

## **Towards a Multicultural World: Identifying Work Systems, Practices and Employee Attitudes that Embrace Diversity**

by

**Charmine E.J. Härtel †**

### ***Abstract:***

*The research program described focuses on identifying the role of organisational culture, as reflected in workplace systems and practices, and employee and group attitudes in the outcomes of interactions among dissimilar parties. A systematic, theory-testing approach underlies the program, which aims to both develop and validate the diversity openness construct. The Perceived Dissimilarity-Openness Moderator Model developed from the research asserts that the affective, cognitive and behavioural consequences of diversity depend in part upon the perception of difference and subsequent quality and magnitude of the response to the perceived dissimilarity. When individuals or social systems (groups or organisations) are diversity-closed, outcomes are predicted to be less positive than when they are diversity-open.*

### ***Keywords:***

*DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT, WORKPLACE DIVERSITY, DIVERSITY OPENNESS, OPENNESS TO PERCEIVED DISSIMILARITY, CROSS-CULTURAL INTERACTION SKILLS, STEREOTYPES.*

† Centre for Business Research, Faculty of Business and Law, Deakin University, 336 Glenferrie Road, Malvern, VIC 3144. Email: [charmine.hartel@deakin.edu.au](mailto:charmine.hartel@deakin.edu.au)

The research program described herein has been carried forward not only by my own passion but also by the passion of my research students: Dennis Appo, Oluremi Ayoko, Sunita Barker, Shane Douthitt, Greg Fisher, Yuka Fujimoto, Shannon Lloyd, Debra Panipucci, Alberto Ramirez, Nasreen Sultana, Ken Tan, Raymond Trau, and Rick Trumble. Thanks also goes to the funding support provided for parts of the program by Monash University grants (2001) and an Australian Research Council grant (1999).

*Australian Journal of Management, Vol. 29, No. 2 December 2004, © The Australian Graduate School of Management*

## 1. Introduction

The concern with diversity management is not new, but the contemporary approach to it is. This article describes a diversity research program aimed at identifying the work systems, practices and employee attitudes that embrace diversity.

## 2. Diversity and Australia

Australian society is becoming multicultural at an exponential rate due to the increasing migrant population and their descendents (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1999; Wilkinson & Cheng 1999). For organisations, this means that their marketshare, efficiency, human capital, international competitiveness, and level of innovation will depend in part upon their ability to effectively manage a diverse workforce both within and across organisational boundaries (Barker & Härtel 2004; Dass & Parker 1996; Kandola, Fullerton & Ahmed 1995; Industry Task Force Leadership and Management Skills 1995; Strauss & Mang 1999; Williams & Bauer 1994). Unfortunately, available research offers organisations little information upon which management practices for diverse workforces and customer bases can be formulated (cf. Pelled, Eisenhardt & Xin 1999). Furthermore, the available literature paints conflicting pictures of the impact of diversity on business interactions, with some studies finding positive effects and others finding negative effects (cf. Chatman, Polzer, Barsade & Neale 1998; Härtel & Fujimoto 1999; Milliken, & Martins 1996). So little is known about the employee and organisational characteristics that explain these different outcomes that Lawrence (1997) described the literature as replete with 'black box studies'. The research program described is aimed at demystifying the 'black box'.

## 3. Diversity Research Program

Diversity openness refers to the degree of receptivity to perceived dissimilarity. An individual, work group or organisation that is diversity-open is unprejudiced and willing to consider new ideas and arguments and is, in essence, receptive to ideas outside their normal way of thinking. Being closed to diversity, therefore, means that an individual, work group or organisation has already decided with respect to diverse others prior to interactions. Diversity openness, therefore, is a generic attitude to difference, where the level of openness and the type of perceived difference varies as a function of the person.

Diversity openness refers to embracing difference. In order to realise the full potential diversity offers to organisations, steps need to be taken to reduce possible negative affective and behavioural reactions to difference (Maznevski 1994). Individuals and groups need to overcome stereotypes or prejudices and recognise that actual dissimilar others have unique and valuable information that can support group processes and performance. Openness to perceived dissimilarity describes the receptivity to perceived dissimilarity of individual, group or organisations.

Diversity openness refers to a tolerance of difference. Racial issues are more openly discussed among Anglo-Saxons in Britain, South Africa and the U.S. than in Australia (Australian Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs 2000).

Partly because of Anglo-Australians' belief that they are tolerant to dissimilar races and that racism does not exist in Australia (James & Heathcote 2002).

Ely and Thomas (2001) conducted a qualitative study to examine whether different perspectives of the concept of diversity impact on the organisation's performance and employee satisfaction and identification with their social group. They found three underlying views of diversity: integration and learning, access and legitimacy or discrimination and fairness. Each of these views 'governed how members of work groups created and responded to diversity' (p. 239). These are, in essence, levels of diversity openness. At the open end, individuals perceive difference as valuable and they are eager to integrate and learn from each other. As the individual becomes less open to the difference they perceive, they see less value in the diversity and lean more towards a moral obligation to provide access to those different. As the individual moves further away from being open to diversity, he or she sees little value in difference and more of an obligation to not appear prejudiced.

The research program has underscored that the existence of diversity itself is not the problem in organisations, for we all differ from one and another on various levels, be that age, behaviour, personality or some other characteristic (Härtel & Fujimoto 2000). However, what does make a difference is our level of openness to the difference we perceive. The level of openness to the perception of difference, therefore, varies as a function of the perceiver.

Past studies show inconsistent results in regards to the effects of diversity. Some researchers have found positive effects such as greater range of perspectives (Watson, Kumar & Michaelsen 1993), higher quality solutions (McLeod & Lobel 1992) and higher profitability (Ng & Tung 1998) of diverse teams. Others, however, have found negative effects of diverse teams, such as lower cohesion and trust (Härtel & Fujimoto 1999; O'Reilly III, Caldwell & Barnett 1989), higher absenteeism (Härtel & Fujimoto 1999; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly III 1992), lower commitment (Härtel & Fujimoto 1999; Tsui et al. 1992), and higher dissatisfaction and turnover (Härtel & Fujimoto 1999; O'Reilly III et al. 1989; Shaw & Barrett-Power 1998). With the exception of Härtel and Fujimoto (1999), these studies fail to acknowledge that it is not the existence of diversity that creates these effects, but rather, how the individuals react to the perception of diversity. My research program is driven by the proposition that the way in which people react to diversity is determined by their level of openness and receptivity to different people with different physical characteristics, ideas, values and beliefs.

#### **4. A Climate of Diversity Openness**

Organisational culture plays an important role in an employee's level of diversity openness as it both shapes the meanings and actions of its members (Ashkanasy, Wilderom & Peterson 2000) as well as being shaped by its members, through their interpersonal relationships at work (Ancona, Kochan, Scully, Van Maanen & Westney 1999). The learned common assumptions underlying an organisation's culture, are 'the ultimate causal determinant of feelings, attitudes, espoused values and overt behaviour' (Schein 1990 p. 111). Thus, culture impacts on perception (Fisher & Härtel 2004) and the nature of prejudice differs across cultures (Fujimoto & Härtel 2004). Consequently, a culture where employees' human needs for

affiliation and identity are met, and provides a sense of psychological safety, will encourage a positive, healthy organisation where the organisation and its members flourish and thrive (Pizer & Härtel 2004). Despite this importance of organisational culture, Schein (1996) noted that previous research has acknowledged the existence of group norms but overlooked the influence of norms across the wider social units such as the organisation. Yet, behind such group norms are the underlying, taken-for-granted assumptions held by members of the culture (Schein 1996). Culture only exists if people give power to the common assumptions and deviation is minimal.

Organisations differ in their culture including how they view dissimilarity within the organisation. Organisational stories, symbols, and practices signal to organisational members how actual dissimilarity in its membership will be viewed. Traditionally, diverse people were expected to assimilate to the existing culture. Assimilation, though, is having a pre-defined idea of what the culture should be and is thus, closed to diversity. Therefore, organisations that expect assimilation to the dominant, existing culture, are not open to diversity. 'The traditional American image of diversity has been one of assimilation... [where migrants must] sacrifice their cultural identities to get ahead' (Bateman & Zeithaml 1993, p. 377) In contrast, organisations whose mission statements assert their will to value diversity, whose performance appraisal systems reward managers who uphold this value, and whose top management teams appear diverse are likely to be perceived by employees and outsiders as open to perceived dissimilarity. When an organisation's culture is perceived as diversity open, it is expected to influence the behaviour, emotions and cognitions of organisational members at the individual and group levels. High openness to perceived dissimilarity is associated with the use of the broad range of perspectives and ideas available in an organisation, which in turn, leads to higher quality decision making processes and innovative outcomes (as in Ely & Thomas' (2001) integration and learning diversity perspective). Fujimoto, Härtel and Panipucci (2004) found that organisations with diversity oriented HR policies and procedures showed lower levels of prejudice. In contrast, low openness to perceived dissimilarity is expected to lead to the discouragement of minorities to exercise their actual abilities (as in Ely & Thomas' (2001) access and legitimacy or discrimination and fairness perspectives).

In summary, the concept of diversity openness or dissimilarity openness describes how individuals, groups or organisations deal with dissimilarity (Härtel, Douthitt, Härtel & Douthitt 1999; Härtel & Fujimoto 1999; Härtel & Trumble 1997). At the dissimilarity openness end of the continuum, difference is viewed positively and as an opportunity for learning. People or systems low in dissimilarity openness, on the other hand, are closed to dissimilar points of view and resist alternative perspectives (Härtel & Fujimoto 2000). One of the key contributions of this approach to the diversity issue is the explicit message that it is not the presence of the diversity itself that determines the effects of the diversity within an organisation but, rather, the level of openness to dissimilarity characteristic of the organisation's members, work groups and culture (Härtel & Fujimoto 2000).

## 5. The Perceived Dissimilarity-Openness Moderator Model

The basic assertion of the resulting Perceived Dissimilarity-Openness Moderator Model (Härtel & Fujimoto 1999) is that diversity influences workgroup processes and outcomes through perceptions of dissimilarity. The quality and magnitude of the response to perceived dissimilarity is asserted to depend on the openness to diversity of the organisation, the group, and the individuals in the group. When the social system is generally diversity-closed, group processes are expected to be more problematic and outcomes less positive than when the social system is generally diversity-open. The primary contribution of the model is its proposal that diversity only has a negative effect in work interactions when two conditions are met (Härtel & Fujimoto 2000), namely, that there is a perception of dissimilarity and that there is closedness to the perceived dissimilarity. The potential of diversity in a workgroup, on the other hand, will be realised when openness characterises interactions. The identification of diversity openness as a determinant of the reactions to perceived dissimilarity offered one of the first explanations for the mixed effects of diversity reported in the literature (see Milliken & Martins 1996, for a review).

The Perceived Dissimilarity-Openness Moderator Model (PDOMM) differs from other explanations of diversity effects in organisations in that it offers an explanation of the processes leading to positive or negative affective (e.g. liking or disliking), cognitive (e.g. stereotyping) and behavioural (e.g. bullying or favouritism) reactions to diversity. This approach to the diversity question was developed drawing upon the similarity-attraction paradigm, social identity theory, self-categorization theory and prejudice theory (Fujimoto, Härtel, Härtel, & Baker 2000; Härtel, Douthitt, Härtel, & Douthitt 1999; Härtel & Fujimoto 2000). Due to space constraints only the key contributions of these theories to the model are outlined here (See Härtel & Fujimoto 1999 for a full discussion of PDOMM).

Self-categorisation theory states that people tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories (Turner & Oakes 1989) based on observable differences. The similarity attraction paradigm describes the human inclination to be attracted to those who hold similar attitudes and opinions and thus, to those in one's social category, which leads to the negative affect and exclusion of actual dissimilar others who are perceived as dissimilar (Byrne 1971; Elsass & Graves 1997). The in-group out-group distinction activates negative stereotypes and prejudices that cause group members to make biased attributions about other members (Jackson, Stone & Alvarez 1993). Social identity theory states that these prejudices result from the need for a positive social identity with an in-group (Tajfel 1981). However, people vary in their extent of prejudice, with the non-prejudiced consciously overriding their negative stereotypes with their internalised principles of justice (Ashby Plant & Devine 1998, p. 813; Ashmore & Lee 1997). Social influence can also motivate individuals to avoid in-group out-group classifications and to be open to diversity (Dunton & Fazio 1997). Thus, organisational culture reflected in work systems and practices can be open or closed to dissimilarity, which would be expected to affect group and individual orientations to diversity. The openness to perceived dissimilarity construct incorporates these notions and thus is measured on a continuum ranging from dissimilarity closedness to dissimilarity openness with respect to the level of interest (i.e. individual, group or organisational).

The research program described here is continually working towards conceptualising and measuring the construct of diversity openness. To date, empirical support for the Perceived Dissimilarity Openness Moderator Model has been demonstrated in a variety of work contexts including newly formed workgroups, in longstanding workgroups (Ayoko & Härtel 2002; Fujimoto, Härtel, Härtel & Baker 2000; Fujimoto & Härtel 2000), in performance appraisal situations (Härtel, Douthitt, Härtel, & Douthitt 1999), in cross-cultural business interactions (Fisher, Härtel & Bibo 2000), in inter-cultural service encounters (Barker & Härtel 1999; Ramirez & Härtel 2001), in salary negotiations (Kaman & Härtel 1994), in comparative studies of women differing on immigrant/native status and skin colour (Sultana & Härtel 1999), in experiences of gay men (Trau & Härtel 2002) and in work systems and practices (Fujimoto & Härtel 2002). For purposes of triangulation and developing a holistic picture, a diverse range of methodological techniques have been incorporated in the research program including participant observation, 360° structured interviews, soft- and hard-copy surveys, secondary data (e.g. HR policies, formal mission statements, annual reports), expert judges and behavioural checklists. The following study provides an example of the incorporation of the diversity openness construct in examining HRM policies and practices of organisations (Fujimoto & Härtel 2002).

### *5.1. Study*

In this study, it was proposed that HRM policies and practices that foster openness to both culture and dissimilarity shape employee attitudes and behaviours and reinforce a diversity open organisational culture (Härtel & Fujimoto 1999; Kossek & Lobel 1996), which is expected to reduce prejudice levels and, in turn, improve key outcomes for the individual and the organisation (Härtel & Fujimoto 1999).

Before empirically testing an application of the model at the organisational level, it was necessary to identify a scoring system that would enable independent judges to rate the extent to which an organisation's HR policies and practices are diversity oriented.

### *5.2 Developing a Base for the Scoring System*

Fifty structured interviews by phone and face-to-face with persons representing different stakeholder perspectives (e.g. HR managers, union representatives, equity officers, diversity trainers and consultants, and members of ICI groups) were obtained. Additionally, documentation of company HR strategy and policies were collected to obtain the formal view of diversity in the organisation, over and above that which was described by the participants.

### *5.3 Developing the Scoring System*

After interviews were transcribed and abstracted onto 347 cards, two stages of unforced Q-sort methodology were used. In the first stage, five diversity experts were asked to sort the cards into self-nominated categories without any foreknowledge of the research objectives. In the second stage, 99 cards representing the categories identified in stage one were converted into survey format. Thirty-two different participants rated each of the items on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 'very diversity closed' to 'very diversity open'. Five

academic experts in diversity were recruited based on their extensive involvement in diversity management issues. They were asked first to specify a few key themes of diversity openness to constructively narrow down the number of sampled cards. In the second stage of the Q-sort, twenty-six university students (from science, business, pharmacy and arts), four new graduates (from accounting and pharmacy) and the parents of one student participant were recruited. Factor analysis suggested a stable four-factor structure with 47 items loading adequately and simply on to those four factors.

#### *5.4 Refining the Scoring System*

Next, 19 participants with more than one year's work experience in a large organisation (that is, with greater than 500 employees) were asked to think about their organisation and indicate the extent to which the final 47 statements reflected their organisation. The factor analysis suggested a stable two-factor structure comprised of 21 items. Factor 1 reflected the diversity open situation of organisations and factor 2 reflected on-going recognition and support for minority members. Internal consistency of the measure was 0.93 (Cronbach alpha) for diversity open situation of organisation and 0.91 (Cronbach alpha) for on-going recognition and support for minority members.

#### *5.5 Providing a Complete Picture*

An additional 15 items were added from documentation of HRM policies and practices obtained from most of the participant organisations and a literature review of diversity management. As suggested earlier, this was used to get a more complete picture of organisational practices, above and beyond that described by the participants, that is, we needed to look at the formal, or what was actually practiced or expected of employees.

Subsequently, diversity climate of openness was measured by thirty-six seven-point likert scale items (1 = strongly agree to 7 = strongly disagree), representing two subscales, namely, diversity oriented HRM policies and practices and combined individualistic and collectivist HRM policies and practices. The diversity oriented HRM policies and practices scale was created from the aforementioned study. The combined individualistic and collectivist HR policies and practices scale was developed from three of Ramamoorthy and Carroll's (1998) six human resource management practices preferences scales because the reported reliability of these scales exceeded 0.60. Human Resource managers indicated the degree to which they agreed or disagreed (seven-point likert scale) with each of the statements with respect to the human resource management policies and practices in their organisations. The average score of progressive HRM and equity in reward allocation (Individualist HRM), and equality reward allocation (Collectivist HRM) was created for combined individualists and collectivists HRM policies and practices.

#### *5.6 Testing the Measure of Diversity Openness*

Two human resource managers in each of 14 organisations rated the final set of 36 items in order to determine the degree of diversity openness of a company's human resource management policies and practices. Additionally, 359 completed surveys

were obtained from supervisors and employees working in culturally diverse teams in these organisations. The results showed that higher levels of diversity oriented human resource management policies and practices were associated with lower levels of prejudice and cultural alienation. Singelis' (1994) independent and interdependent self-construal scale was adapted to measure the prejudice dimension of interpersonal prejudice and intergroup prejudices (Cronbach alpha = 0.73). The reliability of the interpersonal prejudices scale in our research was Cronbach alpha = 0.73 and the intergroup prejudices scale was Cronbach alpha = 0.67 (Fujimoto 2002).

The measure of cultural alienated self was adapted from Jessor and Jessor (1977), with a Cronbach alpha of 0.74. Workgroup members and supervisors completed this measure. Cultural alienation was associated with higher levels of negative emotion and lower levels of positive emotion.

## 6. Implications

Several implications and recommendations for organisations and diversity researchers arise from the research. First, organisations are admonished to promote and continuously monitor the ability of their culture and climate to facilitate positive stereotypes towards difference (cf. Härtel & Fujimoto 2000). They need to conduct regular checks that everyone is included in task interactions and there is receptivity to dissimilar ideas and perspectives and to ensure that everyone is learning from each other and not just merely providing access to diverse people. Further research is required to identify the factors that need to be present and absent and how to transform a workplace accordingly.

Second, selection should consider the capacity of recruits to provide (or be trained to provide) equitable and positive service to persons from a variety of backgrounds (Ashkanasy, Härtel & Daus 2002). Assessment of job-relevant cross-cultural communication and interaction attitudes and skills including dissimilarity openness should be addressed. Research is required to assist organisations in identifying those who can be developed to be dissimilarity open.

Third, performance monitoring, feedback and evaluation in organisations should compare the service of employees to similar and dissimilar internal and external customers to ensure open behaviours. Fourth, training and development should include activities that prepare employees for cross-cultural work (Lloyd, Härtel & Youngsamart 2004). Promoting or providing opportunities for intercultural experience may help develop people's dissimilarity openness as it has been linked to cultural flexibility (Bhawuk & Brislin 1992). Research is required to identify other ways of developing employee and workgroup openness.

## 7. Conclusion

The research program described contributes to the theoretical and measurement base available to analyse diversity issues in the workplace. From a practical stance, this research provides management, particularly those with human resource responsibilities, with a better understanding of the work systems, practices and employee attitudes necessary for the provision of equitable working conditions and customer service.

The area of diversity management will no doubt continue to fascinate management scholars as diversity underpins advancement in knowledge, evolution, and innovation—the stuff that leads to increased productivity and profits, opens markets and international trade, increases employee and client loyalty, and best uses the skills and abilities of all employees.

(Date of receipt of final transcript: June, 2004.  
Accepted by Robert Wood, Area Editor.)

## References

- Ancona, D., Kochan, T., Scully, M., Van Maanen, J. & Westney, E.D. 1999, *Managing for the Future: Organizational Behavior & Processes*, South-Western, Cincinnati, OH.
- Ashby Plant, E.A. & Devine, P.G. 1998, 'Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 75, no. 3, pp. 811–32.
- Ashkanasy, N.M., Härtel, C.E.J. & Daus, C.S. 2002, 'Diversity and emotion: The new frontiers in organizational behaviour research', *Journal of Management*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 307–38.
- Ashkanasy, N.M., Wilderom, C.P.M. & Peterson, M.F. 2000, *Handbook of Organizational Culture & Climate*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Ashmore, R.D. & Lee, J. (eds.) 1997, *Self and Identity: Fundamental Issues*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1999, *Australian Demographic Statistics*, 3101.0, ABS, Canberra.
- Australian Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, 2000, *Diversity Management: Benefits, Challenges, and Strategies*, DIMA, Canberra.
- Ayoko, O.B. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2002, 'The role of emotion and emotion management in destructive and productive conflict in culturally heterogeneous workgroups', in *Managing Emotions in a Changing Workplace*, N.M. Ashkanasy, C.E.J. Härtel, & W.J. Zerbe, (eds.) M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, pp. 77–97.
- Barker, S. & Härtel, C.E.J. 1999, 'The interface of front line employees and demographically diverse customers', paper presented August 13 at the International Conference on Immigrants and Immigration, Toronto, Canada.
- Barker, S. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2004, 'Intercultural service encounters: An exploratory study of customer experiences', *Cross-Cultural Management: An International Journal*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 3–14.
- Bateman, T.S. & Zeithaml, C.P. 1993, *Management: Function and Strategy*, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, Boston.
- Bhawuk, D.P. & Brislin, R. 1992, 'The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, vol. 16, pp. 413–36.
- Byrne, D. 1971, *The Attraction Paradigm*, Academic Press, New York.
- Chatman, J.A., Polzer, J.T., Barsade, S.G. & Neale, M.A. 1998, 'Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition an organisational culture on work processes and outcomes', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 749.
- Dass, P. & Parker, B. 1996, 'Diversity: A strategic issue', in *Managing Diversity: Human Resource Strategies for Transforming the Work Place*, E.E. Kossek & S.A. Lobel (eds.), Blackwell, Massachusetts, pp. 365–91.

- Dunton, B.C. & Fazio, R.H. 1997, 'An individual difference measure of motivation to control prejudice reactions', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 316–26.
- Elsass, P.M. & Graves, L.M. 1997, 'Demographic diversity in decision-making groups: The experiences of women and people of colour', *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 946–73.
- Ely, R.J. & Thomas, D.A. 2001, 'Cultural diversity at work: The moderating effects of work group perspectives on diversity', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 46, June, pp. 229–73.
- Fisher, G., Härtel, C.E.J. & Bibo, M. 2000, 'Two rhetorics and two realities: Similarities and differences in how Thai and western colleagues perceive the performance of western managers working in Thailand', refereed proceedings of the Asian Academy of Management, December, Singapore.
- Fisher, G.B. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2004, 'Evidence for crossvergence in the perception of task and contextual performance: A study of western expatriates working in Thailand', *Cross-Cultural Management: An International Journal*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2–17.
- Fujimoto, Y. 2002, 'Diversity attitudes, values, and norms make a difference to culturally diverse workgroups', unpublished thesis dissertation, Monash University, Melbourne.
- Fujimoto, Y. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2000, 'A self-representation analysis of the effects of individualist-collectivist interactions within organisations in individualistic cultures: Moderators and intervening processes', refereed proceedings of the Asian Academy of Management, December, Singapore.
- Fujimoto, Y. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2002, 'Emotional experience of individualist-collectivist workgroups: findings from a study of 14 multinationals located in Australia', paper presented at the third EMONET Conference, July, Gold Coast.
- Fujimoto, Y. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2004, 'Culturally specific prejudices: Interpersonal prejudices of individualists and intergroup prejudices of collectivists', *Cross-Cultural Management: An International Journal*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 54–69.
- Fujimoto, Y., Härtel, C.E.J., Härtel, G.F. & Baker, N.J. 2000, 'Openness to dissimilarity moderates the consequences of diversity in well-established groups', *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 46–61.
- Fujimoto, Y., Härtel, C.E.J., & Panipucci, D. 2004, 'Emotional experience of individualist-collectivist workgroups: Findings from a study of 14 multinationals located in Australia', in *Emotions in Organizational Behavior*, eds. C.E.J. Härtel, W.J. Zerbe, & N.M. Ashkanasy, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Mahwah, NJ, pp. 125–60.
- Härtel, C.E.J., Douthitt, S., Härtel, G.F. & Douthitt, S. 1999, 'Equally qualified but unequally perceived: General cultural openness as a predictor of discriminatory performance ratings', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 79–89.
- Härtel, C.E.J. & Fujimoto, Y. 1999, 'Explaining why diversity sometimes has positive effects in organizations and sometimes has negative effects in organizations: The perceived dissimilarity openness moderator model', refereed proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, August, Chicago, IL, published as CD-ROM.
- Härtel, C.E.J. & Fujimoto, Y. 2000, 'Diversity is not a problem to be managed by organisations but openness to perceived dissimilarity is', *Journal of Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 14–27.
- Härtel, C.E.J. & Trumble, R.B. 1997, 'IDADA: The individual difference approach to diversity awareness, Management Paper Series #36, University of Queensland, Graduate School of Management, Brisbane.
- Industry Task Force Leadership and Management Skills, 1995, *Enterprising Nation: (Report of the Karper Committee)*, AGPS, Canberra.

- Jackson, S.E., Stone, V.K. & Alvarez, E.B. 1993, 'Socialization amidst diversity: Impact of demographics on work team oldtimers and newcomers', in *Research in Organizational Behavior*, L. L. Cumming & B. M. Staw (eds.), JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 45–109.
- James, D. & Heathcote, A. 2002, 'Race gets the silent treatment', *Business Review Weekly*, pp. 70–3.
- Jessor, R. & Jessor, S.L. 1977, *Problem Behavior and Psychosocial Development: A Longitudinal Study of Youth*, Academic Press, New York.
- Kaman, V.S. & Härtel, C.E.J. 1994, 'Anticipating pay negotiation strategies and pay outcomes during recruitment: An exploration of gender differences', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 183–97.
- Kandola, R., Fullerton, J. & Ahmed Y. 1995, 'Managing diversity: Succeeding where equal opportunities has failed', *Equal Opportunities Review*, vol. 59, pp. 31–6.
- Kossek, E.E. & Lobel, S.A. 1996, *Managing Diversity: Human Resource Strategies for Transforming the Work Place*, Blackwell, Massachusetts.
- Lawrence, B.S. 1997, 'The black box of organisational demography', *Organizational Science*, vol. 8, pp. 1–22.
- Lloyd, S.L., Härtel, C.E.J. & Youngsamart, D. 2004, 'Working abroad: Competencies expatriates need to successfully cope with the intercultural experience', *Doing Business Across Borders Journal (Special Issue: Australian Perspectives on the Expatriate Experience)*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 54–66.
- Maznevski, M.L. 1994, 'Understanding our differences: Performance in decision-making groups with diverse members', *Human Relations*, vol. 47, pp. 531–52.
- McLeod, P.L. & Lobel, S.A. 1992, 'The effects of ethnic diversity on idea generation in small groups', *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings*, pp. 227–31.
- Milliken, F.J. & Martins, L.L. 1996, 'Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organisational groups', *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 21, pp. 402–33.
- Ng, E.S.W. & Tung, R.L. 1998, 'Ethno-cultural diversity and organizational effectiveness: A field study', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 980–95.
- O'Reilly III, C.A., Caldwell, D.F. & Barnett, W.P. 1989, 'Work group demography, social integration and turnover', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 34, pp. 21–37.
- Pelled, L.H., Eisenhardt, K.M. & Xin, K.R. 1999, 'Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict and performance', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1–2.
- Pizer, M. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2004, 'For better or worse: Organizational culture and emotions', in *Emotions in Organizational Behavior*, eds. C.E.J. Härtel, W.J. Zerbe & N.M. Ashkanasy, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. pp. 478–510.
- Ramirez, A. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2001, 'How do stereotypes affect the ability to deliver good service in the hospitality industry?' paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Global Business, Cancun, Mexico, November.
- Schein, E.H. 1990, 'Organizational culture', *American Psychologist*, vol. 45, pp. 109–19.
- Schein, E.H. 1996, 'Culture: The missing concept in organization studies', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 41, pp. 229–41.
- Shaw, J.B. & Barrett-Power, E. 1998, 'The effects of diversity on small group processes and performance', *Human Relations*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 1307–25.
- Strauss, B. & Mang, P. 1999, 'Culture shocks in inter-cultural service encounters?' *Journal of Services Marketing*, vol. 13, no. 4/5, pp. 329–46.

- Sultana, N. & Härtel, C.E.J. 1999, 'Experiences of migrant women entering and advancing in management positions', paper presented at the International Conference on Immigrants and Immigration, Toronto, Canada, August 13.
- Tajfel, H. 1981, *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trau, R. & Härtel, C.E.J. 2002, 'Individual and contextual factors affecting quality of work life and work attitudes of gay men', best paper nomination, presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Denver, CO, August.
- Tsui, A.S., Egan, T.D. & O'Reilly III, C.A. 1992, 'Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 37, pp. 549–79.
- Turner, J.C. & Oakes, P.J. 1989, 'Self-categorization theory and social influence', in *Psychology of Group Influence*, P.B. Paulus (ed), Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc. Hillsdale, New Jersey, pp. 233–75.
- Watson, W.E., Kumar, K. & Michaelsen, L.K. 1993, 'Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups', *Academy of Management*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 590–602.
- Wilkinson, I. & Cheung, C. 1999, 'Multicultural marketing in Australia: Synergy in diversity', *Journal of International Marketing*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 106–25.
- Williams, M.L. & Bauer, T.N. 1994, 'The effect of a managing diversity policy on organizational attractiveness', *Group & Organization Management*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 295–308.