Norms in Mixed Sex and Mixed Race Work Groups

JENNIFER A. CHATMAN*

Haas School of Business, University of California, Berkeley

Abstract

Norms determine regular patterns of behavior and influence members' identification with a group. They are also a proximate way to predict and understand behavior in diverse work groups but, surprisingly, have not been extensively examined in this context. After reviewing research on group norms and the psychology of prejudice, I suggest that reaping the benefits of the increased range of available task relevant resources in demographically diverse work groups may depend on the strength and content of the norms it adopts, but that diverse groups face distinct obstacles in developing strong norms that create satisfying interpersonal interaction and effective work performance. I consider the difficulties diverse work groups have in forming strong norms and then focus on how anti-bias norms, which are directed toward preventing behaviors associated with prejudice and discrimination and address members' security concerns, and openness norms, which promote people's ability to individuate those whom they might otherwise stereotype as well as address nurturance concerns, may increase a work group's ability to optimize social interaction and performance amidst

*Email: chatman@haas.berkeley.edu

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

diversity. I suggest that reorienting psychological and organizational research on prejudice to focus on group norm strength and content may be a way of both understanding and solving the greater challenges of discrimination.

The demography of the U.S. workforce has changed dramatically. According to the 2009 Bureau of Labor Statistics, women now represent 49.83% of the labor force and are on the verge of outnumbering men for the first time in history. Asian and Hispanic workers have been joining the workforce at an unprecedented rate over the last 10 years and, along with Black workers, are projected to significantly increase their presence through 2050 (Toossi, 2006). Recent immigrants accounted for 41% of labor force growth in the 1990s and the percentage of the total labor force that was foreign-born doubled to 12% in 2000 (Kritz & Gurak, 2004). As a group, older workers, those over 55, are projected to grow five times faster than the overall labor force (Toossi, 2007). These compositional changes have created opportunities for working differently by collaborating to incorporate diverse perspectives. But they have also produced significant social psychological challenges within organizations and work groups.

The interdependence and interaction required for work to be accomplished successfully in diverse groups presents fundamental challenges to older models of work (Doerr, Mitchell, Schriesheim, Freed, & Zhou, 2002). The proportion of the population participating in the workforce combined with the amount of time each person spends at work, both in terms of daily demands and the length of a typical career, are enormous. People working in diverse groups are exposed to different others more regularly and intimately than they are in many other stratified sectors of society. Thus, diverse work groups offer a social laboratory for understanding why diversity is such a challenge in human society more generally, and potentially, for solving larger societal problems such as racism and sexism (e.g., Walsh, Weber, & Margolis, 2003). In this paper, I focus on how work group norms provide insight into the manifestations of and potential solutions to discrimination at work.

Diversity refers to differences between people that may lead one person to consider another different. At the group level, diversity reflects the distribution of differences on a particular attribute or a set of attributes among members of a group, such as age, sex, education, length of service, race, nationality, or functional background. Though there are numerous attributes on which people differ, sex and race are among the most psychologically potent and morally charged because they raise questions about prejudice, justice, and inequality (e.g., Fiske, 2000; Norton, Vandello, & Darley, 2004). They are also immutable and easy to spot. In fact, of all the dimensions that people use to categorize others, sex and race are the quickest and most automatic (Ito & Urland, 2003; Montepare & Opeyo, 2002). Groups can be characterized on a

continuum from demographically homogeneous, in which members closely resemble one another across a variety of demographic attributes, to diverse, in which members' attributes differ. Groups can differ on one or more specific attributes as well as on how multiple attributes converge among members.[1]

As these demographic changes have been underway, organizations have significantly increased their use of teams rather than individuals to make key decisions and accomplish goals (e.g., Moreland & Argote, 2003). A team approach emphasizes convening interdependent and often cross functional groups to get work done (e.g., Keller, 2001; Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). Social and organizational psychologists have constructed an enormous foundation of research identifying the conditions in which groups and their members thrive or flounder, though guaranteeing successful work groups remains elusive (e.g., Ilgen, Hollenbeck, Johnson, & Jundt, 2005; Stewart, 2006; Thibaut & Kelley, 1986).

Organizing in demographically diverse groups, rather than in homogeneous groups or as diverse individual contributors, is intuitively appealing—diverse groups *should* be able to solve more complex problems and generate more creative ideas based on greater range and diverse expertise among members (e.g., Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991; Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999; Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin, 1999; Van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004). Being exposed to different perspectives can enhance creativity and innovation by strengthening a group's vigilance in processing relevant information as well as preventing it from settling too easily on agreed-upon options (e.g., Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Bantel & Jackson, 1989; Thomas & Ely, 1996; Nemeth & Staw, 1989; Phillips, Liljenquist, & Neale, 2009).

On the other hand, bringing together people who are different from one another to accomplish work objectives may magnify their differences. The cognitive and behavioral biases that emerge in work groups can lead people to use immediately apparent primary categories and their associated stereotypes to predict and evaluate one another's performance and to overlook attributes that are more relevant to the actual work (e.g., Flynn, Chatman, & Spataro, 2001; Stauffer & Buckley, 2005). These biases typically handicap members of minority identity groups, such as women and non-Whites, leading them to feel more uncomfortable and less attached to their employing organization and work group (e.g., Biernat, Collins, & Katzarska-Miller, & Thompson, 2009; Joshi, Liao, & Jackson, 2006; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992; Westphal & Stern, 2007). Majority identity group members are also affected by diversity, as they report feeling less socially integrated and experiencing more communication problems, more conflict, and a higher desire to leave diverse as compared to homogeneous groups (e.g., Allmendinger & Hackman, 1995; Hambrick, Cho, & Chen, 1996; Jehn & Mannix, 2001; O'Reilly, Caldwell, &

Barnett, 1989). Thus, despite their purported advantages, the benefits of diverse work groups have been slow to materialize (e.g., Bacharach, Bamberger, & Vashdi, 2005; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003).

Psychological and organizational research has provided some insight about diverse work groups focusing on work processes (e.g., Chatman & Flynn, 2001; Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998), leadership styles (e.g., Mitchell & Boyle, 2009; Somech, 2006), and members' individual differences (e.g., Homan et al., 2008). Fundamentally, each of these is an antecedent to group *norms*, which determine regular patterns of behavior, and influence members' identification, within the group (e.g., Bettenhausen & Murnighan, 1991). Classic research in psychology has shown that social norms are remarkably strong predictors of behavior (e.g., Sherif, 1936), and recently, research has linked norms to expressed prejudice, a behavior that is obviously relevant in diverse work groups (Crandall, Eshleman, & O'Brien, 2002). Thus, focusing on norms is a proximate way to understand diverse work groups, and reaping the value of the increased range of available task-relevant resources in demographically diverse groups may depend on the norms it adopts. Further, the norms that will enable diverse work groups to generate constructive interaction and effective performance are distinct from those that would be useful in homogeneous groups. I consider two core motivational concerns, nurturance and security (Higgins, 1997), and examine their manifestations in diverse work groups. I suggest that norms addressing these motives are essential for diverse work groups to function effectively and identify two categories of them—anti-bias norms and openness, but after reviewing the relevant research, conclude that such norms are unlikely to emerge easily.

Roadmap for the Paper

I begin by defining work group norms and then, in the second section of the paper, discuss the difficulties diverse groups experience in developing strong norms of any type. This is a problem because a lack of strong norms reduces members' ability to identify with the work group or make it a salient social category. I also discuss how majority and minority identity group members respond differently and how this makes it harder for diverse work groups to form its own strong norms. In the third section I focus on the content of norms by considering anti-bias norms, which are intended to *prevent* behaviors associated with prejudice and discrimination but which do so imperfectly. I also discuss the longer term importance of developing openness norms in diverse groups, those that *promote* members' willingness to expand or decategorize stereotyped associations thereby increasing a group's ability to optimize interactions with diverse others. I conclude with suggestions for future research that enables diverse work groups to be more effective. Through the paper I focus on sex and race diversity and distinguish between "work

groups," which refer to a person's membership based on job, role, or organizational assignments, from "identity groups," which refer to a person's membership based on demographic attributes (e.g., Asian Americans are members of the Asian American identity group by virtue of their race).

Why are Norms Important in Groups, and in Diverse Groups in Particular?

Norms are ubiquitous in social life; they offer a means for expressing and codifying a group's shared values, they provide identity for group members, and ultimately, they help people interpret and predict their own and others' behavior (e.g., Bettenhausen & Murnighan, 1991; Feldman, 1984). Norms can be descriptive or prescriptive (Prentice & Miller, 1996). Descriptive norms reflect members' actual behavior and attitudes and are an informational source of social influence. Prescriptive norms reflect the attitudes and behaviors that the group desires or expected behaviors that are sanctioned by the larger relevant system (e.g., the group, organization, or society) with a specific "ought" or "must" quality. Prescriptive norms act as a normative source of social influence (Birenbaum & Sagarin, 1976; Cialdini, Kallgren, & Reno, 1991; Sherif, 1936). Thus, group norms are shared definitions of the way people do, or should, behave (Miller, Monin, & Prentice, 2000).

Ample research has demonstrated that demographically diverse groups experience different psychological conditions than do homogeneous groups; in particular, members trust each other less, are less motivated to identify with the group, and are more distracted (e.g., Bell, 2007; Chatman & O'Reilly, 2004; Kearney, Gebert, & Voelpel, 2009; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). These negative outcomes may result from of a lack of strong norms that could ease interaction and help the group accomplish its goals (Crandall et al., 2002).

Norm Strength in Diverse Work Groups

A single norm rarely, if ever, exists in isolation. Instead, behavior in groups and organizations reflects a profile of norms that can be arrayed relative to one another according to their importance or prevalence within the group (e.g., O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Schein, 1988). In some cases, groups only pay lip service to "vacuous" norms that are easy to agree with but lack intensity (e.g., Cha & Edmondson; 2006). For example the U.S. Department of Motor Vehicles claims that customers are its "highest priority" but customers think otherwise ("Complaints about the DMV," 2007). A group's strongest norms are those that members both agree about and hold intensely (Jackson, 1965; O'Reilly, 1989). Strong norms possess both descriptive and injunctive properties such that members can observe one another upholding them and are willing to sanction others for failing to comply (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996). For example, secrecy is so important at Apple that employees who leak information to the outside world are tracked down and fired (Stone & Vance, 2009).

Norms are not as straightforward or apparent as formal rules; they are typically more nuanced and often emergent (Chatman & Flynn, 2001). Nevertheless, norms generate detectable and enduring cues and offer a variety of efficiencies for group members. Norms typically form around behaviors that are significant to the group such as its stance on risk taking or cooperation (e.g., Cohen, Ledford, & Spreitzer, 1996; Feldman, 1984; Levine, Higgins, & Choi, 2000). This helps people solicit and attend to information about which behaviors are more or less likely to be valued or useful within the group (e.g., Ashford & Northcraft, 1992). Strong norms can increase a group's reliance on task related routines to promote efficiency, freeing members to concentrate on non-routine challenges (e.g., Hackman & Gersick, 1990; Hackman & Wageman, 2005).

Strong norms can also smooth social interaction since norm agreement and intensity, even on issues that are trivial or unrelated to the group's purpose such as shared views about which restaurants are good, may serve to enhance group cohesion and identification, while low levels of agreement even on insignificant issues may reduce a group's felt cohesion (e.g., Janis & Mann, 1977; Phillips et al., 2009). The existence of strong group norms and their predictable enforcement, therefore, increase a group's felt distinctiveness and longevity (e.g., Axelrod, 1984; Rucker, Polifroni, Tetlock, & Scott, 2004). Below I discuss how members' identification with the group, based both on category salience as well as the range of behavior associated with various norms, determines how extensively people adhere to and internalize a group's norms.

The Influence of Self Categorization on Norm Strength in Diverse Work Groups

People define their self-concept in terms of their memberships in various social groups. Different aspects of a person's self-concept may become salient in response to the distribution of characteristics of others who are present in a situation (Markus & Cross, 1990). A salient social category is defined as one that functions psychologically to influence a person's perception and behavior and how others treat the focal individual (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Higher similarity among members, which initially is determined by visible and immutable similarities like race and sex, makes in-group membership more salient (Fiske, 2000). Once people have defined themselves as an in-group member, they are more likely to cooperate with in-group members and compete against out-group members (Brewer, 1979).

Though a person's sex and race may have some relevance for their potential work contributions, other characteristics—such as their education, functional background, and past work experience—likely have more bearing on the group's work by virtue of their relevance in a work context. But, according to expectations states theory (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch,

1977; Ridgeway, 1991) immutable characteristics such as sex and race become associated with perceptions of work-related competence when status beliefs associated with these characteristics are imported from the broader societal context and are "structurally reproduced" in the group. As a result, certain identity groups within society—such as racial minorities and women—are traditionally treated as lower status at work (Alderfer & Thomas, 1989). When these status beliefs are legitimated by members of the work group they bias interpersonal expectations and interactions at work such that higher status group members are favored (Nishii & Mayer, 2009). Discounting people's capabilities based on identity category membership both reduces productivity but also impairs personal well-being (e.g., Ruggiero & Taylor, 1997; Steele, 1997).

Demographically different members come to the work group with variations in social category memberships which are reinforced by work experiences that correspond to those categories (e.g., Wharton & Baron, 1987). Thus, a central challenge for diverse work groups is to ensure that identity group memberships are at once validated but also do not constrain members from developing a salient work group identity. This is a concern because functional antagonism exists between the salience of different categories such that when demographic categories are salient, work group membership as a social category is not and vice versa (Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, & Neale, 1998). Further, diverse work groups develop more individualistic than cooperative norms, limiting interaction and perceptions of shared group goals (Chatman & Flynn, 2001). In sum, members are less likely to adhere to and enforce norms in diverse work groups limiting the strength of the shared norms that can develop because of the salience of identity group membership.

How Majority and Minority Responses to Diversity Influence Norm Strength in Diverse Work Groups

The discussion above suggests that diversity reduces members' willingness to agree with and enforce work group norms because of different category memberships. Norm strength may also be influenced by the perceptions of and actual behavioral range associated with various norms in diverse groups. Some norms are inherently identifiable because the range of behaviors associated with them is small and unambiguous. Returning to the example of secrecy norms at Apple, behavioral manifestations are consistent, comprehensive, and unambiguous: Employees are required to go through a maze of security doors, each of which requires them to swipe their badges until they finally enter a numeric code to reach their own office. Workspaces are monitored with security cameras and employees working in the most critical product-testing rooms are required to cover up devices with black cloaks when working on them—and to turn on a red warning light when devices are unmasked

so that everyone knows to be extra-careful. Further, Apple's CEO, Steve Jobs, exudes secrecy, even risking violating SEC disclosure rules by withholding information about serious personal health issues (Stone & Vance, 2009, p. B1). The importance of secrecy at Apple would be hard for anyone, inside or outside the company, to misunderstand.

But other norms are harder to detect because their corresponding behaviors are more divergent. For example, adopting the norm to "agree to disagree" (Flynn & Chatman, 2001) would result in apparently divergent and individualistic behavior among members of the group. An example is the well-known "constructive confrontation" norms at Intel which foster what founder and former CEO Andy Grove called "ferocious arguing and disagreement about ideas in the pursuit of new knowledge" ("Inside Intel," 2006). In this case, the norm to which members conform gives rise to highly variant, non-uniform behavior, making it more difficult to determine whether members actually have an agreed-upon norm to disagree, or whether they just simply disagree. As a result, observers could interpret the behavioral variation associated with this norm as a sign of weaker group norms.

A second reason why norms may be hard to detect is that they apply differently to different identity groups. Norms pertaining to how people should dress at work, for instance, are significantly more complicated for women than for men (Rafaeli, Dutton, Harquail, & Mackie-Lewis, 1997). As such, norms are often misunderstood and misinterpreted (Earley & Gibson, 2002) especially by newcomers and outsiders (e.g., Cable, Aiman-Smith, Mulvey, & Edwards, 2000; Morrison, 1994), and most relevant for this paper, among members of demographically diverse work groups.

Interacting with people from different social categories can be ambiguous and cause uncertainty and anxiety (e.g., Brewer & Miller, 1984; Plant & Devine, 2003; Richeson & Shelton, 2007). Indeed, social fear appears to be a primary mechanism driving people's propensity to develop identity group stereotypes (Meyer-Lindenberg et al., 2005). One way that people have dealt with this uncertainty is by inhibiting certain behaviors. Though both majority and minority identity group members feel inhibited when faced with diversity, they withhold different behaviors. I discuss these differences, which underscore the ways in which social interaction is complicated by the varying expectations and responses among members of diverse work groups, below.

Majority group's response to work group diversity. When faced with diversity, members of the dominant identity group (e.g., Whites or men in the U.S.) worry primarily that they will say or do something inappropriate and appear socially incompetent and prejudiced (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). Indeed, to avoid this problem they often try to appear color- or gender-blind, using the logic that if one appears not to notice race or sex

then one cannot possibly be prejudiced (Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura, & Ariely, 2006).

Researchers have investigated colorblind behavior, which involves avoiding talking about race or even acknowledging racial differences when they are salient (Norton et al., 2006). In one study, Whites were more likely to avoid using race as a descriptor when paired with a Black partner than with a White partner to complete a matching task that required people to describe a person in a photograph, even when doing so would have allowed them to complete the task more quickly and accurately (Norton et al., 2006). In addition, when White subjects avoided mentioning race, their Black interaction partners perceived them as less friendly, leading demographically different partners to perform poorly on dyadic tasks (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008). In perhaps the most vivid manifestation of the anxiety of appearing racist, White subjects who expected to discuss a racially contentious topic with Black partners arranged their chairs further apart, literally distancing themselves from their expected discussion partner (Goff, Steele, & Davies, 2008).

Other research has shown that the effort majority members undertake to appear unprejudiced can affect their task performance by increasing their cognitive load (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000; Richeson & Trawalter, 2005). King, Kaplan, and Zaccaro (2008) found that worrying about appearing prejudiced to others constitutes a significant distraction. They describe a three-part process for how a team's diversity influences its effectiveness through meta-perceptions, or people's perceptions about others' perceptions of them. The first part of the process is that people are pre-occupied with monitoring their own behavior to avoid appearing prejudiced. A second is that the focal individual scrutinizes others' behaviors, using them as reference points to detect his or her own prejudice. Finally, the focal individual monitors his or her own behavior to avoid conforming to negative stereotypes of the demographic groups he or she represents. The net effect of all of this mental work, of course, is that valuable cognitive effort that could otherwise be devoted to satisfying interactions and to accomplishing the task at-hand is instead devoted to these complicated interpersonal considerations that often preclude improved interaction with diverse others over time.

Minority group response to diverse work groups. The strategies that minority identity groups use to respond to diversity are distinct from those used by majority group members. Before discussing the effects of group members' behaviors within diverse groups, two observations about the vast psychological research in this domain are worth noting. First, significantly more research has focused on the impact of prejudice toward minority group members, not on their response to diversity (e.g., Kawakami, Dunn, Karmali, & Dovidio, 2009; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). Second, significantly

more research focuses on how majority, rather than minority, identity group members respond to diversity (see Roberson, Deitch, Brief, & Block, 2003, for a notable exception). This is ironic given the relative regularity with which minority identity group members confront diversity.

Notwithstanding these limitations, there may be clues from recent research showing that members of minority races experience attributional ambiguity and are resistant even to positive feedback when they know that an evaluator has knowledge of their race. Specifically, racial minorities who did not believe that their race was valued by majority-race professors and teaching assistants were less likely to accept academic feedback as legitimate, regardless of whether it was negative or positive (Mendoza-Denton, Goldman-Flythe, Pietrzak, Downey, & Aceves, in press). Minority identity group members are also more resistant to the inter-group bias-reducing effects of contact with people from different races (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). This suggests that minority members question the authenticity of majority group members' behaviors toward them and implies that it may take extensive exposure to different others, or similar others in high status positions, offering valid positive feedback before minority identity group members will trust such feedback.

Other researchers have suggested that diversity distinctly inhibits members of underrepresented identity groups. Under such conditions, minorities feel apprehensive about discussing their concerns about fairness, which can breed misunderstanding and mistrust within groups and organizations (Ely, Meyerson, & Davidson, 2006). Likewise, minority group members who inter-act with majority group members worry that they will be rejected (Shelton, 2003) and perceived by both majority and minority identity group members in negatively stereotypical ways (Major & O'Brien, 2005), contributing to a sense of uncertainty about how to behave in such situations.

Minority group members may also resist acknowledging discrimination against them. For example, Ruggiero and Taylor (1997) found that women, Asians, and Blacks minimized discrimination as a possible interpretation of their own poor performance and instead attributed the cause of poor performance to themselves. While this strategy served to protect their self-esteem by maintaining a sense of control over their performance, it also obscured the actual source of poor performance. This can hinder a person's ability to improve performance over time, which in some cases may require taking steps to increase the accuracy of their colleagues' perceptions of them rather than changing their approach to tasks.

Members of minority identity groups are also more likely to experience stereotype threats that reduce their performance. When stereotypes about people's identity group indict an important ability, they worry about fulfilling the stereotype in situations where that ability can be judged, which in turn causes their performance to decline (Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999).

Whether it is women who are equivalently capable to men on math test performance, highly educated African Americans taking standardized tests, or African American professionals at work, the threat of confirming a widely existing stereotype interferes with performance and feedback seeking (Roberson et al., 2003; Steele, 1997; Steele & Aronson, 1995; Spencer et al., 1999).

Thus, within diverse work groups, majority and minority identity group members will enact norms differently by responding to identity-based demands that apply differently to different identity groups. A further complication is that even similar behaviors will be viewed differently depending on who enacts them (e.g., Briton & Hall, 1995; Hess, Blairy, & Kleck, 2000). These sources of ambiguity about the interpretation of behavior within diverse work groups can lead members who are unfamiliar with the group's norms or entire groups that are unfamiliar with one other to be even more uncertain about which norms are in effect (e.g., Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004; Mendoza-Denton et al., in press; Rudman & Phelan, 2008).

Summary: Diverse Work Groups Are Less Likely to Form and Adhere to Strong Work Group Norms

Taken together, the research discussed above suggests that members are less likely to identify with a diverse work group than with a homogeneous work group (Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2006) and ultimately, less likely to form strong norms or adhere to them (e.g., Cooper, Kelly, & Weaver, 2001; Hogg & Terry, 2000). One implication, then, is that greater work group diversity may result in *fewer* norms and fewer *strong* norms within a particular work group. Further, compared to members of demographically homogeneous work groups, members of diverse work groups will likely express lower levels of intensity; that is, less willingness to sanction other members for failing to uphold group norms.

Beyond the effects of norms on members of diverse groups, research also implies that norms may vary in their signaling clarity depending on a group's composition. Thus, given a norm's similar range of behavioral manifestations, members of demographically diverse work groups may view the norm as less agreed upon and less strongly held than will members of homogenous groups. And finally, because of the differences in how people from different identity groups are affected by diversity, the same norm may have a larger number of behavioral manifestations in demographically diverse than in homogeneous work groups.

Ultimately, the discussion above suggests that diverse groups experience obstacles in defining, articulating, and codifying strong norms. Though some might argue that norms constrain rather than enable effective interaction (e.g., Goncalo & Staw, 2006), the picture that emerges from relevant research

implies that diverse work groups suffer from a lack of cohesion based on a lack of strong norms. But it may matter a lot which norms become strong in diverse work groups. Therefore, in the next section I suggest that two types of norms—those that inhibit bias and those that promote openness—are particularly likely to enable smoother social interaction and better performance within diverse work groups.

Norm Content in Diverse Work Groups

A norm's content consists of the specific shared attitudes and expected behaviors that are characteristic of and enacted in a group (e.g., Flynn & Chatman, 2003). People have two primary concerns, about security and nurturance, which reflect their predominant approach to self-regulation and achieving desired end-states (Higgins, 1997). Though pervasive across settings, recent research suggests that these two motivational concerns are particularly activated in the context of group diversity (Kark & Van Dijk, 2007; Shah, Brazy, & Higgins, 2003; Pierro, Cicero, & Higgins, 2009). *Security needs*, which are most salient when people perceive uncertainty or threat, trigger a prevention focus leading to avoidant behavior and agitation, anxiety, and sensitivity to negative outcomes (Forster, Grant, Idson, & Higgins, 2001). In contrast, *nurturance needs* trigger a promotion focus and activate cheerful approach-related behavior and heightened receptivity to positive outcomes (Brendl, Higgins, & Lemm, 1995).

I focus on two norms that are well-suited to these motivational concerns in diverse groups. First, I consider research on anti-bias norms, which incite a prevention focus involving inhibition or avoidance of behaviors. Anti-bias norms may satisfy security needs by making interactions safer and more predictable. Then I examine research on a set of norms that incite a promotion or approach focus. These can broadly be categorized as norms pertaining to openness—to learning about and appreciating demographically different others. Openness norms may satisfy nurturance needs by enabling members of different identity groups to decategorize different others and appreciate their individuated contributions.

The Influence of Societal Level Anti-Bias Norms on Diverse Work Groups

Membership in diverse work groups is complicated by pervasive societal norms that favor appearing unprejudiced (e.g., Paluck & Green, 2009). *Anti-bias norms* are defined as those that compel people to avoid words and actions that might be offensive to other demographic groups. These norms represent attempts to reduce prejudice, or the negative evaluation of a group or of an individual on the basis of their identity group membership (e.g., Crandall et al., 2002). But some have argued that articulating and imposing anti-bias norms risks inciting closed-mindedness (Bloom, 1987), repression (Finn, 1986; Ravitch, 2003), and Orwellian-like attempts at thought control (Kors &

Silvergate, 1998). This perspective suggests that the potential benefits of strengthening anti-bias norms may come at a significant cost and should be avoided, especially within work groups that require an open-minded exchange of ideas.

Though many have argued that the broad normative climate has turned against racial prejudice (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986; Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989), some question the extent to which measured decreases in expressions of prejudice reflect genuine changes in attitude or rather, whether they simply reflect people's willingness to conform to but not internalize anti-bias norms (e.g., Crandall et al., 2002). For example, in addition to the lack of clarity caused by multiple behavioral responses to diversity across members of different identity groups, as discussed in the prior section, people are internally inconsistent in their anti-bias behavior. Monin and Miller (2001) showed that once people behave in a way that confirms an anti-bias stance (disagreeing with blatantly sexist comments) they feel licensed to make subsequently biased hiring decisions (favoring a male candidate for a stereotypically male job).

Other research shows that new forms of more nuanced racism and sexism have emerged. "Modern" racists and sexists both act on their prejudices in particular organizational and social climates (e.g., Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000) and are, paradoxically, able to distance themselves from such labels and behavior (Sommers & Norton, 2006). For example, when no justification was given for favoring White applicants over non-Whites, there was no difference among prejudiced and unprejudiced White subjects' choice. But, when given a justification for discriminating between candidates based on race, prejudiced subjects were significantly more likely to choose the White candidate than were their unprejudiced counterparts (Brief et al., 2000). Similarly, Norton, Vandello, and Darley (2004) showed that men engaged in moral casuistry, justifying in-group hiring decisions by inflating the importance of whatever other attribute favored the male over the female candidate (e.g., experience or education).

In contrast, people's concern about appearing unprejudiced can also lead to less biased positions. Sommers (2008) found that White jurors who knew that they would be serving on a jury with Black jurors (as opposed to other Whites) were less likely to believe that Black defendants were guilty—even before they began deliberating with the jury. Those who anticipated their interaction with Blacks were also more vigilant, making sure that they were well prepared and had developed justifiable positions. Further, members of racially diverse juries perceived that their jury group represented a broader range of opinions and perspectives than did members of homogeneous juries even if, in objective terms, the range was the same (Sommers, 2008). These findings complement the main findings of the well-known minority influence literature (e.g., Moscovici, 1994) showing that minority members significantly

influence group members' positions. Sommers (2008) offers, perhaps, a more precise demonstration of the underlying mechanism by which this influence occurs—through increased vigilance in anticipation of defending one's position to different others with relevant task experience.

Despite the widespread value of being unprejudiced and attempts to develop norms that discourage prejudice (Ely et al., 2006; Paluck & Green, 2009; Rynes & Rosen, 1995) and encourage people to use politically correct language in public discourse and everyday conversation (Lakoff, 2001), we know relatively little about how people might respond to explicit instructions or appeals to avoid being biased, especially in work groups. A recent laboratory experiment showed that individuals who were high in social dominance were less likely to make racially biased section decisions when they were instructed to use job performance indicators as an explicit criterion in their decision (Umphress, Simmons, Boswell, & Triana, 2008). While lacking a test of this in a group context, this suggests that explicitness may help reduce rather than increase threats to members' desire for interpersonal security within the group. Taken together, this research suggests that majority members lack consistency with regard to their adherence to anti-bias norms, and as a result such norms penetrate diverse work groups unevenly just as they do in society (e.g., Ridgeway, 1991).

The Effects of Anti-Bias Norms Generated in Diverse Work Groups

One recent study revealed intriguing results about the benefits of explicitly strong anti-bias norms in diverse work groups. Goncalo, Chatman, Deguid, and Kennedy (2010) found that one anti-bias norm, political correctness, which focuses on sensitivity to different others in language use, actually *facilitated* the free exchange of ideas in diverse (mixed sex) work groups by reducing the uncertainty that arose during work interactions between men and women. Goncalo and his colleagues (2010) also found that politically correct norms had different effects on solo versus majority members of the group. Members who were in the demographic minority (e.g., one woman in a group of men or one man in a group of women) shared significantly more ideas within their group when political correctness norms were made explicit and salient. And, minority idea sharing mediated the relationship such that the influence of political correctness norms on performance in mixed sex groups diminished when minority idea sharing was considered.

Why might greater certainty about the group's position on anti-bias norms improve performance in diverse groups? At the most superficial level, making political correctness a strong norm in diverse groups provides a shared guideline or source of bonding for members. Groups often attempt to socialize new members with early bonding experiences that are not task relevant, as in popular outdoor courses aimed at establishing interpersonal trust (e.g., Wagner, Baldwin, & Roland, 1991). The goal of these experiences is to

establish a shared identity among group members quickly (e.g., Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

But, if adopting a shared norm regardless of its content were all that mattered, adopting *any* strong norm would be useful for diverse groups. Thus, Goncalo and his colleagues (2010) also assessed the impact of the content of the norm by randomly assigning subjects in mixed sex groups to conditions that either highlighted the norm to be polite or the norm to be politically correct. Results showed that only those groups in the politically correct condition showed a performance improvement. This suggests that it is the combination of the norm's strength (uniformly salient) and content (relevant to the group) that regulates behavior in diverse groups.

Interestingly, the anti-bias norm of political correctness was not beneficial for all types of groups. Indeed, Goncalo et al. (2010) found that same sex (homogeneous) groups exposed to the political correctness norm performed significantly worse than homogeneous groups exposed to no norm (control) or to diverse groups exposed to the political correctness norm. Since the pressure to insure unbiased behavior is so often associated with interactions between demographically different people (Lakoff, 2001; Talbot, 2008) the salience of political correctness in a homogenous group may be distracting and heighten uncertainty about how to appropriately direct their effort to be sensitive. In addition, people use surface-level similarities to guide assumptions about deep level characteristics such as shared norms and values (e.g., Fiske, 1998), which is why disagreements with similar others trigger more surprise and irritation than do disagreements with dissimilar others, with whom differences of opinion are expected (Phillips, 2003). The assumption of deep-level similarity in homogenous groups may lead people to believe that they can speak freely because they are among like-minded others. The imposition of a political correctness norm in that context violates such expectations and the resulting uncertainty may stifle the free exchange of ideas (Camacho & Paulus, 1995).

Further, members of both majority and minority member's identity groups may benefit from clear norms (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Operario & Fiske, 2001). Making anti-bias norms salient at the work group level helps majority members since they know that the group expects them to avoid words and behaviors that may be offensive. This reduces the need to continuously evaluate whether such efforts are appropriate and the corresponding cognitive load that detracts from smooth interaction and task performance (Richeson & Trawalter, 2005). Further, if majority group members have the opportunity to agree with and support a norm for political correctness, their concerns that minority group members will think they are prejudiced might be alleviated (Monin & Miller, 2001). Minority identity group members may also anticipate with certainty that the majority will make an effort to avoid offensive words or actions. They will, as a result, experience less anxiety during

contact with demographically different group members and be less inhibited about participating in the group's work (Blascovich, Mendes, Hunter, Lickel, & Kowai-Bell, 2001). Moreover, though the effort to censor references to demographic differences may cause the majority to appear cold and aloof (Norton et al., 2006) this may not be the conclusion minority members draw if their behavior can, instead, be attributed to a strong group norm (Weiner, 1985).

The net result of agreeing to uphold anti-bias norms might be that all the members of demographically diverse groups will be less distracted by the uncertainty in the social context and, as a result, more able to focus on the task (e.g., Johns, Inzlicht, & Schmader, 2008). Further, since people desire certainty, subsequent interactions with fellow group members may be imbued with positive affect (Lawler, 1992) and signal to individual members that the group provides a context that is predictable enough to risk the expression of novel solutions (Schwarz & Clore, 2003; Edmondson, 1999).

One question is whether political correctness as a norm operates like other anti-bias norms. Recent research shows that when the anti-bias norm of egalitarianism is made salient, even by simply asking people to read a paragraph advocating egalitarianism in society, they are less likely to express biased attitudes toward people of other races (Galliot, Stillman, Schmeichel, Maner, & Plant, 2008). Still, further research assessing the extent to which a wider array of anti-bias norms has the same impact in diverse work groups would be useful. And, a fuller assessment of this relationship would include a longitudinal assessment of the strength of norms in terms of true agreement and intensity, that which generates consistent behavior and peer enforcement of anti-bias behavior in actual work groups.

Summary: The Value of Establishing Anti-Bias Norms in Diverse Work Groups

This discussion raises a number of implications. First, it is likely that anti-bias norms will be structurally reproduced in diverse work groups because of their relevance and the paucity of common norms on which diverse members cohere (Levina & Orlikowski, 2009). Second, members of different identity groups will internalize and manifest these norms differently because of their specific experiences and identity group orientation (Mendoza-Denton et al., in press). Left in an ambiguous state, this internal variance in behavioral manifestations of anti-bias norms may hinder the group's ability to effectively leverage diversity. Paradoxically then, *strengthening* anti-bias norms within the work group can reduce uncertainty and improve performance on certain tasks—those requiring preparation and judgments of different others (Sommers, 2008) and creativity (Goncalo et al., 2010)—suggesting that developing members' agreement and intensity about anti-bias norms, which inhibit the expression of prejudice in demographically diverse work groups, may improve performance and members' identification with the group.

It is also possible that diverse groups benefit from strong anti-bias norms early in their development and may not benefit from emphasizing them as strongly over time. This would be the case if strong norms incited normative commitment, or value congruence, among members (e.g., O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996). When members have internalized a work group's norms, they adhere to those norms without the sustained oversight of the group. Diverse groups that develop normative commitment among members may not need to continue to emphasize anti-bias norms over time, a boundary condition for anti-bias norms. Of course it is possible that the conditions that enable value congruence to emerge also preclude prejudice. Either way, value congruence and prejudice may be incompatible such that diverse groups in which members express higher normative commitment to the group will benefit less from strong anti-bias norms than will diverse work groups that have developed less normative commitment.

Promoting Openness and Positive Interaction in Diverse Work Groups

In the section above I suggested that, rather than engaging in color- or gender-blind strategies, members of diverse work groups would be better served by simply acknowledging sex and race differences when they are relevant. Because of the inhibitory and potentially negative connotation of anti-bias norms, there may be alternative, approach oriented behaviors that provide a more palatable pathway for effectiveness in diverse work groups. Thus, another option is for group members to engage in affiliative behaviors to communicate positive inter-category intentions and focus on people's accomplishments (Shelton & Richeson, 2006). Even if diverse work groups develop agreement and intensity among members about anti-bias norms, members would rather identify with a work group based on having their own nurturance needs satisfied rather than on inhibiting behavior to manage their differences (e.g., Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994). It is also possible that when group members inhibit certain behaviors (e.g., prejudice) they may clear a path for expressing behaviors that promote effective interaction (e.g., creative problem solving).

Evidence for the value of these enhancing behaviors arises from recent research on individual differences and behaviors in diverse groups. Though this work has not focused on norms per se, individual differences and behaviors are the building blocks for norm emergence (e.g., Chatman & Flynn, 2001), and so considering these links may be useful in developing a comprehensive theory of norms in diverse groups. Norms also offer an additional route for improving interaction within diverse groups since addressing the challenges of diverse work groups through individual differences restricts solutions to the original selection of specific members. A normative solution, in contrast, implies that a group can be socialized to adopt norms that enhance its effectiveness (e.g., Hackman & Wageman, 2005).

Research has shown that contact with members of different identity groups is useful (e.g., Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), but not always sufficient to overturn existing stereotypes in diverse work groups (e.g., Chatman & Flynn, 2001). Indeed, contact can, in some cases, cause greater dysfunctions in diverse groups by spreading negative emotion and behavior (e.g., Glomb & Liao, 2003). Thus, sustained identification may require diverse groups to develop norms that allow members who are unfamiliar with one another's capabilities to update their judgments, in effect, decategorizing different others so that inaccurate stereotypes are corrected (Flynn et al., 2001; Gartner et al., 2000).

Decategorization is the process of surfacing personalized self-revealing information to enable people to get to know one another. Decategorizing people dislodges intergroup bias among identity groups (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Pettigrew, 1998). Prior research has addressed how perceptions of others evolve over time from surface level to deeper value based differences (e.g., Harrison et al., 1998), though explicit links to behavioral norms have not been made. Below I highlight individual differences and behaviors that may promote members' ability to accurately judge one another in non-stereotypic ways, and in so doing, contribute to the emergence of openness norms in diverse work groups.

Self-Verification, Positive Deferrals, Openness, and Entity Theories of Intelligence

Self-verification. One of the most direct ways of decategorizing people is by engaging in self-verifying activities when a group is convened. Cultivating norms supporting interpersonal congruence reduces members' reliance on inaccurate stereotyped perceptions. Self-verification describes the process by which people "seek and attain confirmation of their self-views" (Swann, Polzer, Seyle, & Ko, 2004, p. 10) and may have confidence-building effects on members of diverse groups. In particular, groups that embrace norms supporting the identity negotiations that lead to greater interpersonal congruence, or alignment between self views and appraisals by others, will replace stereotyped labels based on simple demographic attributes (Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002). In such groups, members will know that their colleagues have a more accurate picture of who they are. Thus, groups that cultivate members' willingness to engage in task relevant self-disclosure and to attend to others' self-disclosures should also enable people to predict and appreciate one another's contributions to the group.

Positive deferrals. A second approach may be to offer people positive attention for valued contributions to the group. Though seemingly straightforward, this may be hard to accomplish since positive deferrals are more likely to emerge in response to people whose identity group is consistent with the task at hand. In one study, numeric distinctiveness (e.g., being a solo

woman in a group of men) interacted with the sex typicality of the task (e.g., men working on math tasks is more typical than women working on math tasks) to influence individual and group behavior (Chatman, Boisnier, Spataro, Anderson, & Berdahl, 2008). But, rather than consistently reducing performance, as prior research had suggested, being numerically atypical *enhanced* individual and group performance when the task was typical for that person's sex. The key behavioral mechanism for these findings was the extent to which group members positively deferred to the "unique expert," the solo woman in the group working on verbal problems or the solo man working on math problems. Positive deferrals are statements by one or more members that explicitly highlight another member's relative expertise or invite him to offer his view in the group setting.

Conversely, when a person's sex was atypical for the task and she was the solo member of her sex, the group extended significantly fewer positive deferrals both to the solo as well as to other members of the group (Chatman et al., 2008). It is worth noting that these differences emerged above-and-beyond the solo member's actual expertise on the task. Indeed, some participating females were unequivocal math experts (e.g., math majors) and yet, when placed in groups that were numerically dominated by male subjects, they were viewed by the group as being less capable, even by those male subjects who were not themselves math experts. It is easy, then, to see why atypical solos' performance declined from their actual level of capability, which had been assessed on the same task but privately before they joined the group. Thus, minority status can boost perceived and actual individual and group performance when the person's sex is stereotypically congruent with the task but impairs performance when the solo is from an identity group that is atypical for the task, regardless of their underlying capability.

From the perspective of norms, however, the solo typical members received the majority of positive deferrals, and positive deferrals partially mediated the relationship between solo status/typicality and individual performance. More importantly, *groups* with solo typical members also performed better and this relationship was mediated by positive deferrals. This suggests that composition and behaviors interact to create norms that influence performance. In this case, larger differences in expertise and matching expertise with category congruent roles increased a group's performance by affecting member's expectations of who would help the group most. For majority members, the relative perceived expertise of the stereotypically congruent solo member led to deferential behavior, instilling confidence among members in the numerical minority and enabling him or her to increase their contribution to the group. Conversely, groups in which the solo member was atypical for the task dragged the group down and prevented the group from developing a behavioral norm to express appreciation for one another, as

evidenced by the lower mean number of positive deferrals in these groups compared to those with unique experts.

This research shows that, absent significant interventions, stereotypes based on readily apparent demographic attributes are likely to endure, despite emerging expertise among members of atypical identity groups. In Chatman et al.'s (2008) study, individuals' expertise was judged by the group according to stereotypes about men and women's expertise on math and verbal problems, respectively, rather than on each members' actual expertise which, in some cases, was considerable. Taken to the logical extreme, this suggests that a minority member would need to be perceived as the unique expert to be allowed, and motivated, to contribute to a group. Thus, improving group performance in settings in which the group has many experts or solo members whose demographic attributes are incongruent with the task may require substantial intervention. Future research might, therefore, examine group performance when members' expertise is highlighted, by a credible leader for example (e.g., Flynn et al., 2001; Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006), and then imposing a norm for expressing appreciation for members' expertise to see if performance improves under such conditions.

Openness. Researchers have identified a variety of individual differences that contribute to effective performance in diverse groups. In one study, Homan et al. (2008) showed that groups in which members were more open to experience performed better, arguing that openness to experience is correlated with openness to diversity. This makes sense since people who are more open to experience are less likely to stereotype others whose race differs from their own, and those who are high on openness are more willing to consider stereotype-disconfirming information (Flynn, 2005). Similarly, Kearney and his colleagues (2009) examined the need for cognition, an individual difference in people's intrinsic motivation for and enjoyment of, effortful cognitive activities (Cacioppo, Petty, Feinstein, & Jarvis, 1996). As predicted, they found that demographically diverse groups were better able to use the task relevant knowledge distributed among members when the average level of members' need for cognition was higher.

Though these studies focused on individual differences, there may be implications for group norms embedded within them. First, as is typical in individual difference research applied to groups, both research teams asked respondents to report on their attitudes and behaviors by replying to survey questions (e.g., "I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems."). Second, Kearney and his colleagues (2009) assessed the need for cognition among existing members of ongoing teams and Homan and her colleagues (2008) studied MBAs from a single cohort at one business school. These study elements allow for the possibility that, in addition to reporting their own individual attributes, respondents were also implicitly

reporting on typical patterns of behavior within their team. In this way, members who are high on openness may cause a norm of openness to emerge in the group or they may perceive behaviors as conforming to such a norm. Future research might assess the extent to which members' individual differences on these dimensions leads to behaviors conducive to openness to diversity and, ultimately, to group norms that support such openness.

Lay theories of the malleability of intelligence. People's theories about the malleability of personal attributes likely influence their behavior in diverse work groups as well. Dweck's mindset theory distinguishes between people who believe that knowledge and ability are fixed (entity theorists) and those who believe that such attributes are malleable (incremental theorists) (e.g., Chiu, Hong, & Dweck, 1997; Plaks, Grant, & Dweck, 2005). As Murphy and Dweck observe, "[P]eople find both entity and incremental views of intelligence plausible; however, they tend to personally endorse one theory more chronically than the other" (2010, p. 284). At the individual level, research has shown that people's lay theories about intelligence influence their endorsement of and tendency to stereotype others (Levy, Stroessner, & Dweck, 1998; Plaks, Stroessner, Dweck, & Sherman, 2001). In particular, people adopting a fixed view of intelligence were more likely to make stereotypical trait judgments of other racial and occupational groups and formed more extreme judgments of novel groups. Conversely, when people are told that intelligence is malleable they are less prejudiced toward people who are different from them (Crandall et al., 2002).

Though typically considered an individual difference (Dweck, 1988), researchers have recently examined how lay theories of intelligence develop within groups and organizations, or how they become normative. For example, even a minimal context consisting of reading an endorsement of either the entity or incremental mindset, can influence a person's implicit theory of intelligence (Nussbaum & Dweck, 2008). This led Murphy and Dweck (2010) to examine how lay theories of intelligence considered at the group level and conceptualized as mindset norms, influence people's understanding about what the group values and, as a result, how they behave in relation to that group. Specifically, subjects provided more information about their accomplishments when applying to the group that expressed fixed mindset norms and more information about their motivation whey applying to the group characterized by growth mindset norms. Perhaps most interestingly, the experience of applying to one type of group or the other had a lasting impact; it influenced subjects' subsequent choice of whom to hire into a totally unrelated group, 30 minutes after the first study, such that subjects who had originally applied to the groups with entity norms favored hiring the candidate who displayed her accomplishments and those who had applied to the group with

the incremental norm favored hiring the candidate who showed the motivation to grow and learn.

This work provides additional evidence that a group's norms influence behavior even if a person did not begin as a particularly good fit with those norms (Chatman, 1991). Further, those who join organizations that focus on entity norms like "being the smartest one in the room" are more likely to engage in extreme competitive behavior possibly leading to cheating and misrepresentation while neglecting opportunities to learn (Murphy & Dweck, 2010). Such behaviors are clearly incompatible with those focused on deriving value from a diverse group's collective efforts. In contrast, organizations that focus on incremental norms, such as fostering professional development, may motivate people to pursue learning opportunities and may cause diverse work groups to emphasize learning how to make the group work together as effectively as possible.

Research has also shown that different solutions exist for reducing bias across identity groups (e.g., Gaertner, Dovidio, Nier, Ward, & Banker, 1999) and that building a common group identity within a demographically diverse group helps the group optimize members' collective efforts (e.g., Chatman et al., 1998). Integrating these research streams leads to the possibility that groups emphasizing different mindset norms may need to use different approaches to reduce intra-group bias. For example, groups in which a fixed mindset norm dominates may be more likely to categorize others. Therefore, they may need to invoke norms that recategorize members from separate identity groups into a superordinate group (e.g., Gaertner et al., 1999). In contrast, groups with an incremental mindset norm might tend towards decategorization anyway but benefit from mutual differentiation, which emphasizes members' mutual distinctiveness in the context of cooperative interdependence.

Summary: The Value of Establishing Openness Norms in Diverse Work Groups

Drawing from a broad array of research domains, it appears as though norms that promote openness to others and openness to ideas may enhance effective interaction and performance in diverse work groups. In contrast to anti-bias norms, which may be unevenly reproduced within diverse groups, openness norms may be very unlikely to emerge in diverse groups without significant intervention. Thus, more effort may be required to establish openness norms than anti-bias norms. Certain individual differences, such as openness to experience and cognition as well as an incremental mindset may set the stage for behaviors associated with openness. Existing research suggests that selecting members who exemplify these attributes will increase the chances that such norms emerge. But, since traits in groups may not aggregate in a linear fashion, future research should assess norms directly to determine patterns of behavior that become normative. Indeed, one study found that the

relationship between members' individual status within the group, which was based on their prior performance, and the group's performance was curvilinear rather than linear such that above a certain average level, higher prior performance (status) among members *reduced* rather than increased group level performance (Groysberg, Polzer, & Elfenbein, in press).

A second general conclusion is that norms pertaining to openness—to experience, cognition, learning, and growth—may enable less biased and more satisfying interaction among members as well as better performance in diverse work groups. The common findings across a set of studies indicate that this is a dimension worthy of more explicit consideration and behavioral definition. Taken together, this suggests that demographically diverse work groups that promote positive deferrals, expressions of appreciation, and who verify members' self knowledge may perform more effectively than those who do not. The review also suggests that demographically diverse work groups composed of members who are higher on openness to diversity will be associated with stronger norms promoting behaviors associated with being open to diverse colleagues. And finally, demographically diverse work groups that develop norms that emphasize people's potential for growth will perform more effectively than those who emphasize an entity or fixed mindset.

Implications of Norms in Diverse Work Groups

Norms in work groups are complex, but are critical to understanding the challenges faced by diverse groups. Because of the unfamiliarity people have when grouped with demographically different others, norms—both their content and strength—are harder for members to develop, detect, and understand. Thus, members of diverse work groups may be less able to use norms to help them interpret and predict other's behavior. Instead of being able to focus completely on the task at hand, members of diverse groups instead deplete their cognitive resources by trying to figure out how to behave appropriately. Further, minority and majority identity group members feel more alienated in diverse work groups. It is surprising that norms, which have enormous influence on behavior (e.g., Crandall et al., 2003), have not been used as a primary lens for understanding and improving interaction among members of diverse work groups.

In reviewing relevant research, two types of norms appear essential. Antibias norms could beneficially be made more, rather than less strong, to reduce uncertainty and fill the norm void with one that is relevant to the process of getting work done in diverse groups. This is a unique solution for diverse groups; anti-bias norms will reduce uncertainty about which norms are strong and offer relevant behaviors for the diverse context of the group. In contrast, homogenous groups likely start with shared beliefs and expectations about numerous task-related and incidental issues and therefore, are burdened when anti-bias norms are made salient. The differences in how diverse and

homogeneous groups react to the imposition of anti-bias norms suggests that organizations may want to be judicious in over-applying these norms when members are demographically similar or already identify with their work group.

The review of recent research conducted here suggests that anti-bias norms, which are inhibitory in nature, may be effectively complemented by promotion focused norms that enable diverse members to decategorize one another and strip away stereotypes. Future research might further investigate the specific complementarities among these two types of norms in diverse work groups but also, more generally between prevention and promotion focused behaviors at the group level. The specific promotion behaviors identified from a survey of recent research include openness to cognitive effort and experience, a growth mindset, positive deferrals, norms that promote member's ability to verify one another based on how they see themselves. Unfortunately for diverse groups, these norms are not likely to develop naturally; instead, diverse groups have been characterized by mistrust, discomfort, and individualistic behavior. Thus, a central problem for diverse groups is that the norms needed to optimize performance are not the ones that will likely emerge naturally. Researchers and managers alike have underestimated the extent of intentional intervention required for diverse groups to be effective, which may also explain why the benefits of diverse work groups have been so slow to materialize. The goal of this paper has been to identify the strength and content requirements of norms that might be particularly useful for diverse groups. Implementing these norms remains a challenge, one that should be vigorously pursued in future research.

Limitations

This paper offered, of course, a limited analysis. Among these limits is a lack of differentiation among specific demographic attributes and a somewhat narrow focus on sex and race differences, which are clearly important but not the only relevant demographic differences affecting work groups (e.g., Pfeffer, 1983). Research has shown that different types of diversity in teams influences information use, performance, and other important outcomes. For example, nationality diversity had a U-shaped relationship to the range of information the group used while educational diversity had the opposite inverted U-shaped effect (Dahlin, Weingart, & Hinds, 2005). Even differences in the context in which research is conducted, the laboratory or the field, can alter which demographic attributes influence group performance (Bell, 2007). On the other hand, some theories seem to extend beyond the demographic categories to which they were originally applied, such as contact theory (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Thus, future research should continue to develop theories that help us understand which diversity findings may generalize across attributes and which have unique effects.

The analysis presented here made only a few distinctions between groups with varying amounts of diversity. More fine grained analyses of a group's complete demographic profile, including whether certain pairs of attributes are correlated, would be useful (e.g., Polzer & Caruso, 2008; Swann et al., 2004). While it is unclear whether groups that are equivalently diverse will develop norms with different content than will groups characterized by correlated attributes, the strength of those norms that develop will almost certainly be affected.

With regard to norms, research has supported the idea that strong norms, regardless of their content, can reduce a group's ability to adapt to changing circumstances. The habitual nature of strong norms, even if they are functional for the group, can reduce a group's vigilance in assessing situations or alternative behavioral choices (Gersick & Hackman, 1990). For example, using data from 200 *Fortune* 500 firms over an 11 year period, Sorensen (2002) found that norm strength was positively related to organizational performance consistency only when industry volatility was low; that is, organizations with stronger norms did worse than those with weaker norms in more dynamic environments. Perhaps more relevant to works groups, Nemeth and Staw (1989) found that greater cohesion and norm agreement led to less tolerance for deviation and reduced creativity. Thus, the relationship between the strength of strong norms focusing on being anti-biased and group performance may be curvilinear such that beyond some level, strong norms of any sort, anti-bias norms included, may stifle rather than stimulate creativity and adaptation. In this way, increasing levels of agreement and intensity on anti-bias norms may improve a diverse group's performance up to a point and then reduce performance. In contrast, anti-bias norms may be both inversely and linearly related to homogeneous group performance. Thus, future research should investigate when strong norms become too strong to promote innovation.

Future Research

Finally, the list of norms that were considered here was limited to those that appear to matter in diverse groups as suggested by prior research. Future research might expand this list to consider norms that are more distal—that is, not related to the immediate need to interact or complete a task. One question is whether diverse groups need to develop *many* norms, including some that are not explicitly linked to that task at hand, as opposed to simply developing a few strong norms that relate to the group's work. Future research could examine and compare new diverse groups for which several behavioral norms that are less relevant to the group's task are made salient (e.g., everyone brings food to share)—an "irrelevant content" or bonding condition and compare that to diverse groups in which one highly task relevant norm is made salient (e.g., majority based decisions)—a "relevant norm content" condition. Such a

test would illuminate the importance of aligning norm content and strength—that is, the relative importance for norms to be strong *and* related to the specific task respectively, versus, for example, building shared norms that are orthogonal to their work. Results could have significant implications for training diverse work groups and whether generalized bonding or, perhaps actual on-the-job group coaching that pertains to the task is most helpful.

Most groups in work organizations experience changing membership over time and so a related question is how norms are maintained within groups as membership changes over time. Researchers have argued that norms should become weaker over time as existing members depart and new members join (e.g., Moreland, 1985) while other research has suggested that group norms can become stronger and more readily enforced even as membership changes (e.g., Harrison & Carroll, 2006). Group norms are at least partially dynamic, changing to accommodate the changing normative orientations of group members and the changing nature of their task demands (e.g., Jehn & Mannix, 2001). It is unlikely, however, that all norms would be equally elastic. For example, compared to individualistic norms, cooperative norms are less likely to emerge and are less stable; they require both a structure that provides benefits associated with cooperation and group members who prefer cooperation (Bettenhausen & Murnighan, 1991; Chatman & Flynn, 2001). Thus, one hypothesis is that cooperative norms will be less persistent over time than will individualistic norms. Specifically groups that start with cooperative norms will likely become more competitive over time as group members with competitive orientations enter, while groups that start with competitive norms will be more likely to retain those norms regardless of whether cooperative members join. If, as past research has shown (Chatman & Flynn, 2001) diverse groups start out with fewer advantageous, but more inelastic, norms such as internal competitiveness, they may be more resistant to change. Further, norm durability may interact with group composition making norms that would be more stable in homogeneous groups less so in diverse groups by, for example, requiring only one or few defecting behaviors to undermine them.

Conclusion

The abundant research and public policy devoted to understanding diversity and prejudice confirms how critically important these constructs are for effective interactions among people in a diverse society. Despite these efforts, however, we have not yet answered the question of how this research aggregates to help understand and improve relationships among people who are different from one another. I focused on diverse work groups in this paper, which implies a functional perspective on improving performance for economic value. But, it is also clear that if diverse work groups cannot solve the social interaction challenges that they uniquely face as a result of their composition and the psychology of diversity, they will be unable to fully

leverage the potential value of that very diversity. Above and beyond this observation, however, confronting the challenges of diversity in small groups may offer insight into solving the challenges of discrimination in our larger society.

What we derive from putting together findings from research on prejudice, norms, and diverse work groups is that strong norms dictate behavior but also, that diverse groups are at a disadvantage since they are less likely to develop strong group norms that reshape the structurally reproduced norms of members' demographic identity groups. We also find that two clusters of norms are particularly useful for diverse groups: those that emphasize inhibiting biased behavior and those that promote openness. Diverse work groups, before they do anything else together, need to enable secure interactions among their members. These two sets of norms may, therefore, be prerequisites to successful interaction and effective performance within diverse groups.

These conclusions suggest that research in these domains could be usefully reoriented to focus on actual, intact diverse groups, rather than on individuals operating in isolation or hypothetical groups, and explicitly on the contextual features of those groups, particularly their norms, that influence group behavior perhaps even more than individual level attributes. The pressure is on to figure out how to unlock the potential of diverse work groups. In the context of economic volatility and the turbulence it has caused for organizations worldwide, discovering and implementing innovative ideas, products, and processes is more important than ever. Research shows that convening diverse teams—whether by nationality, sex, function, race, age, experience, or tenure—is a key to deriving innovative solutions to complicated problems. Given the simultaneously occurring trends of using teams and unprecedented diversity in the workforce, it is surprising that social norms, which powerfully shape attitudes and behaviors relevant to diversity, have not been more specifically investigated in this context.

Recognizing both the unique challenges of forming strong and relevant norms should accelerate our understanding of diverse work groups. Since these groups are microcosms of larger societal interactions, perhaps even our understanding of relationships among diverse others more broadly conceived, will be enlightened by a sharper focus on salient norms. Specifically, some norms appear to improve functioning in diverse groups allowing them to generate and use diverse information. Groups that are able to gain agreement and intensity among members about norms that emphasize the importance of being sensitive to different others without stifling creativity are likely to be more innovative. Further, groups with members who resonate with and behave in ways that show that they are open to experience and diversity, who believe that intelligence is malleable, and who set in motion behaviors that encourage others to contribute and recognize them for doing so, are likely to

be more effective not only compared to diverse groups who fail to develop these norms, but compared to homogeneous groups as well. Organizations, leaders, and work groups that are able to embrace these norms will be the ones who, by addressing basic needs and apprehensions, cultivate innovation, and define what's next.

Acknowledgement

Endnote

1. A group can, for example, include a subset of members who share multiple attributes, or faultlines (Lau & Murnighan, 1998). Some evidence suggests that dysfunctions are more pronounced in groups characterized by moderate diversity (faultlines) than by those in which maximum diversity exists (e.g., Lau & Murnighan, 2005). But, no research to-date has shown that faultlines result in *different* dysfunctions than those arising in maximally diverse groups. Rather, a few studies have shown that groups characterized by faultlines may experience similar dysfunctions to those of maximally diverse groups, such as a lack of group identification and increased conflict (e.g., Bezrukova, Jehn, Zanutto, & Thatcher, 2009). Thus, for the purposes of this paper, *diversity* includes groups that differ on one dimension or many, and groups in which demographic dimensions are distributed evenly or unevenly.

References

Alderfer, D.A., & Thomas, C.P. (1989). The influence of race on career dynamics: Theory and research on minority career experiences. In M.B. Arthur, D.T. Hall, & B.S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory* (pp. 133–158). Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Allmendinger, J., & Hackman, J.R (1995). The more the better? A four-nation study of the inclusion of women in symphony orchestras. *Social Forces, 74,* 423–460.

Ancona, D.G., & Caldwell, D.F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37,* 634–665.

Apfelbaum, E.P., Sommers, S.R., & Norton, M.I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist? Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 95,* 918–932.

Ashford, S.J., & Northcraft, G.B. (1992). Conveying more (or less) than we realize: The role of impression-management in feedback seeking. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 53,* 310–334.

Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation.* New York: Basic Books.

Bacharach, S.B., Bamberger, P.A., & Vashdi, D. (2005). Diversity and homophily at work: Supportive relations among White and African-American peers. *Academy of Management Journal, 48,* 619–644.

Bantel, K.A., & Jackson, S.E. (1989). Top management and innovations in banking: Does the composition of the top team make a difference? *Strategic Management Journal, 10,* 107–124.

Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35,* 633–642.

Bell, S.T. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 595–615.

Berger, J., Fisek, M.H., Norman, R.Z., & Zelditch, M. (1977). Status organizing processes. *Annual Review of Sociology, 6,* 479–508.

Bettenhausen, K.L., & Murnighan, J.K. (1991). The development and stability of norms in groups facing interpersonal and structural challenge. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36,* 20–35.

Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K.A., Zanutto, E.L., & Thatcher, S. (2009). Do workgroup faultlines help or hurt? A moderated model of faultlines, team identification, and group performances. *Organization Science, 20,* 35–50.

Biernat, M., Collins, E., Katzarska-Miller, I., & Thompson, E. (2009). Race-based shifting standards and racial discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35,* 16–28.

Birenbaum, A., & Sagarin, E. (1976). *Norms and human behavior.* New York: Praeger.

Blascovich, J., Mendes, W., Hunter, S., Lickel, B., & Kowai-Bell, N. (2001). Perceiver threat in social interactions with stigmatized others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 253–267.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Brendl, C.M., Higgins, E.T., & Lemm, K.M. (1995). Sensitivity to varying gains and losses: The role of self-discrepancies and event framing. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 69,* 1028–1051.

Brewer, M.B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 86,* 307–324.

Brewer, M., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives of desegregation. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in conflict: A psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281–302). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Brief, A.P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R.R., Pugh, S.D., & Vaslow, J.B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81,* 72–97.

Briton, N.J., & Hall, J.A. (1995). Gender-based expectancies and observer judgments of smiling. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 19,* 49–65.

Cable, D.M., Aiman-Smith, L., Mulvey, P.W., & Edwards, J.R. (2000). The sources and accuracy of job applicants' beliefs about organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 1076–1085.

Cacioppo, J.T., Petty, R.E., Feinstein, J.A., & Jarvis, W.B.G. (1996). Dispositional differences in cognitive motivation: The life and times of individuals varying in need for cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 119,* 197–253.

Camacho, M., & Paulus, P. (1995). The role of social anxiousness in group brainstorming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68,* 1071–1080.

Cha, S.E., & Edmondson, A.C. (2006). When values Backfire: Leadership, attribution, and disenchantment in a values-driven organization. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17,* 57–68.

Chatman, J.A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36,* 459–484.

Chatman, J., Boisnier, A., Spataro, S., Anderson, C., & Berdahl, J. (2008). Being distinctive versus being conspicuous: The effects of numeric status and sex-stereotyped tasks on individual performance in groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 107,* 141–160.

Chatman, J., & Flynn, F. (2001). The influence of demographic composition on the emergence and consequences of cooperative norms in groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 44,* 956–974.

Chatman, J., & O'Reilly, C. (2004). Asymmetric effects of work group demography on men's and women's responses to work group composition. *Academy of Management Journal, 47,* 193–208.

Chatman, J., Polzer, J., Barsade, S. & Neale, M. (1998). Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 43,* 749–780.

Chiu, C., Hong, Y., & Dweck, C.S. (1997). Lay dispositionism and implicit theories of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73,* 19–30.

Cialdini, R.B., Kallgren, C.A., & Reno, R.R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 24,* 201–234.

Cohen, S.G., Ledford, G.E., & Spreitzer, G.M. (1996). A predictive model of self managing work team effectiveness. *Human Relations, 49*(5), 643–676.

Complaints about the DMV. (2007, March 2). *New York Times,* p. B1.

Cooper, J., Kelly, K.A., & Weaver, K. (2001). Attitudes, norms, and social groups. In M.A. Hogg & S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Group processes* (pp. 259–282). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Cox, T.H., Lobel, S.A., & McLeod, P.L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 827–847.

Crandall, C.S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 414–446.

Crandall, C.S., Eshleman, A., & O'Brien, L. T. (2002). Social norms and the expression of prejudice: The struggle for internalization. *Journal for Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 359–378.

Dahlin, K., Weingart, L., & Hinds, P. (2005). Team diversity and information use. *Academy of Management Journal, 48,* 1107–1123.

Doerr, K.H., Mitchell, T.R., Schriesheim C.A., Freed T., & Zhou X.T. (2002). Heterogeneity and variability in the context of flow lines. *Academy of Management Review, 27,* 594–607.

Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (1986). *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Dweck, C.S. (1988). Motivation. In R. Glaser & A. Lesgold (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology and education* (pp. 187–239). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eagly, A., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward men and women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15,* 543–558.

Eagly, A.H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C., & van Engen, M.L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 569–591.

Earley, P.C., & Gibson, C.B. (2002). *Multinational work teams: A new perspective.* Malwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Earley, P.C., & Mosakowski, E. (2000). Creating hybrid team cultures: An empirical test of transnational team functioning. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 26–49.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44,* 350–383.

Ehrhart, M.G., & Naumann, S.E. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: A group norms approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 960–974.

Ely, R.J., Meyerson, D.E., & Davidson, M.J. (2006). Rethinking political correctness. *Harvard Business Review, September,* 1–11.

Ely, R.J., & Thomas, D. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The moderating effects of work group perspectives on diversity. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46,* 229–273.

Feldman, D.C. (1984). The development and enforcement of group norms. *Academy of Management Review, 9,* 47–53.

Finn, C.E. (1986). The campus: An island of repression in a sea of freedom. *Commentary,* 17–23.

Fiske, S. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed.) (pp. 357–414). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiske, S.T. (2000). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination at the seam between the centuries: Evolution, culture, mind, and brain. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30,* 299–322.

Flynn, F.J. (2005). Having an open mind: The impact of openness to experience on interracial attitudes and impression formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 816–826.

Flynn, F., & Chatman, J. (2001). Strong cultures and innovation: Oxymoron or opportunity? In S. Cartwright et al. (Eds.), *International handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 263–287). Sussex, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Flynn, F., & Chatman, J. (2003). "What's the norm here?" Social categorization as a basis for group norm development. In J. Polzer, E. Mannix, & M. Neale (Eds.), *Research in managing groups and teams* (pp. 135–160). London: JAI Press, Elsevier Science.

Flynn, F., Chatman, J., & Spataro, S. (2001). Getting to know you: The influence of personality on impression formation and performance of demographically different people in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46,* 414–442.

Forster, J., Grant, H., Idson, L.C., & Higgins, E.T. (2001). Success/failure feedback, expectancies, and approach/avoidance motivation: How regulatory focus moderates classic relations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37,* 253–260.

Gaertner, S.L. & Dovidio, J.F. (2000). Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Gaertner, S., Dovidio, J., Banker, B., Houlette, M., Johnson, K., & McGlynn, E. (2000). Reducing intergroup conflict: From superordinate goals to decategorization,

recategorization, and mutual differentiation. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice* [Special issue: One hundred years of group research], *4,* 98–114.

Gaertner, S., Dovidio, J., Nier, J., Ward, C., & Banker, B. (1999). Across cultural divides: The value of a superordinate identity. In D. Prentice & D. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides*: *Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 173–212). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Galliot, M.T., Stillman, T.F., Schmeichel, B.J., Maner, J.K., & Plant, E.A. (2008). Mortality salience increases adherence to salient norms and values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34,* 993–1003.

Gersick, C.J.G., & Hackman, J.R. (1990). Habitual routines in task-performing groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 47,* 65–97.

Glomb, T.M., & Liao, H. (2003). Interpersonal aggression in work groups: Social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects. *Academy of Management Journal, 46,* 486–496.

Goff, P., Steele, C., & Davies, P. (2008). The space between us: Stereotype threat and distance in interracial contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94,* 91–107.

Goncalo, J.A., Chatman, J.A., Deguid, M., & Kennedy, J.A. (2010). *Political correctness and freedom of expression in idea generating groups: The role of uncertainty reduction.* Working paper, University of California, Berkeley Haas School of Business.

Goncalo, J.A., & Staw, B.M. (2006). Individualism-collectivism and group creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 100,* 96–109.

Groysberg, B., Polzer, J., & Elfenbein, H. (in press). Too many cooks spoil the broth: How high status individuals decrease group effectiveness. *Organization Science.*

Hackman, J.R., & Gersick, C.B.G. (1990). Habitual routines in task-performing groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 47,* 65–97.

Hackman, J.R., & Wageman, R. (2005). When and how team leaders matter. In B. Staw & R. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 26) (pp. 37–74). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Hambrick, D.C., Cho, T.S., & Chen, M. (1996). The influence of top management team heterogeneity on firm's competitive moves. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41,* 659–684.

Harrison, D., Price, K., & Bell, M. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal, 41,* 96–107.

Harrison, J.R., & Carroll, G. (2006). *Culture and demography in organizations.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hess, U., Blairy, S., & Kleck, R.E. (2000). The influence of facial emotion displays, gender, and ethnicity on judgments of dominance and affiliation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 24*(4), 265–283.

Higgins, E.T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52,* 1280–1300.

Hogg, M.A., & Terry, D.J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *The Academy of Management Review, 25,* 121–140.

Homan, A.C., Hollenbeck, J.R., Humphrey, S.E., Van Knippenberg, D., & Ilgen, D.R., & Van Kleef, G.A. (2008). Facing differences with an open mind: Openness to experience, salience of intragroup differences, and performance of diverse work groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 51,* 1204–1222.

Ilgen, D.R., Hollenbeck, J.R., Johnson, M., & Jundt, J. (2005). Teams in organizations: From I–P–O models to IMOI models. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56,* 517–543.

Inside Intel: Paul Otellini's plan will send the chipmaker into uncharted territory—and founder Andy Grove applauds the shift. (2006, January 9). *Business Week.* Retrieved from http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/06_02/b3966001.htm

Ito, T.A., & Urland, G.R. (2003). Race and gender on the brain: Electrocortical measures of attention to the race and gender of multiply categorizable individuals. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 85,* 616–626.

Jackson, J. (1965). Structural characteristics of norms. In I.D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), *Current studies in social psychology* (pp. 301–309). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Jackson, S.E., Joshi, A., & Erhardt, N.L. (2003). Recent research on team and organizational diversity: SWOT analysis and implications. *Journal of Management, 29,* 801–830.

Janis, I.L., & Mann, L. (1977). *Decision making.* New York: Free Press.

Jehn, K.A., & Mannix, E.A. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 238–251.

Jehn, K.A., Northcraft, G.B., & Neale, M.A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44,* 741–763.

Johns, M., Inzlicht, M., & Schmader, T. (2008). Stereotype threat and executive resource depletion: Examining the influence of emotion regulation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 137,* 691–705.

Joshi, A., Liao, H., & Jackson, S.E. (2006). Cross-level effects of workplace diversity on sales performance and pay. *Academy of Management Journal, 49,* 459–481.

Kark, R., & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review, 32,* 500–528.

Kawakami, K., Dunn, E., Karmali, F., & Dovidio, J.F. (2009). Mispredicting affective and behavioral responses to racism. *Science, 323,* 276–278.

Kearney, E., Gebert, D., & Voelpel, S.C. (2009). When and how diversity benefits teams: The importance of team members' need for cognition. *Academy of Management Journal, 52,* 581–598.

Keller, R. (2001). Cross-functional project groups in research and new product development: Diversity, communications, job stress, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 44,* 547–556.

King, E., Kaplan, S., & Zaccaro, S. (2008). Metaperceptions in diverse work groups: Intrapersonal perspectives and intragroup processes. In K.W. Phelps (Ed.), *Research on managing groups and teams* (Vol. 11) (pp. 109–141). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kors, A.C., & Silvergate, H. (1998, November). Codes of silence: Who's silencing free speech on campus and why. *Reason Magazine.* Retrieved from http://reason.com/archives/1998/11/01/codes-of-silence

Kozlowski, S., & Bell, B. (2003). Work groups and teams in organizations. In W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen, & R.J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 12) (pp. 333–375). New York: Wiley.

Kritz, M.M., & Gurak D.T. (2004). Immigration and a changing America. In R. Farley & J. Haaga (Eds.), *The American people: Census 2000* (pp. 259–299). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lakoff, R.T. (2001). *The language war.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lau, D.C., & Murnighan, J.K. (1998). Demographic diversity and faultlines: The compositional dynamic of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 325–340.

Lau, D.C., & Murnighan, J.K. (2005). Interactions between groups and subgroups: The effects of demographic faultlines. *Academy of Management Journal, 4,* 645–659.

Lawler, E.E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levina, N., & Orlikowski, W.J. (2009). Understanding shifting power relations within and across organizations: A critical genre analysis. *Academy of Management Journal, 52,* 627–703.

Levine, J.M., Higgins, E.T., & Choi, H.S. (2000). Development of strategic norms in groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 82,* 88–101.

Levy, S.R., Stroessner, S., & Dweck, C. (1998). Stereotype formation and endorsement: The role of implicit theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 1421–1436.

Major, B., & O'Brien, L.T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56,* 393–421.

Markus, H., & Cross, S. (1990). The interpersonal self. In L.A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 576–608). New York: Guilford Press.

Mendoza-Denton, R., Goldman-Flythe, M., Pietrzak, J., Downey, G., & Aceves, M. (in press). Group value ambiguity: Understanding the effects of academic feedback on minority students' self-esteem. *Social Psychological and Personality Science.*

Meyer-Lindenberg, A., Hariris, A., Munoz, K.E., Mervis, C.B., Mattay, V.S., Morris, C.A., & Berman, K.F. (2005). Neural correlates of genetically abnormal social cognition in Williams syndrome. *Nature Neuroscience, 8,* 991–993.

Miller, D.T., Monin, B., & Prentice, D.A. (2000). Pluralistic ignorance and inconsistency between private attitudes and public behaviors. In D.J. Terry & M.A. Hogg (Eds.), *Attitudes, behavior, and social context: The role of norms and group membership* (pp. 95–113). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mitchell, R., & Boyle, B. (2009). A theoretical model of transformational leadership's role in diverse teams. *Leadership and Organization Development, 30,* 455–474.

Monin, B, & Miller, D. (2001). Moral credentials and the expression of prejudice. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *81,* 33–43.

Montepare, J.M., & Opeyo, A. (2002). The relative salience of physiognomic cues in differentiating faces: A methodological tool. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 26,* 43–59.

Moreland, R.L. (1985). Social categorization and the assimilation of "new" group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 1173–1190.

Moreland, R.L., & Argote, L. (2003). Transactive memory in dynamic organizations. In R. S. Peterson & E. A. Mannix (Eds.), *Leading and managing people in the dynamic organization* (pp. 135–162). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Morrison, E.W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 37,* 1543–1567.

Moscovici, S. (1994). Three concepts: Minority, conflict, and behavioral style. In Moscovici, S., Mucchi-Faina, A., & Maass, A. (Eds.), *Minority influence.* Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin, 126,* 247–259.

Murphy, M., & Dweck, C. (2010). A culture of genius: How an organization's lay theory shapes people's cognition, affect, and behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36,* 283–296.

Nembhard, I.M., & Edmondson, A.C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27,* 941–966.

Nemeth, C.J., & Staw, B.M. (1989). The tradeoffs of social control and innovation in groups and organizations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 22,* 175–210.

Nishii, L.H., & Mayer, D. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help the performance of diverse groups? The moderating role of leader-member exchange in the diversity to group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94,* 1412–1426.

Norton, M., Sommers, S., Apfelbaum, E., Pura, N., & Ariely, D. (2006). Color blindness and interracial interaction: Playing the political correctness game. *Psychological Sciences, 17,* 949–953.

Norton, M.I., Vandello, J.A., & Darley, J.M. (2004). Casuistry and social category bias. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 87,* 817–831.

Nussbaum, A.D., & Dweck, C.S. (2008). Defensiveness versus remediation: Self-theories and modes of self-esteem maintenance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34,* 599–612.

Operario, D., & Fiske, S.T. (2001). Ethnic identity moderates perceptions of prejudice: Judgments of personal versus group discrimination and subtle versus blatant bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2,* 550–561.

O'Reilly, C.A., III. (1989). Corporations, culture, and commitment: Motivation and social control in organizations. *California Management Review, 31,* 9–25.

O'Reilly, C.A., III, Caldwell, D.F., & Barnett, W.P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34,* 21–37.

O'Reilly, C.A., III, & Chatman, J. (1996). Culture as social control: Corporations, cults and commitment. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 18,* 157–200.

O'Reilly, C.A., III, Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D.F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 487–516.

Paluck, E.L., & Green, D.P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A critical look at evidence from the field and the laboratory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60,* 339–367.

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, 44,* 1–28.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49,* 65–85.

Pettigrew, T.F., & Tropp, L.R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90,* 751–783.

Phillips, K.W. (2003). The effects of categorically based expectations on minority influence: The importance of congruence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 3–13.

Phillips, K.W., Liljenquist, K.A., & Neale, M.A. (2009). Is the pain worth the gain? The advantages and liabilities of agreeing with socially distinct newcomers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(3), 336–350.

Pierro, A., Cicero, L., & Higgins, E.T. (2009). Followers' satisfaction from working with group-prototypic leaders: Promotion focus as moderator. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45,* 1105–1110.

Plaks, J.E., Grant, H., & Dweck, C.S. (2005). Violations of implicit theories and the sense of prediction and control: Implications for motivated person perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 245–262.

Plaks, J.E., Stroessner, S.J., Dweck, C.S., & Sherman, J.W. (2001). Person theories and attention allocation: Preferences for stereotypic versus counter-stereotypic information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 876–893.

Plant, E.A., & Devine, P.G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 790–801.

Polzer, J.T., & Caruso, H.M. (2008). Identity negotiation processes amidst diversity. In A.P. Brief (Ed.), *Diversity at work* (pp. 89–126). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polzer, J.T., Milton, L.P., & Swann, W.B. (2002). Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47,* 296–324.

Prentice, D.A., & Miller, D.T. (1996). Pluralistic ignorance and the perpetuation of social norms by unwitting actors. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29) (pp. 161–209). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Rafaeli, A., Dutton, J., Harquail, C.V., & Mackie-Lewis, S. (1997). Navigating by attire: The use of dress by female administrative employees. *Academy of Management Journal, 40,* 9–45.

Ravitch, D. (2003). *The language police.* New York: Knopf.

Richeson, J.A. & Shelton, J.N. (2007). Negotiating interracial interactions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16,* 316–320.

Richeson, J., & Trawalter, S. (2005). Why do interracial interactions impair executive function? A resource depletion account. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 934–947.

Ridgeway, C.L. (1991). The social, construction of status value: Gender and other nominal characteristics. *Social Forces, 70,* 367–386.

Roberson, L., Deitch, E.A., Brief, A.P., & Block, C.J. (2003). Stereotype threat and feedback seeking in the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62,* 176–188.

Rokeach, M., & Ball-Rokeach, S.J. (1989). Stability and change in American value priorities, 1968–1981. *American Psychologist, 44,* 775–784.

Rucker, D.D., Polifroni, M., Tetlock, P.E., & Scott, A.L. (2004). On the assignment of punishment: The impact of general-societal threat and the moderating role of severity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30,* 673–684.

Rudman, L., & Phelan, J. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28,* 61–79.

Ruggiero, K.M., & Taylor, D.M. (1997). Why minority group members perceive or do not perceive the discrimination that confronts them: The role of self-esteem and perceived control. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 72,* 373–389.

Rynes, S., & Rosen, B. (1995). A field survey of factors affecting the adoption and perceived success of diversity training. *Personnel Psychology, 48,* 247–270.

Saks, A.M., & Ashforth, B.E. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 234–279.

Schein, E.H. (1988). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schwarz, N.B., & Clore, G.L. (2003). Mood as information: 20 years later. *Psychological Inquiry, 14,* 296–303.

Shah, J.Y., Brazy, P.C., & Higgins, E.T. (2003). Forms of ingroup bias. In D.M. Mackie, & E.R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp. 31–48). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Shelton, J.N. (2003). Interpersonal concerns in social encounters between majority and minority group members. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6,* 171–185.

Shelton, J.N., & Richeson, J.A. (2006). Ethnic minorities' racial attitudes and contact experiences with white people. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12,* 149–164.

Sherif, M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms.* New York: Harper & Row.

Somech, A. (2006). The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams. *Journal of Management, 32,* 132–157.

Sommers, S. (2008). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90,* 597–612.

Sommers, S.R., & Norton, M.I. (2006). Lay theories about White racists: What constitutes racism (and what doesn't). *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 9,* 117–138.

Sorensen, J.B. (2002). The strength of corporate culture and the reliability of firm performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47,* 70–91.

Spencer, S.J., Steele, C.M., & Quinn, D.M. (1999). Stereotype threat and women's math performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35,* 4–28.

Stauffer, J., & Buckley, M. (2005). The existence and nature of racial bias in supervisory ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 586–591.

Steele, C.M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist, 52,* 613–629.

Steele, C.M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 69,* 797–811.

Stewart, G.L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of relationships between team design features and team performance. *Journal of Management, 32,* 29–55.

Stone, B., & Vance, A. (2009, June 22). Apple's obsession with secrecy grows stronger. *New York Times,* p. B1.

Swann, W.B., Polzer, J.T., Seyle, D.C., & Ko, S.J. (2004). Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups. *Academy of Management Review, 29,* 9–27.

Swim, J.K., Aikin, K.J., Hall, W.S., & Hunter, B.A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 68,* 199–214.

Talbot, M. (2008). Feminism and language. In S. Gamble (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to feminism and postfeminism* (2nd ed.) (pp. 111–116). London: Routledge.

Thibaut, J.W., & Kelley, H.H. (1986). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Thomas, D., & Ely, R. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review, September–October,* 79–90.

Toossi, M. (2006). A new look at long-term labor force projections to 2050. *Bureau of Labor Statistics Monthly Labor Review, 129*(11), 19–39.

Toossi, M. (2007). Labor force projections to 2016: More workers in their golden years. *Bureau of Labor Statistics Monthly Labor Review, 130*(11), 33–52.

Tsui, A.S., Egan, T.D., & O'Reilly, C.A., III. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37,* 549–579.

Tropp, L.R., & Pettigrew, T.F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16,* 951–957.

Turner, J.C., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Turner, J.C., Oakes, P.J., Haslam S.A., & McGarty C. (1994). Self collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 454–463.

Umphress, E.E., Simmons, A.L., Boswell, W.R., & Triana, M. (2008). Managing discrimination in selection: the influence of directives from an authority and social dominance orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 982–993.

Van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C.K.W., & Homan A.C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 1008–1022.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M.C. (2006). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58,* 515–541.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M.C. (2007). Work group diversity. In M.I. Posner & M.K. Rothbart (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology* (Vol. 58) (pp. 515–541). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Wagner, R., Baldwin, T., & Roland, C. (1991). Outdoor training: Revolution or fad? In C.E. Schneir, C.J. Russell, R.W. Beatty, & L.S. Baird (Eds.), *Training and development sourcebook* (pp. 142–147). Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Walsh, J.P., Weber, K., & Margolis, J.D. (2003). Social issues and management: Our lost cause found. *Journal of Management, 29,* 859–881.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review, 92,* 548–573.

Westphal, J.D., & Stern, I. (2007). Flattery will get you everywhere (especially if you are a male Caucasian): How ingratiation, boardroom behavior, and demographic minority status affect additional board appointments at U.S. companies. *Academy of Management Journal, 50,* 267–288.

Wharton, A.S., & Baron, J. (1987). So happy together? The impact of gender segregation on men at work. *American Sociological Review, 52,* 574–587.