Jones, D. (2004). Screwing diversity out of the workers? Reading diversity. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17*, 281–291.
Jones, D., & Stablein, R. (2006). Diversity as resistance and recuperation: Critical theory, post-structuralist perspectives and workplace diversity. In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J. K. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace diversity* (pp. 145–166). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Lee, A. S. (1991). Integrating positivist and interpretive approaches to organizational research. *Organization Science, 2*, 342–365.
Prasad, A. (2012). Beyond analytical dichotomies. *Human Relations, 65*, 567–595.
Prasad, A., & Mills, A. J. (2010). Critical management studies and business ethics: A synthesis and three research trajectories for the coming decade. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*, 227–237.
Scherer, A. G., & Steinmann, H. (1999). Some remarks on the problem of incommensurability in organization studies. *Organization Studies, 20*, 519–544.
Willmott, H. (1993). Breaking the paradigm mentality. *Organization Studies, 14*, 681–719.

# Values Cannot Be Ignored

EDEN B. KING, DAVID A. KRAVITZ, AND TRACY MCCAUSLAND
*George Mason University*

SAMANTHA PAUSTIAN-UNDERDAHL
*University of North Carolina at Charlotte*

We agree with Ferdman and Sagiv (2012) that the disciplines of workplace diversity and cross-cultural work psychology can and should learn from one another. However, we think it is important to consider the implications of a "value-free" cross-cultural work psychology. Although cross-cultural work psychology scholars may attempt to describe culture without systematic preferences, as Ferdman and Sagiv suggest, culture inherently imposes a set of values on individuals that affect their interpersonal and intergroup interactions. Cultural values affect reactions to diversity in the United States and the ability to generalize and export U.S. diversity concepts to other countries. Moreover, value-free approaches to cross-cultural work psychology have had the unintended consequence of discounting value-laden cross-cultural interactions and thus have sometimes inhibited diversity work.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Eden B. King.
E-mail: Eking6@gmu.edu
Address: Department of Psychology, George Mason University, 4400 University Drive, MSN 3f5, Fairfax, VA 22030

## Different Underlying Values

Ferdman and Sagiv contrast diversity and cross-cultural research in light of the values scholars bring to their research questions. They argue that "diversity research is not neutral." Diversity scholars view diversity as a desirable outcome and as a source of additional desirable outcomes for individuals and organizations. Research in this area focuses on overcoming challenges, such as bias, to attaining those positive outcomes. This is contrasted with the description of cross-cultural scholarship as an investigation of "both universals and differences across cultures with no preference for either" that ultimately seeks to understand the "full spectrum of values, norms, and thought systems." To elaborate on this distinction, we note that diversity practice is typically designed to change both individuals and organizations to ensure equal inclusion of everyone, whereas cross-cultural training is designed to help individuals adapt to life in foreign lands (Caligiuri, Phillips, Lazarova, Tarique, & Bürgi, 2001; Takeuchi, Yun, & Tesluk, 2002). Because such sojourners cannot change the host culture and thus cannot adapt successfully if they consider their own perspectives

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01459.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

to be superior, a value-free approach is necessary.

## The Valuable Lens of Workplace Diversity

We argue that the value-free lens Ferdman and Sagiv describe is problematic because it overlooks consistent—universal—evidence of the emergence of conflicts between people from different groups. Insofar as cross-cultural work psychology views distinct collective understandings as equally "good" or valid, its ability to contribute to the diversity area may be limited. Scholars of culture taking a value-free approach may forget that individuals and groups do not see their cultures as value free. Indeed, the cultures within which individuals are embedded are themselves embedded within the individuals. That is, culture directly shapes individual beliefs about what is right and wrong—with their own cultural assumptions being right and other approaches being wrong. Controversial examples of these effects can be seen in starkly contrasting views about the role of women in different cultures. Members of a culture high in gender egalitarianism (see House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004, pp. 437–512) perceive traditions that involve female genital mutilation, female feticide, or even conservative standards of dress (e.g., coverings such as hijabs or burkas) as "wrong," whereas they are seen as "right" in the cultures within which they occur frequently.

Ferdman and Sagiv specified that, "cross-cultural work psychology seeks to identify patterns that exist at a collective level and then influence individual behavior." Unfortunately, however, with few exceptions (e.g., Luijters, Zee, & Otten, 2008; Zee, Atsma, & Brodbeck, 2004), cross-cultural studies rarely consider the set of individual behaviors that relate to acceptance of *other* cultures. The question of how individuals view others is generally left for scholars of diversity.

We do not dispute the contention that diversity research is value ridden. Instead, we argue that this research highlights the importance of understanding the beliefs and attitudes (often grounded on cultural values) that employees bring with them to work. As Ferdman and Sagiv mention, this scholarship is anchored in social identity and self-categorization theories (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) that view individuals as members of meaningful social groups from which they derive knowledge of themselves and others. The large body of findings that has emerged from this theoretical base has shown that people generally prefer and favor members of their own social groups to members of other groups (Brewer, 2007) and that seemingly insignificant, minimal distinctions between groups can give rise to group favoritism or even intergroup conflict (Tajfel, 1970). Indeed, there is even evidence that this bias is biologically determined (Lewis & Bates, 2010).

An application of this perspective to cross-cultural psychology would allow for greater consideration of the cultural lenses that color everyday human actions. These biases are so ingrained by our socialization that they may be even more difficult to identify, assess, and overcome than the prejudices that are typically studied in diversity scholarship.

## Research at the Intersection of Culture and Diversity

When we acknowledge that cultural differences are value-filled for individuals residing in different cultures, implications for diversity research become evident. Although national culture—the focus of cross-cultural work psychology—"has been studied as one notable source of diversity" (Ferdman & Sagiv), there is less work on how national culture moderates reactions to diversity and on how organizations should approach diversity management.

From a practitioner perspective, the professional press is filled with articles about the dangers of exporting U.S.-centric diversity management to other countries (e.g., Doke, 2003), and the business world is well aware of the problem (Forbes, 2011).

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01459.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

Researchers have contributed to this discussion by suggesting that organizations can develop more effective diversity management practices through interorganizational knowledge transfer (Easterby-Smith, Lyles, & Tsang, 2008). In addition, Chen and Easterby-Smith (2009) examined how Western organizations can learn from HR management practices of Eastern organizations including guanxi and action-oriented practices.

The need for culture-specific approaches to diversity management is front and center in Nishii and Özbilgin's (2007) model of global diversity management. Unfortunately, we are aware of distressingly few examples of diversity research that explores the moderating effects of national culture. Such work is needed if we are to develop an evidence-based diversity management. The little work that exists points to interesting conclusions. For example, Holladay and Quiñones (2005) demonstrated that trainees from collectivistic cultures are less receptive to diversity training than are those from individualistic cultures. In addition, ratings of trainer effectiveness and training usefulness were affected by interactions of trainee culture by trainer culture, trainee culture by trainee job level, and trainer culture by trainer gender. In each case, effects of other variables were larger in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures. Another example is provided by Van der Vegt, Van de Vliert, and Huang (2005), who studied innovative climate in multiple locations of a multinational company. They found that tenure and functional diversity were positively related to innovative climate in low-power-distance countries, but this relationship was reversed in high-power-distance countries. On the other hand, power distance did not moderate the relations between innovative climate and either age or gender diversity.

## The Appeal of a Value-Free Approach

Unfortunately, we believe that the disconnectedness of the diversity and cross-cultural work psychology literatures has been perpetuated by and contributed to the development of an implicit hierarchy wherein discussions of "culture" are more socially acceptable than considerations of "diversity." In general, people are more comfortable talking about "value-free" cultural differences than about power-based ethnic or gender differences (Allen, 1995), and we believe this contributes to a preference within organizational scholarship for research on cross-cultural psychology over that on workplace diversity. A search of articles published in major journals (*Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, and *Academy of Management Journal*) in the past two years yielded twice as many using the word "culture" ($N = 45$) than those using the word "diversity" ($N = 22$), with an additional set using both terms ($N = 12$). Correspondingly, business schools often require classes about global management and sometimes even require international travel as part of their curricula (Kedia, 2006; Thanopoulos & Vernon, 1987) but rarely offer courses on diversity management, much less require them (Bell, Connerley, & Cocchiara, 2009). Practitioners and researchers of organizational psychology apparently see questions of culture as central to the functioning of a globalized workplace, whereas they believe diversity is a peripheral issue. This preference for a value-free approach is rather ironic given the central role of values in cross-cultural work psychology and the importance of cultural values as a source of diversity and as a moderator of reactions to diversity. Nevertheless, there remains opportunity: The diversity area can advance by incorporating the values explored by cross-cultural work psychology, and cross-cultural work psychology can advance by incorporating the diversity area's focus on how differences in values affect interpersonal relations.

## References

Allen, B. J. (1995). "Diversity" and organizational communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 23*, 143–155.

Bell, M. P., Connerley, M. L., & Cocchiara, F. (2009). The case for mandatory diversity education.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01459.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Academy of Management Learning & Education, 8,* 597–609.
Brewer, M. B. (2007). The importance of being we: Human nature and intergroup relations. *American Psychologist, 62,* 728–738.
Caligiuri, P., Phillips, J., Lazarova, M., Tarique, I., & Bürgi, P. (2001). The theory of met expectations applied to expatriate adjustment: The role of cross-cultural training. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12,* 357–372.
Chen, C. L., & Easterby-Smith, M. (2009). Can Western HRM learn from Eastern MNCs? The case of Taiwanese/Chinese MNCs in the UK. *International Journal of Chinese Culture and Management, 2,* 333–351.
Doke, D. (2003). Shipping diversity abroad. *HR Magazine, 48,* 58–64.
Easterby-Smith, M., Lyles, M. A., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2008). Inter-organizational knowledge transfer: Current themes and future prospects. *Journal of Management Studies, 45,* 677–690.
Ferdman, B. M., & Sagiv, L. (2012). Diversity in organizations and cross-cultural work psychology: What if they were more connected? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 5,* 323–345.
Forbes. (2011). *Global diversity and inclusion: Fostering innovation through a diverse workforce.* New York, NY: Forbes.
Holladay, C. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2005). Reactions to diversity training: An international comparison. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 16,* 529–545.
House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies (Leadership, culture, and organizations).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Kedia, B. L. (2006). Globalization and the future of international management. *Journal of International Management, 12,* 242–245.
Lewis, G. J., & Bates, T. C. (2010). Genetic evidence for multiple biological mechanisms underlying in-group favoritism. *Psychological Science, 21,* 1623–1628.
Luijters, K., Zee, K. V. D., & Otten, S. (2008). Cultural diversity in organizations: Enhancing identification by valuing differences. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32, 154–163.*
Nishii, L. H., & Özbilgin, M. F. (2007). Global diversity management: Towards a conceptual framework. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18,* 1883–1894.
Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223,* 96–102.
Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
Takeuchi, R., Yun, S., & Tesluk, P. E. (2002). An examination of crossover and spillover effects of spousal and expatriate cross-cultural adjustment on expatriate outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 655–666.
Thanopoulos, J., & Vernon, I. R. (1987). International business education in the AACSB Schools. *Journal of International Business Studies, 18,* 91–98.
Van der Vegt, G. S., Van de Vliert, E., & Huang, X. (2005). Location-level links between diversity and innovative climate depend on national power distance. *Academy of Management Journal, 48,* 1171–1182.
Zee, K. V. D., Atsma, N., & Brodbeck, F. (2004). The influence of social identity and personality on outcomes of cultural diversity in teams. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35,* 283–303.

# International and Intranational Cultures in Organizations: Overlapping or Contested Terrain?

KATHLYN Y. WILSON AND CHRISTINA SCHWABENLAND
*University of Bedfordshire*

We agree broadly with the core argument that Ferdman and Sagiv (2012) are making, and we believe that where diversity in organizations is focused on differences of race or ethnicity (as opposed to other markers of identity such as gender or disability) there is clear scope for integration. Indeed, we contend that the distinction between ethnic minority research and cross-cultural research is probably a false one (Wilson, 2006). In this commentary, we argue that

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kathlyn Y. Wilson.
E-mail: Kathlyn.Wilson@beds.ac.uk
Address: Business School, University of Bedfordshire, Park Square, Luton, Bedfordshire LU1 3JU, UK

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01459.x Published online by Cambridge University Press