Recentering, and Rebuilding* (pp. 161-192).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/nurturing-and-empowering-of-women-in-leadership-positions/331682

Describing Undergraduate Students' Intercultural Learning through Study Abroad in Terms of Their 'Cultural Responsiveness'

Susan Oguroand Angela Giovanangeli (2016). *International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education* (pp. 29-38).

www.irma-international.org/article/describing-undergraduate-students-intercultural-learning-through-study-abroad-in-terms-of-their-cultural-responsiveness/156496

"Most of the Teaching is in Arabic Anyway", English as a Medium of Instruction in Saudi Arabia, Between De Facto and Official Language Policy

Ismael Louberand Salah Troudi (2019). *International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education* (pp. 59-73).

www.irma-international.org/article/most-of-the-teaching-is-in-arabic-anyway-english-as-a-medium-of-instruction-in-saudi-arabia-between-de-facto-and-official-language-policy/231474

Racial Disproportionalities in Discipline: The Role of Zero Tolerance Policies

F. Chris Curran (2017). *Discrimination and Diversity: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1251-1266).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/racial-disproportionalities-in-discipline/182138