SOCIALIZATION AMIDST DIVERSITY:
THE IMPACT OF DEMOGRAPHICS ON WORK TEAM OLDTIMERS AND NEWCOMERS

Susan E. ackson, Veronica K. Stone,
and Eden B. Alvarez

ABSTRACT

increasingconcerns about the work experiences of women and ethnic minorities have spawned various organization-based interventions for "managing diversity." Yet the organizational literature offers little guidance for designing and evaluating such efforts. Furthermore, much of the available research emphasizes static comparisons between groups of employees who differ with respect to their demographic attributes. In contrast, a full understanding of diversity requires attending to cognitive, affective, and behavioral phenomena inherent in social interaction. This paper presents a broad framework' for studying diversity that focuses on its impact on socialization processes for oldtimerssand newcomers within work teams, for it is during the socialization phase of group life that relations among team members are established and routinized. Key components comprising the framework cross multiple levels of analysis and include: demographic and personal attributes (e.g., sex, ethnicity); intrapersonal mediating processes (self-concept, affect, social cognitions); interpersonal manifestations (e.g., communications, roles); and subsequent, more distal consequences (performance, power and influence, development, membership stability). Numerous propositions about the relationships among these phenomena are derived from existing evidence and offered to stimulate new research.

Research in Organizational Behavior, Volume 15, pages 45-109.

ISBN: 1-55938-522-7

During the past five years, concern over the implications of the increasingly diverse nature of the workforce has grown. In the wake of the Hudson Institute's influential reports titled *Workforce 2000* (Johnston & Packer, 1987) and *Opportunity 2000* (Bolick & Nestleroth, 1988), newspapers and business magazines have focused the public's attention with stories about ambitious new "managing diversity" initiatives being implemented by many organizations. Although these initiatives differ in a number of ways, generally they are designed to improve an organization's ability to manage a work force that includes employees of varying genders, ages, races, ethnicities, values, skills, and lifestyles. The goal is to enable all employees to realize their full potential (Thomas, 1992) while contributing to organizational effectiveness.

The consequences of work force diversity are pervasive and broad-ranging: Diversity uniquely shapes the experiences of individuals, dyads, groups, relations between groups, organizations as wholes, and even relations between organizations (see Jackson, May, & Whitney, forthcoming). The pervasive consequences of diversity mean that organizations should design any new initiatives with an awareness of how *all* of these phenomena might be impacted. Research programs, on the other hand, are better served by more focused attention. In this paper, we focus on the question of how diversity shapes intrapersonal and interpersonal processes that unfold during the socialization phase in the life of a work team.

In order to address the question of how diversity impacts these socialization processes this paper takes the reader on a journey that begins with a brief look at the environmental forces that are pushing the topic of diversity onto the business agenda. Understanding this is an important first step for researchers because it highlights the multifaceted nature of diversity. Having broadly described the environmental context, we present a framework for discussing the consequences of diversity.

The framework we adopt treats teams as dynamic social systems with a definable life course, which can be characterized by several phases that unfold developmentally over time. Undoubtedly, diversity impacts team functioning throughout the team's entire life course. In this paper, however, we focus only on the role diversity plays during socialization because it is during this period that many patterns of interaction are negotiated and routinized. Assuming that group relations are continually in flux, we treat socialization as a phase that occurs early in a team's life. It is not a state or endpoint to be achieved. Instead, socialization is a dynamic period during which the team attempts to assimilate newcomers and newcomers attempt to achieve accommodation from the team (e.g., see Ashford & Tsui, 1991; Bell & Staw, 1989; Feldman & Brett, 1983; E. Morrison, 1992a, 1992b). During the socialization phase, the uncertainty created by shifting membership is transformed into predictable patterns of interaction, which are then more or less maintained until the team's membership again changes. Because the imprint of the socialization phase is

carried forward to influence the team in later phases, is has special significance for understanding the interpersonal dynamics observed in established work teams and for understanding how and why diversity impacts work team effectiveness.

WHY IS "MANAGING DIVERSITY" ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL AGENDA?

The New EEO Era

For some organizations, today's managing diversity efforts have their roots in the affirmative action programs of the 1960s and 1970s. Then, the social agenda included correcting the effects of past discrimination and preventing further discrimination. The method for achieving this was to increase the work opportunities for members of groups that had been discriminated against in the past, especially women and members of ethnic minority groups. Organizations-which up until that point were populated predominantly by white males-began to develop affirmative action programs to actively recruit and hire "nontraditional" employees. Due *in part* to the success of affirmative action programs, today's work force is more heterogeneous. However, this heterogeneity is concentrated primarily in the lower and middle rungs of the organizational hierarchy (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990), suggesting the presence of a glass ceiling.

Of course, women and members of ethnic minority groups are not the only ones experiencing glass ceilings. Lesbians and gay men, who are increasingly vocal in the workplace, have long felt pressured to deny or hide their sexual identities out of fear of having their careers sidetracked (Stewart, 1991). Currently, both changing legislation (e.g., the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990) and changing labor market demographics are expanding the number of employee characteristics to which employers must be sensitive.

Paradoxically, at the same time as organizations are being alerted to the apparent presence of glass ceilings, white males are becoming more vocal in expressing their dissatisfaction with affirmative action programs, which some people perceive as tantamount to "reverse discrimination" (e.g., Deutsch, 1991; "Race in the Workplace," 1991; Solomon, 1991). Also, a growing number of women and minority group members are realizing that programs that target them for special attention can have unintended negative side-effects (e.g., Carter, 1991; DeLuca & McDowell. 1992; Heilman, Lucas, & Kaplow, 1990; Williams, 1987).

Employers' rising concerns about the best way to manage diversity reflect concerns of the larger society. But social and political forces are not the only reasons behind organizations' growing interest in the issue of managing diversity. Combining with these are several other forces that seem to make

the challenge of managing diversity all the more pressing, including: slower growth in the labor supply; substantial changes in work force demographics; globalization; and new organization designs that rely relatively more on work teams as basic building blocks.

Slow Growth in Labor Supply

One of the more salient forces currently experienced by employers is the tightening of the supply of qualified employees. According to one survey (Towers Perrin & Hudson Institute, 1990), shortages of technical, secretarial, clerical, professional, and supervisory/ management skills make recruiting difficult now for at least half of U.S. employers, and the problem is expected to worsen in the near future. Particular types of labor shortages are slightly worse in some geographic regions and in some industries, but regional and industry variations are relatively minor-the problem is pervasive within the United States and is likely to become worse when the economy recovers from the current recession and begins to expand. Developing a corporate image of being "friendly" toward nontraditional employees appears to be one tactic employers can use to compete in such a labor market ("Welcome to the Woman-friendly Company," 1990).

Changing Work Force Demographics

Gender Diversity

In the late 1950s, when many of today's CEOs were entering the labor force as young professionals, they were being joined almost exclusively by other men. At that time, men were receiving 95% of the MBA degrees awarded and 90% of the bachelors degrees in business. As these men finish their careers 30 years later, women are receiving approximately 31% of the MBA degrees awarded, 30% of the law degrees, 13% of engineering degrees (Butruille, 1990), and half of all undergraduate degrees. Women, as a group, are now better educated than before and more of them are in the labor force. The result is that by the year 2000, the work force is expected to be almost completely balanced with respect to gender. Because women represent such a large portion of the work force, maximizing their level of productivity is essential to competitiveness, yet male executives readily admit that women still face discriminatory barriers to development and advancement (Edwards, 1991; Fierman, 1990).

Diverse Ethnic Cultures

Cultural diversity is another frequently noted change in the U.S. work force. *Workforce 2000* projections indicate that during this decade, only 58% of labor

force entrants will come from the "majority" population of whites born in the United States. Nearly one-fourth of new entrants are expected to be immigrants. African-Americans will account for most of the remainder of new entrants. The use of broad labels such as "immigrant," "white American," "African-American," "Hispanic-American," "American Indian," and "Asian-American" reveal only a small part of the story, however, for within each of these broad categories are many distinct ethnic cultures and subcultures. For example, the 1990 U.S. Census included 11 different categories for Asian-American respondents to use to describe their ancestry, 8 categories for respondents with Pacific Island ancestry, 4 categories for respondents of Hispanic origin, 16 categories for white native respondents, as well as separate categories for American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts. Given that ethnic heritage often has a substantial impact even on second- and third-generation citizens (Fugita & O'Brien, 1991; Mydans, 1991), it is clear that domestic firms, as well as international firms, must learn to manage cultural diversity effectively.'

Age Diversity

In developed countries such as the United States, the median population age has been increasing steadily. The result is a bulging cohort of "older" employees trying to climb a very crowded corporate ladder. The plight of this cohort is further exacerbated by recent waves of downsizings and restructurings made in response to competitive pressures. As corporations reduce layers of hierarchy and become flatter, previously segregated generations of employees find themselves working together and even rotating jobs among themselves. The combination of changes in the age distribution of employees and flatter organizational structures means that four generations of workers can find themselves working side by side ("Managing Generational Diversity," 1991). Even *if* employees from these four generations all shared a similar ethnic background, they would nevertheless differ in their values and attitudes about work (see Elder, 1975; Howard & Bray, 1988; "Work Attitudes," 1986), their physical and mental functioning (Rhodes, 1983), and everyday concerns reflecting their differing stages in the life cycle.

Globalization

The globalization of business activities is another force pushing issues of diversity into the foreground. As trade barriers fall, foreign sourcing sometimes becomes more attractive and new growth opportunities are created. To capture large shares of foreign markets, offshore production plants, licensing agreements and joint ventures with foreign-based firms are often desirable and sometimes necessary. The speed of globalization in the business world is

suggested by a recent worldwide survey of over 12,000 managers: 45% of respondents in large companies reported that their employing organization had expanded internationally during the past two years (Kanter, 1991). At the very least, these expansions require cross-cultural interactions for top-level managers; in many organizations technical experts and other nonexecutives also are more likely to find themselves working with colleagues from different cultural backgrounds. The diversity issues inherent in such a scenario parallel those that have arisen from the ethnic diversity of our domestic work force. The high rates and high cost of expatriate failures and unsuccessful or conflictual international alliances experienced by U.S. companies are yet another force that is heightening the business community's awareness of the potential value of managing diversity effectively.

More Teamwork

The industrial revolution led organizations to design jobs in ways that keep task interdependence to a minimum (e.g., see Piore & Sable, 1984). In search of ever-greater efficiency, the predominant approach to job design for most nonprofessional jobs has been to break work into small tasks that individuals can repeatedly perform throughout the day, more or less independently of other employees.

Recently, a number of forces have pushed organizations to redesign jobs in ways that increase task interdependence for nonprofessional as well as professional jobs. One such force was the emergence of Japanese businesses as major U.S. competitors, which stimulated many companies to experiment with group-based interventions. Another reason for redesigning jobs to emphasize teamwork is that multifunction/ multidepartment teams are believed to improve a company's competitiveness in a number of ways, for example by facilitating production quality (see Banas, 1988; see also Walton & Hackman, 1986), innovation (Kanter, 1988, 1989), and the development of new products that will be acceptable to customers and easy to produce (Dumaine, 1990). For these and other reasons, some observers of the American business scene are now predicting that self-managing work teams who have control over the management and execution of their tasks are the "wave of the future" (see Hoerr, 1989). A recent survey of nearly 3,000 managers from around the world indicates that the growing interest in teamwork is a global phenomenon (Towers Perrin, 1991). This trend toward greater reliance on work teams, in combination with the increasing diversity of the work force, will almost certainly force employers to find new approaches to managing diversity.

The Need for Research on Diversity

In response to the environmental forces discussed above, organizations are experimenting with a wide variety of interventions (e.g., see Jackson &

Associates, 1992; Jamieson & O'Mara, 1991; Thomas, 1991). Unfortunately, due to the lack of scientific research available to guide these efforts, the interventions may not be effective. Or, their success may be overshadowed by unexpected negative side effects. For example, special mentorship programs designed to enhance the management skills of women may be viewed by men as unfair favoritism. At the same time, women may reject such programs as an unwelcome signal that their abilities are not valued as highly as they ought to be, or that something about them needs to be "fixed." As another example, training programs designed to "raise awareness" and educate people about differences in the behaviors, norms, and values of people from various ethnic and national cultures are sometimes criticized because they are viewed as perpetuating stereotypes (Lindsay, 1990). Negative side effects such as these could perhaps be anticipated if researchers, managers, and business consultants were better informed about the dynamics of diversity.

To stimulate research and provide guidance to those designing initiatives for improving the management of diversity, this paper articulates how diversity can be expected to shape interpersonal and group processes in organizations, focusing in particular on the socialization phase that occurs early in the life of a work team. Our discussion is organized around the framework shown in Figure 1. First, the specific elements of the framework are described and our key assumptions are explicitly stated. Then, we briefly review research relating diversity to longer-term consequences. This brief review reveals that there is already a fair amount of evidence supporting our assertions that the constructs listed in the first column of Figure I are empirically related to socialization experiences and to the constructs listed in the last column. With this established, we then turn to a discussion of the intrapersonal mediating processes and their interpersonal consequences, for these are likely to account for the empirical relationships found between diversity and its longer-term consequences such as performance and membership stability.

A FRAMEWORK FOR STUDYING SOCIALIZATION AMIDST DIVERSITY

A fairly inclusive framework for considering the consequences of diversity in work organizations has been developed by Jackson et al. (forthcoming). The framework covers multiple levels of analysis, identifies several components of diversity, and maps out a broad range of relevant cognitive, affective, and behavioral phenomena. Figure 1 presents an abbreviated adaptation of the Jackson et al. framework that highlights phenomena particularly relevant for understanding interpersonal and group dynamics during socialization. Figure l specifies the constructs to be discussed in this paper. However, it does not specify the causal connections proposed among the constructs listed. Numerous reciprocal and complex interrelationships are assumed to exist. Propositions

Figure 1. Framework for Studying Socialization Amidst Diversity

MODERATING CONDITIONS

Societal Context

Organizational Context

Team Characteristics | Nature of Team's Task | Human Resource Management Practices

Components of Diversity For Three Levels of Analysis	*Intrapersonal Mediating Processes*	*Interpersonal Manifestations*		*Subsequent Consequences For Individuals and Team*
		Communication	*Relations Established.*	
Levels of Analysis	Self-Concept	Work-Related Communications	Reference Orientation of Newcomers	Performance
Individual: Individual Attributes	Social Identity			
	Self-Esteem		Assimilation	
Individual-to-team: Attribute (Dis)similarity	Self-Efficacy		Integration	
			Marginalization	
			Separation	
Team: Attribute Heterogeneity				
Demographic Attributes	Affective Responses	Friendship-Related Communications	Roles of Newcomers and Oldtimers in Team	Power and Influence
Sex	Attraction			
Race	Anxiety		Custodianship	
Ethnicity	Frustration		Innovation	
Age				
Personal Attributes	Social Cognitions	Influence-Related	Cohesiveness	Development
Status	Stereotypes	Communications		
Knowledge, Skills, & Abilities	Expectancies			
Behavioral Style	Information			
Values & Beliefs	processing			
	Attributions			Membership Stability

Note: Causal linkages among constructs are multiple and complex. This heuristic framework is not designed to directly reflect these causal linkages.

describing some of these interrelationships are developed below. It is worth doting, however, that we do *not* intend to suggest that simple statements of cause-and-effect relationships can adequately reflect the complex dynamics ',uggested by Figure 1. Instead, consistent with an open systems perspective, we assume that the elements shown in Figure 1 are nodes in a complex, multilevel, and dynamic nomological net. The objectives of this paper are to (l) briefly review what is known about this nomological net and (2) use this as a foundation to speculate about how diversity might impact the specific dynamics that unfold during a new work team's socialization phase. Figure 2, a hypothetical case example, illustrates the complexity of the social phenomena we hope to illuminate through our analysis. The dynamics described in this example are the focus of this paper.

Groups and Teams

Discussions of socialization assume the existence of a group of individuals who have some type of meaningful relationship to each other. Virtually all adults belong to multiple groups. Consequently they experience socialization, as agents and as targets, within the context of multiple groups. This paper focuses on socialization in face-to-face work groups. We refer to these groups as work teams, and make several assumptions about their characteristics. First, we assume that a team is "new" in the sense that it has recently had at least one new member join it. However, we also assume some continuity between t he newly instantiated team and a previous team-our discussion may not apply to "newborns" created by bringing together employees who have *no* previous history. The "new" teams we consider are assumed to include at least two established members (oldtimers) in addition to at least one new member (newcomer). Second, the teams of interest are those considered by members and by the larger organization to be somewhat enduring entities rather than temporary structures with intendedly short life spans; such teams, we presume, will be responsible for completing organizational tasks that require some coordination among team members. Also, due to space constraints, throughout most of our discussion we make two important simplifying assumptions: that the team of interest includes a group of relatively homogeneous oldtimers and a newcomer who is perceived as dissimilar to the oldtimers.

Components of Diversity

We use the general term *diversity* to refer to situations in which the actors of interest are not alike with respect to some attribute(s). However, because the actors of interest can be individuals and/or groups, more precise terms are sometimes needed. These terms are described next.

Figure 2. Illustration of Socialization Amidst Diversity

Richard, Tom, Jerry, and Paul (hereafter referred to as the ` oldtimers") are longtime state government employees. These middle-age middle managers work in the office of the comptroller. They've worked as a team on various projects, and a good deal of comraderie has evolved amongst them. Three months ago, they were charged with evaluating alternative medical benefits packages for state employees, and providing recommendations to the state legislature. A week ago, a new member, Lynn, was hired by Hal. She is a replacement for John, who took early retirement just as this project was getting underway. John had worked his way into his position through years of loyalty and a willingness to learn from others. On past projects, the team counted on him to support their decisions and carry out many of their more routine tasks.

Richard and his teammates have mixed reactions to Lynn, who is in her early 30s and earned her MBA degree at Wharton. They are relieved to finally have someone to pick up John's workload and they trust Hal's positive assessment of Lynn's technical expertise, but they are slightly uncomfortable with the prospect of working closely with her. Although they would balk at the suggestion, their feelings and behavior toward Lynn are shaped by the behavior patterns and associated stereotypes about women that prevailed when they were much younger.

Overall, the oldtimers experience ambivalence about Lynn as a teammate. Anticipating the benefits that may accrue to the team due to Lynn's technical knowledge and status as a Wharton graduate, they are also somewhat threatened by her education and social status (Paul and Richard have only recently enrolled in the executive MBA program offered by the local state college). Also, they are skeptical about how much a woman-and a young one at that-can contribute to the complex finance-related matters that they have been dealing with for so many years. Still, the oldtimers are optimistic about Lynn's transition into the team: As long as she is eager to learn they feel a positive working relationship will probably evolve.

Lynn experiences anxiety as she begins her transition into this team. Initially, her anxiety is comparable to that experienced by any newcomer. It is accompanied by a feeling of attraction to a team of professionals who she views as similar due to their common areas of expertise. She appreciates their status within the system and hopes to be accepted as a colleague. However, as time passes, the oldtimers'stereotypes about women and their expectations for her become more clear. Her anxiety and her identity as a woman are heightened as a result.

Fresh from a successful stint with an insurance company and with memories of an outstanding academic record still salient, Lynn feels confident about her skills. Sensitive to her role as a newcomer, she decides to keep a low profile initially, particularly during the team's daily meetings. Her quiet manner inadvertently confirms the oldtimers' low expectations regarding her ability to contribute to their project. After a few weeks, more confident in her assessment of the oldtimers and the nature of the work, Lynn begins to speak up more frequently. Most of the time her teammates interrupt her when she attempts to contribute so she begins to feel that her suggestions are not taken seriously. Also, she realizes that her teammates frequently socialize

(continued)

Figure 2. (Continued)

together outside of work, and she occasionally overhears off-color remarks about "girls" made by Jerry, which draw chuckles from the other oldtimers. This heightens her awareness of being different and leads her to comment about the "old-boy network" when she talks with her friends about life at work.

Lynn becomes progressively more frustrated with the oldtimers and their resistance to her ideas about new ways to analyze the costs associated with various benefits packages. Her increasing outspokenness during meetings creates some anxiety among the oldtimers, who aren't sure how to react. Fortunately, she has at least established a bit of a friendship with Tom, who she discovered grew up in the same small town as she did. Tom has begun to take her comments more seriously, but as a result there seems to be some tension between him and the other oldtimers. Being well-meaning, he attempts to act as a mentor, suggesting to Lynn that her ideas might be given more weight by the others if she adopted a more feminine style and was a bit less aggressive. Put off a bit by this remark, Lynn begins to reassess her role in the group. She doesn't accept the subordinate role the oldtimers have carved out for her but she nevertheless continues to want to be accepted by them. She knows their evaluations can have important career implications, particularly given how well-connected they are politically within the system.

Lynn decides that the smoothest and most fruitful approach is to work behind the scenes on the project, subtly proffering her ideas to her teammates on a one-to-one basis outside of the formal meetings held by the team. The new tactic meets with mixed success. Her demure behavior during meetings yields subtle approval, yet she continues to feel her ideas are undervalued. In spite of her belief that the oldtimers' behavior reflects their inability to take female peers seriously, in general, self-doubts about her ability to handle such a high level job begin to pervade her thoughts. When Hal checks with her to see how things are going, her self-doubt, along with her fear of being labelled "weak" or "not a team player," lead her to conceal her feelings of frustration. Nor does she reveal her feelings to Tom, her one ally on the team, for fear he will not understand. Being new to state government and having few female colleagues to turn to she feels isolated.

During the months that follow, Lynn copes by monitoring the reactions of her teammates and adjusting her behavior accordingly-to a point. After four months on the job, relationships within the team appear to stabilize. The oldtimers now make efforts to ask for her input during each meeting and Lynn typically reins in her comments until that time. Slowly, minor new cost analyses have been incorporated into their projections for their report. Lynn has lowered her expectations about how much she can contribute to the project, particularly given her teammates' resistance to her ideas, but she freely speaks her mind when she has a strong opinion about a debated issue. She has learned to continue to keep talking when she is interrupted, and finds she is interrupted less now than she was initially. At the same time, she is developing her network outside of the team with hopes of learning about other job opportunities.

Individual Attributes

At the individual level of analysis, attributes describe characteristics of team members, including both newcomers and oldtimers. Two types of attributes relevant to a discussion of diversity are *demographic* attributes and *personal* attributes. Demographic attributes refer to those that are immutable, that can be readily detected during a brief interaction with a person, and for which social consensus can be assumed (e.g., sex, race, ethnicity, age). Personal attributes are mutable and subjectively construed psychological and interpersonal characteristics (e.g., status, knowledge, behavioral style), which can change as a consequence of socialization processes.

Although both demographic and personal attributes can influence team processes, the influences they have are likely to differ. Both types of attributes are associated with some characteristic behaviors. However, easily detected demographic attributes are the basis for the way people spontaneously categorize each other (Stangor, Lynch, Duan, & Glass, 1992); thus, they are the primary basis of social cognitions, including stereotypes, expectancies, and attributions. In a sense, these social cognitions reflect the inferential logic by which people translate easily detected information about demographic attributes into best-guess hypotheses about the personal attributes of a stranger.

Attribute (Dis)similarity

Dissimilarity is a relational construct that refers to the degree to which two entities share common attributes. In the present discussion, the entities of interest are social in nature and the attributes of primary interest are demographic. Thus, we use the term *demographic similarity* to characterize the degree to which two individuals share common attributes (e.g., Tsui & O'Reilly, 1989) and the degree to which an individual's attributes are shared by other members of a team (e.g., Jackson, Brett, Sessa, Cooper, Julin, & Peyronnin, 1991; Wagner, Pfeffer, & O'Reilly, 1984). The term *similarity* can also be used to characterize the degree to which members of two subgroups or groups share common attributes.

Attribute Heterogeneity

Heterogeneity refers to the degree to which members of a group, as a whole, are similar (homogeneous) or dissimilar (heterogeneous) to each other on individual-level attributes. Thus, heterogeneity is a summary description that specifies the average degree of similarity among all possible pairs of individuals in a group on a given dimension. In laboratory experiments, heterogeneity is often treated as a dichotomous variable, with only two levels generally observed: homogeneous groups are compared to heterogeneous groups whose

members are split 50-50 between two categories. In natural field settings, however, heterogeneity is a matter of degree. It takes a low value when all members of a group belong to the same category and approaches higher values to the extent (a) members are relatively equally distributed among all categories represented in the group, and (b) there are many categories represented in the group.

Conceptually, the constructs of dissimilarity and heterogeneity can both be used to characterize relations between social entities for an entire array of attributes. That is, degrees of dissimilarity and heterogeneity are best captured by comparing attribute *profiles* rather than considering dissimilarity and heterogeneity for attributes singly and in isolation from each other. While it is likely that future research will utilize profile measures of similarity and heterogeneity (cf. Chatman, 1991; Rentsch, 1990), most past theorizing and empirical research in this area considers the consequences of attributes treated singly. Although our references to empirical studies reflects this past practice, we intend our propositions to be interpreted as consistent with the more complex operational indices likely to be used in the future.

Intrapersonal Mediating Processes

In our framework, intrapersonal mediating processes are conceptualized as individual-level psychological phenomena. As is true for all components of the framework shown in Figure 1, the phenomena listed as mediating processes can be used to characterize the experiences of oldtimers as well as newcomers. For example, in our hypothetical case (Figure 2), the feelings and behaviors of both the newcomer, Lynn, and the oldtimers reflect the stereotyping people naturally engage in.

Self-concept

Theories about the nature of the self are many, varied, and complex (see Rosenberg, 1990). Following Cooley's (1902/1964) discussion of the "looking-glass" self, we treat self-concept as an individual's view of him- or herself, assuming this self-view partly reflects how others view the person. Figure 1 highlights three interdependent components of self: social identity, self-esteem, and self-efficacy. Social identity refers to that part of the self-concept that is derived from one's membership in various social categories and groups (Turner, 1987). Self-esteem is a global evaluative component of the self-concept indicative of the degree to which one views oneself with positive regard. Self-efficacy refers more specifically to a person's beliefs about his or her ability to perform successfully (Bandura. 1986); in this paper, successful task and role performances are the presumed target of felt efficacy.

Affective Responses

Reflecting the cognitive revolution within psychology, current efforts to understand the dynamics of intergroup relations often emphasize social cognitions over affective responses. However, recent research suggests that affective (rather than cognitive) responses to national, ethnic, and religious groups may be superior predictors of interpersonal relations (Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991; also see Isen & Baron, 1991). Numerous distinct affective responses undoubtedly occur throughout the socialization process, although we highlight only three: attraction, anxiety, and frustration.

Attraction refers to the strength of one's desire to be accepted by another person or group. For both newcomers and oldtimers, attraction implies greater motivation to make the transition a positive and successful experience.

Anxiety refers to a state of fear or evaluation apprehension. A recent description of terror management theory clearly describes anxiety's relevance to an understanding of diversity: "terror management theory posits that any information that implies that the cultural worldview [of a person] is wrong or that alternative, incompatible worldviews are equally valid should engender anxiety" (Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 1991, p. 128). For newcomers, anxiety also may be aroused by concerns about not being capable of performing as required in a new role or not being accepted by the group. Additionally, oldtimers might experience anxiety if they view a newcomer as a potential threat to the status quo (as might occur when a high status newcomer or a new leader enters the team).

Frustration refers to an affective response to blocked opportunities to attain valued outcomes. Relevant outcomes may include being able to express one's personal identity, being accepted by the team, and/or, being able to use one's abilities. As is true for attraction and anxiety, frustration may be experienced by oldtimers as well as newcomers.

Social Cognitions

In order for diversity to impact socialization processes, individuals must attend to and be influenced by differences among members' attributes. Cognitive structures such as stereotypes and associated expectancies influence what available information is attended to and used by perceivers, the attributions made about the causes and meaning of another's behavior, and the interaction process itself. These effects are described in much more detail later in this paper.

Interpersonal Manifestations

As used in this paper, socialization refers to a broad range of phenomena that occur relatively early in the formation of a team. Socialization encom-

passes the entire process of mutual adjustment that occurs as newcomers and oldtimers negotiate-both proactively and reactively-the details of a new uncial order. The entire sequence of events described in Figure 2 depicts one example of such mutual adjustment.

The beginning of the socialization process is difficult to identify precisely, and the end of the initial socialization process is ambiguous also (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Conceptually, we anchor the beginning of a team's socialization phase as the time when a newcomer *begins* to enter the team, acknowledging the importance of recruitment activities that sometimes precede the establishment of formal team membership. We assume the socialization phase has ended when a relatively stable relationship between the group and its new member has been established. Normally, this point of stabilization means that the newcomer's role within the group is established to the satisfaction of both the newcomer and the group (cf. Moreland & Levine, 1982). We recognize that roles may later be renegotiated and that resocialization processes may later occur, but we do not treat these processes explicitly in this paper.

While our conceptualization of socialization is broad, we do not give equal treatment to all alternative targets of socialization, described as job tasks, interpersonal relationships, and culture by Louis (1990). Within this taxonomy, our emphasis is on interpersonal relationships. Many types of interpersonal relationships must be established among organizational members, including those with immediate colleagues, supervisors, subordinates, associates in other departments or work units, clients, and so forth. This paper focuses on socialization processes within work teams and so considers primarily relationships among immediate colleagues. Interpersonal manifestations of the socialization process include communication behaviors and relationships established between and among oldtimers and newcomers.

Communication

In Figure 1, behaviors that occur during socialization are separated from the relationships eventually established as a result of these behaviors. Of particular interest are behaviors related to communication. The term *communication* refers to the acquisition and/or offering of information through interpersonal channels. The behaviors of newcomers and oldtimers are included. Furthermore, we include here both direct and indirect information exchange, both passive and proactive activities, and both verbal and nonverbal behaviors.[2] Unfortunately, nonverbal behaviors are seldom studied in organizational contexts. Yet, because nonverbal behaviors are difficult to control and easily monitored by others (see DePaulo, 1992), they may serve as particularly important sources of information about oldtimers'

evaluations of newcomers. As will be discussed in some detail, such evaluations are a key force during socialization.

We highlight three domains of communication: work-related communications, friendship-related communications, and influence-related communications. Behaviors within these three domains can be treated as conceptually distinct, although in everyday interactions they are often inextricably intertwined. Work-related communications include the exchange of descriptive information (e.g., "here is what your job requires") and the exchange of evaluative information (e.g., "you have done your job well"). Influence-related communications include the exchange of information for the purpose of changing the attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors of others (attempted influence). Finally, friendship-related communications include seeking and/or offering social support.

As is true for many other constructs we discuss, communication can be assessed as an individual-level phenomenon (e.g., sent communications, received communications), as an interaction between two entities (e.g., information exchange), and/or as a group-level phenomenon (e.g., a communication network).

Relations Established

The team relations established during the socialization process are the most proximal consequences of the communications between newcomers and oldtimers. These relations can be characterized in several ways, three of which are listed in Figure 1. The first dimension, the *reference orientation of newcomers,* addresses the degree to which the newcomer adopts the norms and values of the team as general guidelines for orienting his or her behaviors and affective reactions, versus using the norms and values of alternative reference groups (outgroups) as orienting perspectives. [3] Studies of women and members of ethnic minority groups clearly suggest that newcomers who are relatively dissimilar from their new teammates experience considerable tension as they attempt to resolve the conflicting implications of their multiple group memberships (e.g., see Bell, 1990; Denton, 1990).

A useful taxonomy for describing reference orientations of newcomers distinguishes between four types: assimilation, integration, marginalization, and separation (see Berry, 1984; Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989). Two dimensions describe the differences among these four types of relationships, namely the degree of adherence to the culture of the new team and the degree of adherence to the culture of alternative groups (e.g., ethnic groups, gender groups, occupational groups). Assimilation occurs when the team's culture replaces the culture of one of the newcomer's reference groups. Integration characterizes a newcomer who accepts and tries to conform to both cultures; that is, the newcomer uses as guides to behavior both the culture of

lie new team and the culture of an alternative reference group. Separation characterizes a newcomer who rejects the new team's culture while adhering to the culture of another reference group. Marginalization characterizes a newcomer who remains fairly independent from both the team and other groups in which he or she is a member (the "individualist").

Although this taxonomy for describing a person's relationship to groups was developed to describe how people from one ethnic or national culture might relate to members of another ethnic or national culture, we use these terms to describe the orientations people can adopt vis-a-vis any types of groups with distinctive cultures. In our example in Figure 2, the cultures relevant to Lynn are those of her new work team and those of her peer cohort, with whom she shares educational experiences and social values. The scenario described depicts Lynn as caught uncomfortably between assimilation and integration.

We use the term *role* to refer to shared evaluations of behavior for what those in particular positions should do (Heiss, 1990). In the types of work teams that are the focus of this paper, roles are highly interdependent: expectations for one role imply reciprocal expectations for associated roles. Consistent with recent treatments of the socialization process, we assume that both oldtimers and newcomers can be active agents who attempt to exert influence over each other and who either resist or adapt in response to such attempts (Louis, 1990; Nicholson, 1984; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). That is, we assume reciprocal plasticity in the expectations (as well as the values, beliefs, and behaviors) of both newcomers and oldtimers. In our example, Lynn's battle to be heard and the team's gradual adjustment is a small illustration of such reciprocal give-and-take.

A custodianship situation occurs when newcomers entering the team fit into their roles as defined by the team at the time of transition (Schein, 1971). For oldtimers, custodianship implies little or no change in their old roles. From the newcomer's perspective, custodianship can arise in two ways. First, if the newcomer's team role is consistent with his or her identity and habitual behaviors, there is little need for the newcomer to change, and simple replication of the role as enacted by others is possible. Alternatively, custodianship may occur when the newcomer gives up an existing identity and behavior pattern in order to carry out the new team role. In this case, absorption occurs, with the newcomer bearing the burden of adjustment (Nicholson, 1984).

Whereas custodianship implies stability in the roles of oldtimers, role innovation implies that oldtimers adjust to accommodate the newcomer. In the extreme case of newcomer determination, the newcomer imposes new role demands and oldtimers adapt to these demands. Determination implies little or no change in the identity and behaviors of the newcomer (Nicholson, 1984). More likely, however, role innovation occurs through mutual exploration and reciprocal adjustment on the part of both newcomers and oldtimers. Because of role interdependencies, innovation in a newcomer's role presumes innovation

in the roles of oldtimers[4] (cf. Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In our example, Lynn's attempt to import innovative cost estimation techniques is constrained by the oldtimers' willingness to acknowledge her expertise and learn from her.

Finally, we use the term *cohesiveness* to describe the degree to which relationships among team members are characterized by *mutual* attraction and respect. Thus, cohesiveness is a team-level construct that parallels the individual-level construct of attraction. Our model assumes that initial attraction to a relatively unfamiliar other (newcomer or oldtimer) influences subsequent behaviors and responses, which, in turn, enhance or attenuate team cohesiveness. It is also possible that team cohesiveness partially influences the attractiveness of team membership.

Subsequent Consequences

Events that occur during socialization have direct and indirect implications for many phenomena at many levels of analysis. Compared to the team relations established during socialization, the subsequent consequences listed in the right-most column of Figure 1 are more distal in time and/or in the strength of the causal role socialization plays. In this column, we highlight only those subsequent individual and team consequences that we believe are most likely to be impacted by diversity. These include performance, power and influence, development (i.e., improvement, learning and growth), and membership stability. Existing empirical evidence (reviewed below) clearly supports our assumption that diversity is associated with several of these longer-term outcomes. What is less clear, however, are the intervening dynamics that account for these empirical associations.

Moderating Conditions

This paper describes how the demographic attributes of newcomers and oldtimers are likely to influence the nature of the interpersonal relationships that develop when a team undergoes the transition of adding a new member. Our intent is to describe general patterns of behavior that are predicted by current theory and research. Nevertheless, we recognize that the framework we present is necessarily culture-bound; the interpersonal dynamics we describe reflect theories and research generated by scientists whose worldviews and subject populations reflect particular cultural contexts. For example, the processes we describe may adequately depict only socialization processes that occur within the context of relatively individualistic societies (e.g., see Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). The moderating conditions shown in Figure 1 acknowledge the importance of this larger context for shaping relationships among team members, although we only briefly consider how differences in context might impact the general processes described. The moderating

conditions we explicitly address are *team characteristics, the nature of the team's task,* and *human resource management practices.*

DOES THE EMPIRICAL LITERATURE CONFIRM THE COMMON ASSUMPTION THAT DIVERSITY IMPACTS TEAM PROCESSES AND PERFORMANCE?

The framework presented in Figure I reflects our assumption that the composition of a team impacts longer-term consequences such as performance and membership stability. Does the empirical evidence support this assumption? For teams as the unit of analysis, the answer is clearly `yes.' The general assumption among employers regarding the importance of work force diversity is consistent with a substantial volume of empirical evidence, which shows that homogeneous teams experience outcomes different from those of heterogeneous or diverse teams. Detailed reviews of this literature have been provided by others (Haythorn, 1968; Jackson, 1991; Shaw, 1976). Here we briefly summarize some of the major findings that pertain to the impact of diversity on team performance and intra-team processes.

Social Psychological Studies of Small Groups

Performance Tasks

McGrath (1984) developed a task taxonomy to describe the types of tasks studied by social psychologists interested in groups. He used the term *performance tasks* to refer to tasks that engage primarily perceptual and motor skills. These tasks require cooperation rather than competition among team members, and task proficiency and productivity are typically the criteria of interest. Although research on the consequences of diversity for performance on such tasks is limited, a tentative conclusion is that demographically heterogeneous teams tend to perform less well than homogeneous teams. In contrast to the negative effects of demographic heterogeneity, it appears that heterogeneity of skills and abilities is beneficial for performance tasks. The superior performance of teams with members who have differing abilities does not appear to be the result of differences among members, per se. Rather, this effect requires that heterogeneous teams successfully match member abilities to tasks (Voiers, 1956).

Events occurring during socialization may partially determine whether such matching of tasks to the most qualified team members occurs. Diversity may be especially influential within self-managed teams that autonomously allocate various subtasks and activities to team members. In such situations, *perceptions*

of the skills and abilities of team members can be expected to influence task allocations; this is in contrast to situations in which objective testing of skills and abilities is carried out by a personnel department, which then makes task assignments. As we document later, perceptions of skills and abilities are driven in part by demographic characteristics such as sex and ethnicity.

Intellective Tasks

Whereas performance tasks engage perceptual and motor skills, intellective tasks are cognitively-based and require cooperative problem-solving activities (McGrath, 1984). By definition, these are tasks for which a "correct" answer exists, either factually or based on the consensus of experts. Unfortunately, too few studies are available to draw firm conclusions about the general impact of diversity on such tasks. However, for the attribute of sex, a meta-analysis of 12 studies indicates some, albeit weak, support for the conclusion that mixed-sex teams outperform same-sex teams (Wood, 1987). The mechanism for such an effect is unclear.

Idea Generation and Decision-making Tasks

Like intellective tasks, idea generation and decision-making tasks are also cognitively-based (McGrath, 1984). Creative idea generation tasks emphasize new ideas whereas decision-making tasks require peer consensus in reaching a "preferred" solution. Laboratory studies often treat these two types of tasks as independent. However, because they typically co-occur in natural team settings, we discuss them together here. Several reviews indicate that heterogeneous teams outperform homogeneous teams for these two types of tasks (Filley, House, & Kerr, 1976; Hoffman, 1979; McGrath, 1984). This effect appears to be robust across several types of attributes, including ethnicity (McLeod & Lobel, 1992). A common explanation for the superior performance of heterogeneous teams is that the team members bring multiple perspectives to bear on the tasks. In organizations, socialization processes often act to suppress unique ways of thinking and behaving and so creativity tends to decline over a period of time (Katz, 1982). However, high levels of initial heterogeneity may attenuate the rate of this decline.

Team Cohesiveness and Conflict

Cohesiveness and conflict are thought to mediate the effects of diversity on outcomes such as task performance. For groups valuing high performance as their goal, cohesive groups tend to outperform or at least match the performance of noncohesive groups (McGrath, 1984; Shaw, 1971). Other positive outcomes associated with greater cohesiveness include greater

satisfaction, lower absenteeism, and lower attrition from the group (Lott & Lott, 1965; Stogdill, 1972). Cohesiveness, in turn, appears to be influenced by heterogeneity, with greater heterogeneity being associated with less cohesiveness (McGrath, 1984; Shaw, 1971). One of the most robust social psychological principles is that people are attracted to others with similar attitudes (Byrne, 1971; Heider, 1958; Newcomb, 1956). Given that cohesiveness is often defined as attraction to other members of one's team (Shaw, 1971), it follows that teams with members who are similar with respect to attitudes should be more cohesive.

Empirical evidence shows that attitudes are not distributed randomly across demographically defined groups. At least some attitudes vary systematically with some demographic characteristics, as both politicians and market researchers are well aware. Thus, members of age cohorts share some attitudes and values that distinguish their cohort from others (e.g., Elder, 1974, 1975), and members of particular ethnic groups share some attitudes and values that differentiate them from members of other ethnic groups (Bontempo, Lobel, & Triandis, 1990; Hofstede, 1980). Such associations between demographic characteristics and attitudes provide one widely-cited explanation for why demographically heterogeneous teams tend to be less cohesive than homogeneous teams. Recent evidence documents that attitudes and perceptions correspond to people's locations within formal organizations also (Rentsch, 1990), providing one reason to expect that multidepartment teams and other lateral alliances within organizations are influenced by the dynamics of diversity.

Conclusion

Overall, a large body of basic research on group dynamics suggests that diversity is detrimental to group cohesiveness but beneficial to performance on some tasks. If these results generalize to employment settings, then employers seem to face a dilemma. In order to gain the advantage of creativity, for example, they must risk lowered work force cohesiveness, which in turn may increase the probability of dysfunctional turnover. To assess whether the results summarized above appear to generalize to work teams, we next briefly describe the results of studies of diversity conducted in organizations.

Recent Field Research in Organizations

Among the few recent studies investigating diversity in natural, organizational settings, performance, team cohesiveness, and turnover are outcomes that have received attention.

Performance Outcomes

One stream of research relevant to diversity in organizations was stimulated by Hambrick and Mason's (1984) description of an upper echelons approach to strategic leadership. The upper echelons perspective is differentiated from other leadership theories by its emphasis on top management teams. Furthermore, Hambrick and Mason advanced numerous propositions relating top management team demographics to the strategic actions and performances of the organizations the teams serve. Some support for such a relationship has now been found in several studies (Bantel & Jackson, 1989; Eisenhardt & Schoonhoven, 1990; Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1990; Michel & Hambrick, 1992; Murray, 1989; Singh & Harianto, 1989; Wiersema & Bantel, 1992). For example, based on a review of research on creativity in small groups, Bantel and Jackson (1989) hypothesized that banks with heterogeneous top management teams would be more innovative than those with a homogeneous senior management group. The demographic diversity in these teams was limited for some dimensions, such as sex and ethnicity, so the impact of these attributes was not tested. However, diversity with respect to the functional backgrounds of the top executives was associated with organizational innovation. The demographic composition of top management teams has been linked to financial performance (Murray, 1989) and to firms' strategic actions (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1990), as well. In all of these studies, however, the results are complex and researchers lack parsimonious explanations for the processes that account for them (Jackson, 1992). For example, in Bantel and Jackson's study of banks, functional heterogeneity in the top management team was associated with greater administrative innovativeness but not greater technical innovativeness. Furthermore, although the study's theoretical foundation assumed that heterogeneity caused innovativeness, its design could not rule out alternative causal explanations (e.g., administrative innovativeness may lead to staffing decisions that create more diverse top management teams). Such problems clearly point to the need for theoretical models that explain why and how diversity impacts team dynamics and performance outcomes.

Cohesiveness and Turnover

A second stream of relevant studies was spawned by Pfeffer's (1983) sociologically-oriented organizational demography thesis. Pfeffer argued that the distribution of demographic attributes among members of an organization serves as a proxy for the distribution of members' attitudes and values, which should, in turn, impact the level of mutual attraction among organizational members. Mediated by the similarity-attraction phenomenon, organizational demography should, therefore, influence processes such as communication, cohesiveness, and turnover.

Several recently published studies have tested the hypothesis that dIcinographic diversity is associated with higher turnover rates, and data from employees in several different occupations (faculty, nurses, managers, sales icpresentatives) are supportive (Jackson et al., 1991; McCain, O'Reilly & I'feffer, 1983; O'Reilly, Caldwell & Barnett, 1989; Wagner, Pfeffer & O'Reilly, 1984). Most of the relevant studies report results using teams as the unit of analysis. Presumably, diversity generates higher turnover rates in part because it inhibits the development of strong affective ties among group members. This explanation for the effect of diversity on turnover was tested directly by O'Reilly et al. (1989). Based on research linking group member similarity to social integration, O'Reilly et al. (1989) hypothesized that group homogeneity in age and tenure would be associated with group-level social integration. Social iiltegration, in turn, was hypothesized to predict turnover. Data collected from 79 employees comprising 20 convenience-store chain work groups found that age heterogeneity predicted turnover and indicated that social integration mediated the age heterogeneity -- turnover link. The group-level explanation, t lien, is that heterogeneity impacts group dynamics, which in turn increase the turnover propensity of all team members.

In contrast to group-level explanations, relational explanations for the associations found between team diversity and turnover rates argue that an individual's dissimilarity to the team prevents satisfactory socialization of the person into the team, and that this dissatisfaction increases the probability that the dissimilar individual will leave. Dissimilar individuals may leave because they feel dissatisfied with the team and/or because team members pressure them to leave (Wagner et al., 1984). Jackson et al. (1991) examined the effects of both relational dissimilarity and team-level heterogeneity. They found that both relational and team-level effects contributed significantly to the prediction of turnover.

Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly (1991) investigated the impact of diversity on supervisor-subordinate pairs. In addition to examining both supervisor and subordinate demographic attributes, these investigators gauged the impact of dyadic demographic similarity. Based on the similarity-attraction paradigm they postulated that, in general, work outcomes would be more negative the greater the demographic dissimilarity between supervisors and subordinates. Results indicated that demographic dissimilarity was significantly related to commitment, absenteeism, intent to stay, and overall organizational attachment. Contrary to what they expected, however. Tsui et al. found that the effects of being different were much stronger for male employees and for white employees. This interesting finding suggests that the consequences of diversity may actually be greater for those who are members of traditional majority groups than for members of minority groups: this is contrary to an Implicit assumption Underlying muchh of the existing literature, which tends to view minority group members as victims and majority group members as beneficiaries.

Conclusions

Empirical research in both laboratory and field settings supports the conclusion that effectively managing diversity in organizational settings is likely to be of some benefit. The challenge, it seems, is to create an organizational environment that encourages the development of cohesive work groups without sacrificing the unique contributions that people from diverse backgrounds can offer.

Socialization processes may play a key role here, for it is during socialization that newcomers and oldtimers negotiate the norms of interaction that will subsequently regulate behavior. Whether the norms of the group will be supportive of diversity or will operate to homogenize the behaviors of group members may ultimately determine both the creative capacities and the longer-term viability of work teams. In the remainder of this paper, we examine the dynamics of the socialization process and consider how these can influence an organization's ability to maintain team cultures characterized by both diversity and cohesiveness.

If socialization processes provide a partial explanation for why team diversity is related to outcomes such as team performance and stability, then an empirical linkage between demographic attributes and socialization experiences should also exist. Next, we consider evidence relevant to this linkage.

DOES THE EMPIRICAL LITERATURE SUPPORT THE ASSUMED LINKAGE BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES AND SOCIALIZATION PROCESSES?

Here we review studies relating demographic and personal attributes to socialization (for more extensive reviews see Church, 1982; Moreland & Levine, 1989). In contrast to studies reviewed in the previous section, where the unit of analysis was most often the team as a whole, studies that focus on socialization more often treat individuals (newcomers) as the unit of analysis. Several studies indicate that an individual's demographic and personal attributes sometimes impact ease of adjustment to and socialization into new groups. However, there is also evidence suggesting that individual attributes are less informative than the relational similarity between a newcomer and other members of the group.

Sex

Based on their review of the socialization literature, Moreland and Levine (1989) concluded that neither sex seems to have a clear advantage across all

situations, although the studies they reviewed often involved young children. some studies indicate that girls are socialized more easily (Ziller & Behringer, 1961) while others indicate that boys are socialized more easily (Newman, 1974). What seems more clear from such studies is that socialization is more difficult for young newcomers who are in the minority (Fairhurst & Snavely, 1983). In the management literature, the difficulties women face during socialization have received considerable attention; discussions sometimes reflect the assumption that the personal attributes of women account for their socialization experiences, but more often relational dissimilarities are assumed to explain why socialization processes differ for male and female newcomers (Bell, 1990; Kanter, 1977; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1991).

Ethnicity

We found no evidence to suggest socialization is more difficult for members of particular ethnic groups, in general. However, research in the fields of sociology, cross-cultural psychology and international management clearly lead to the expectation that socialization is likely to be more difficult for a newcomer entering a homogeneous group of people whose ethnic heritage is dissimilar to the newcomer's (Adler, 1990; Jones, 1991; Oberg, 1960). Furthermore, research on the adjustment of international sojourners indicates that adjustment to a new culture is more difficult for visitors whose home countries are more "culturally distant" from the host country (Church, 1982). Again the evidence suggests that it is the experience of being dissimilar that is key.

Age

Several studies of adults and children indicate that younger newcomers are socialized more easily than older newcomers (e.g., Brett, 1980; Church, 1982; Deutsch, 1970). As Moreland and Levine (1989) point out, there are many possible explanations for why socialization may be easier for younger newcomers. For example, younger people may be more willing to adapt to the group's norms, or the group may expect less adaptation from younger newcomers in comparison to older newcomers. Alternatively, the differences in ease of socialization may have less to do with internal group dynamics than with differences in the strength of ties older and younger newcomers have with people outside the group being studied.

Status

Like age, status seems to have a clear effect on socialization: Socialization is easier for higher-status newcomers than for lower-status newcomers. Two

processes may help to account for this effect. Initially, group members behave more positively toward higher-status new members (Zander & Cohen, 1955), perhaps because higher status newcomers contribute to a positive group identity (Turner, 1987). Newcomers, in turn, are able to detect a group's affective reaction to them and newcomers then reflect this reaction back to the group. This process is aptly referred to as a "two-way mirror" by some researchers (Davis, 1963, 1971) and as "perceptual reciprocity" by others (Ibrahim, 1970). Thus, positive affect appears to operate like a lubricant that smooths the adjustments that must occur during socialization. In addition, due to the social exchange value of high status, oldtimers may be more willing to adjust their own behavior to accommodate higher-status newcomers than they are for lower-status newcomers.

Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities

Socialization is easier for newcomers with task-relevant skills and abilities (Moreland & Levine, 1989), but the reasons for this are not clear. Like status, task-relevant skills are valued resources that newcomers bring to a team and thereby enhance the team's identity. Newcomers who bring skills into the team may, as a consequence, be given greater latitude and/ or they may be in a better position to effect changes in group norms. General knowledge and skills related to being a newcomer also appear to facilitate the socialization process. Studies of organizational newcomers, neighborhood newcomers, and international sojourners all suggest that-other things being equal-people with more frequent experience in the newcomer role are more easily socialized (e.g., Brett, 1980; Church, 1982; Fellin & Litwak, 1963).

Behavioral Style

Given that the socialization process involves mutual adjustments by newcomers and oldtimers, behavioral flexibility on the part of the newcomer could be expected to facilitate socialization. Across studies using several personality measures indicative of flexibility, such as tolerance for ambiguity and openness, the evidence supports this expectation to a degree (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Morrison, 1977; Reichers, 1987). For newcomers, these behavioral styles might speed the socialization process because they lessen the probability that the newcomer will initiate negotiations over roles and norms.

Other Attributes

Socialization researchers have examined only a few of the many possible attributes that might influence interpersonal relations during socialization. Other attributes are likely to be influential, also. For example, because of the

important role of communication during socialization, differences between newcomers and oldtimers with respect to a wide range of values, beliefs, or perspectives may impact how the socialization process unfolds. Thus, attributes related to membership in any type of group with a strong and distinct culture (e.g., religious groups, political groups, and some occupations) could color socialization experiences. Another general class of attributes relevant to socialization processes are social stigmas. Stigmas are actual or inferred attributes that serve as the basis for perceiving someone as atypical, aberrant, or deviant (Stone, Stone, & Dipboye, 1992). Included in this category of attributes would be physical handicaps, disfigurement, and mere unattractiveness. Although we do not include a full discussion of them here, stigmatized attributes that are readily apparent, disruptive, or aesthetically displeasing may be especially powerful determinants of the intrapersonal and interpersonal processes shown in Figure 1. In fact, attributes of almost any type have some potential for shaping the socialization process. This is illustrated by studies of ingroup-outgroup biases, which reveal that interpersonal relations can be influenced simply by labeling a group of strangers as members of meaningless nominal groups. Such labeling alone leads people to exhibit an ingroup bias (Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel, Flament, Billig, & Bundy, 1971). When salient, even trivial similarities and differences can enhance or inhibit the development of positive relationships.

Conclusion

Evidence from studies of many types indicates that the demographic and personal attributes of newcomers impact the nature of socialization experiences. There is some evidence that newcomers' attributes per se are predictive of their socialization experiences (for sex, age, skills, and some aspects of behavioral style), but relational similarity between newcomers and oldtimers appears to shape the socialization process also. When the objective is understanding the consequences of diversity for socialization processes, the relational effects are of primary interest. Nevertheless, given that both attributes per se and attribute similarity have the potential to influence the socialization process, researchers should assess attribute constructs at both levels of analysis (and possibly total team heterogeneity as well). If this is not done, inappropriate conclusions may be drawn due to a confounding of newcomer attributes and newcomer dissimilarity to the team.

The studies reviewed above usually considered socialization experiences from the perspective of newcomers. However, task and role interdependence between newcomers and oldtimers means the socialization process as experienced by oldtimers would be influenced also. Thus the evidence is consistent with the conclusion that the attributes of all parties involved in the process of socialization shape the team relations established by that process.

Assuming a linkage between the attributes of those involved in socialization and the process of socialization, the next task is to specify the intervening processes that explain why the linkage exists. The remainder of this paper addresses this task. Our primary objective is to propose specific consequences of diversity for behaviors exhibited by newcomers and oldtimers during the socialization process. Propositions relating diversity constructs to specific socialization behaviors are derived by logically extending findings from research on social cognition, self-categorization theory, and related research. In addition, we suggest some possible consequences of diversity for more distal outcomes.

NEW PROPOSITIONS TO BE TESTED

The Role of Demographic Attributes

Pervasive throughout the management literature is the congruence assumption, which holds that empirical relationships found between demographic attributes and various outcomes are epiphenomenal. That is, such relationships are presumed to arise because demographic attributes are correlated with cognitions, values, and other psychological characteristics. Furthermore, these psychological characteristics are thought to be the primary causal factors influencing behaviors and, therefore, interpersonal relations. This assumption was stated explicitly by Hambrick and Mason (1984) in their influential article describing an upper echelons perspective for understanding leadership and by Pfeffer (1983) in his influential treatise on organizational demography. Generally, demographic variables are treated as little more than highly visible and admittedly imperfect markers; their merit as research variables derives from the ease with which they can be assessed by investigators rather than from their intrinsic theoretical importance.

In a critique of demography research, Lawrence (1991) recently questioned the validity of this assumption of congruence between demographic and personal attributes. Following up on the critique advanced by Lawrence, Jackson et al. (forthcoming) reviewed the evidence regarding the relationships between several demographic attributes (sex, age, ethnicity, and organizational affiliations) and several personal attributes (knowledge, behavioral style, status). Numerous reviews of research on nation-based cultural differences have also appeared (see Ferdman, 1992). The evidence clearly supports the congruence assumption to a degree; however, many relationships between demographic and personal attributes are only weak to moderate in strength. Of particular relevance to socialization processes are (a) studies that indicate differences in the behavioral styles (including nonverbal behaviors) of people of different demographic standing (males versus females, members of different

ethnic groups), and (b) studies revealing that members of some demographic groups (women, members of ethnic minority groups, older people) are generally considered to have lower status in American society (in comparison to men, whites, and younger people, respectively).

The framework depicted in Figure 1 reflects an assumption of some congruence between demographic and personal attributes as a partial explanation for associations between the constructs of diversity and socialization processes. However, even if the congruence assumption were not empirically valid, we would nevertheless expect demographic diversity to impact the socialization process. This is because, contrary to those who view demographic attributes as *merely* convenient markers for researchers to take advantage of, we assume demographic attributes are highly visible markers that are used routinely as behavioral guides by people in everyday life. This assumption is well supported by research on the consequences of stereotypes (e.g., see Feingold, 1992; Stephan, 1985) and research on expectation states theory (Berger, Cohen & Zeldich, 1965; Berger, Wagner, & Zelditch, 1985). In summary, we assume that readily detectable demographic attributes of newcomers and oldtimers will be predictive of behavior during the socialization process. The consequences of demographic attributes may be due, in part, to actual empirical associations that exist between demographic group memberships and personal attributes, but these associations are not the sole explanations for the powerful effects of demographic diversity. In addition, diversity creates consequences through the mediating effects of social cognitions, including accurate as well as inaccurate cognitive representations about one's self and about others.

Levels of Analysis

The assumption stated above is not expected to hold equally well for all levels of analysis (individuals, individual-to-team interface, team). Many studies of socialization have been conducted in the tradition of psychological research, adopting the individual level of analysis and focusing on consequences of socialization for the individual newcomer (e.g., see the reviews by Church [1982] and Moreland & Levine [1989]). Research in this tradition reveals some impact of demographic attributes at the individual level of analysis (i.e., main effects of newcomer demographics on ease of socialization), but the studies reported often fail to control for the effects of relational constructs (attribute similarity between newcomers and oldtimers) or for the effects of group level attributes. In contrast, descriptions of socialization appearing in the organizational literature more accurately capture the mutual interdependence between newcomers and oldtimers (e.g., Reichers, 1987; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In this literature, both newcomers and oldtimers are viewed as actively negotiating an acceptable relationship. This view of socialization positions the

phenomena of interest at the individual-team interface, treating the newcomer as the individual of interest and treating oldtimers as comprising the team of interest. Consistent with this dynamic view of socialization, newcomer attributes are likely to be most predictive of socialization processes when operationalized as relational constructs that take into account the attributes of newcomers in interaction with the attributes of oldtimers. Therefore,

Proposition 1. Work force diversity has consequences for socialization processes to the degree it impacts the relational similarity between newcomers and oldtimers. That is, the nature of socialization processes will be influenced by the degree of relational dissimilarity between newcomers and members of the team they are joining.

Socialization processes can be considered using any of several units of analysis as the targets for study, including individual newcomers, cohorts of newcomers, individual oldtimers, oldtimers considered as a team, newcomer-oldtimer dyads, whole teams that include both newcomers and oldtimers, and so forth. The proposition above does not preclude consideration of any of these units of analysis.

Relational Similarity and lntrapersonal Mediating Processes

Proposition 1 is a rather general one that merely directs attention to relational constructs as the most relevant for understanding the consequences of diversity. More specific propositions describing the psychological dynamics set in motion by diversity are suggested by research and theory on self-categorization, intergroup relations, and social cognitions. Next, we review this work in some detail in order to begin to elucidate the path between team diversity and socialization outcomes. Our review draws from two distinct literatures: Social cognition research, conducted primarily by social psychologists within the United States, has described the cognitive structures of stored social information and the dynamics of information processing. It shows that the social labels we apply to ourselves and others influence the way we process information about ourselves, the way we process information about others, and the subsequent behaviors of both ourselves and others. A complementary stream of research on self-categorization and intergroup behavior, conducted primarily by European-trained social psychologists, addresses the conditions that influence whether social labels are likely to be activated, which labels we are likely to apply to ourselves and others, and the consequences of labelling on behavior. Based on evidence from research in these areas, we develop propositions to suggest how dissimilarity influences the intrapersonal experiences (self-concepts, social cognitions, and affective responses) of newcomers and oldtimers.

(Diversity and the Self-concept

Self-categorization theory (Turner, 1987) is a cognitively-based theory that evolved out of Tajfel and Turner's (1979, 1986) social identity theory of intergroup behavior. The theory articulates the basic processes that account (or the formation of a "psychological group," which is equivalent to a positive reference group. Symbolic interactionism postulates reference groups as important in the formulation, expression, and changing of attitudes and behaviors (cf. Ashforth & Mael, 1987). Over a century ago, William James observed:

> Properly speaking, *a man has as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize him* and carry an image of him in their mind .... But as the individuals who carry the images fall naturally into classes, we may practically say that he has as many selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinions he cares. He generally shows a different side of himself to each of these different groups ... We do not show ourselves to our children as to our club ... companions, to our customers as to the laborers we employ, to our own masters and employers as to our intimate friends. (1890. p. 294)

Self-categorization theory addresses the question of which of these different selves is likely to become salient in a situation and, as a consequence of its salience, serve as a behavioral guide. This question is relevant to understanding the behaviors of both newcomers and oldtimers involved in the socialization process.

Consistent with the perspective offered by James (1890), self-categorization theory proposes that, under some circumstances, people perceive and relate to others not as unique individuals, but as members of groups. That is, one's identity or self-concept is defined, in part, by group memberships. Importantly, the conditions that make group memberships salient arise easily and frequently.

According to self-categorization theory, multiple cognitive representations comprise the self-concept. These representations, referred to as self-categorizations, are organized according to levels. The self-concept has meaning at each of these levels. At the personal level, one's identity reflects similarities and differences between the self and relevant others on psychological dimensions such as personality or behavioral style. At this level of abstraction, the self is categorized as a unique individual; this is consistent with traditional views of the self-concept. At an intermediate level of abstraction is the *social* self-concept. Here the self is categorized as a member of an ingroup, based on a comparison between one's membership group (e.g., males) and relevant outgroups (e.g., females).

These levels of self-categorization co-exist within the self-concept. Furthermore, at each level, numerous possible dimensions can be used for self-categorization. For example, social identity can be based on demographic characteristics ("American," "woman"), family-related characteristics (e.g., "father," "cousin,"

"single"), and work-related characteristics (e.g., "bricklayer," "executive," "work group **ABC,**" "organization XYZ"). At any point in time, which dimensions of one's social identity become salient depends largely on the situational context. Because self categorization is based on contrasts between self and others, the characteristics of others partly determine which aspects of one's own self-concept influence our interactions (Wilder & Shapiro, 1984).

Turner (1987) describes social self-perception as a continuum, bounded by perceptions of the self as a unique individual at one end and perceptions of the self as a member of a social group at the other. Much of the time, self perceptions fall near the midpoint of this continuum; that is, people define themselves according to some unique personal characteristics on which they are moderately different from ingroup members while also viewing ingroup members as moderately different from members of outgroups. Turner posits that categorization at the social level of identity is a function of an interaction between the accessibility of the category and its fit with the social stimulus. In addition to information processing factors (e.g., recency effects; Higgins & King, 1981), the importance of group membership to self-identity and the categorization's current emotional significance are thought to be primary determinants of accessibility (Oakes, 1987; Turner, 1987).

A key proposition of self-categorization theory is that self-categorization at the social level of the self-concept accentuates perceived intragroup similarities and intergroup differences. Furthermore, the salience of unique personal self-conceptions is inversely related to the salience of social identities. For example, self-categorization at the social level (e.g., Asian-American) accentuates ingroup similarities and outgroup differences, and the exaggerated perceived ingroup similarities inhibit the salience of one's identity as a unique individual. In other words, categorization of the self as a member of a social ingroup depersonalizes self-perception: the self is stereotyped on dimensions defining the ingroup. One's own goals are seen as interchangeable with those of other ingroup members, and this occurs even when one's interdependence with members of the ingroup are weak (as is true for demographically-defined groups). Given that an ingroup category is derived from the perception that differences between a collection of individuals are less than the differences between those individuals and other psychologically relevant individuals, the following proposition is suggested:

Proposition 2. To the degree a newcomer is demographically dissimilar to oldtimers as a group, the social identities (e.g., woman, Asian-American) of both the newcomer and the oldtimers will become more salient.

When social identities become salient, stereotype-based information processing and its effects are more likely to occur also. The most impressive

evidence of this comes from research on so-called "minimal groups" (e.g., see fajfel, 1970; Tajfel, Flament, Billing, & Bundy, 1971). In the minimal group paradigm, social categorization is isolated as an independent variable so its effects on intergroup behavior can be explored. Subjects are randomly assigned to groups; sometimes subjects are told they were randomly assigned to groups, or they may be told they were assigned to groups on the basis of ostensibly trivial performance criteria. They then work on decision tasks that involve privately deciding how to treat other people who have been identified solely by their group membership. The original goal of the paradigm was to strip away all variables typically thought to determine group-based behavior (e.g., task interdependence, intragroup cohesiveness, social interaction, a conflict of interest between groups) and then systematically reintroduce the variables to see when intergroup discrimination "kicks in." However, results showed that the perceptions of group belonging created merely by the formation of such minimal groups were sufficient to generate pro-ingroup bias and anti-outgroup discrimination.

Diversity and Affective Responses

Self-categorization theory assumes that people evaluate self-defining categories positively and are motivated to maintain such evaluations. Positive evaluation of self categories is associated with positively evaluating others who fit within the same category. For the group and its members, this translates into interpersonal attraction, group cohesiveness, and ethnocentrism. Thus, self-categorization theory views a person's motivation to maintain a positive self-identity as a partial explanation for the well-documented effect of similarity on attraction (Byrne, 1971; Lott & Lott, 1965). The following propositions are consistent with self-categorization theory and the empirical evidence:

Proposition 3. Newcomers will be attracted to oldtimers (both individually and as a group) to the degree their relational demographic similarity is high. Associated with greater newcomer attraction will be a desire on the part of the newcomer to be accepted by the team.

Proposition 4. Oldtimers (both individually and as a group) will be attracted to newcomers to the degree their relational demographic similarity is high. Associated with greater oldtimer attraction will be a desire on the part of oldtimers to be accepted by the newcomer and a desire to facilitate the newcomer's transition into the group.

Flowing from social identities are expectations for behavior (Thoits, 1991). The behavioral expectations associated with an identity serve as a script that

guides behavior and imparts a sense of meaning and purpose. Successful enactment of identity scripts is associated with positive self evaluations (Hoelter, 1983); failure to meet identity-relevant expectations may result in lower self-esteem, lower self-efficacy, and lower psychological well-being (Solomon et al., 1991).

For both newcomers and oldtimers, the entry of a new member into a new team and the ensuing process of socialization may be perceived as potentially threatening for particular identities and/or as opportunities for identity enhancement. Feelings of anxiety and stress will be associated with either perception, but perceptions of threat are likely to have more debilitating effects on productivity, satisfaction, commitment, and tenure in the team.

Whether this time of transition will be perceived as a threat to one's identities is likely to be partially determined by demographic similarity. When newcomers are relatively similar to oldtimers, they are more likely to anticipate congruence between their existing script for an identity and the expectations held by oldtimers. However, when similarity is low, the likelihood that expectations will be incongruent increases. When expectations are incongruent, the newcomer may anticipate pressures from oldtimers to modify the existing identity script or to divest the identity. Alternatively, the newcomer may anticipate engaging in interactions that will modify the scripts held by oldtimers. This line of argument suggests the following proposition:

Proposition 5. The anxiety experienced by newcomers will be greater to the degree their relational demographic similarity to oldtimers (individually and as a group) is low. The heightened anxiety of dissimilar newcomers will be associated with heightened sensitivity to information concerning the team's evaluation of them.

Proposition 6. The anxiety experienced by oldtimers (individually and as a group) will be greater to the degree their relational demographic similarity to newcomers is low.

The .ambient status level and the skills of new members may moderate the effects of relational demographic similarity, however. Assuming the team serves as a positive reference group for oldtimers, self-categorization theory predicts that oldtimers' positive feelings will covary with their perceptions that the team is held in high regard. From the perspective of the oldtimers, the addition of a new member who has relatively high status and/ or team-relevant skills would be a positive change because it would increase the status of the team as a whole, suggesting the following proposition:

Proposition 7. The effects of relational dissimilarity on the salience of social identities, attraction, and anxiety will be influenced by the ambient

status of the newcomer. To the degree a newcomer has relatively high status in comparison to oldtimers, and/or valuable team-relevant skills, the effects of relational dissimilarity will be weaker.

Diversity and Social Cognitions

A stereotype refers to a cognitive structure that contains a person's beliefs about a social group and its members; the particular beliefs one holds regarding the characteristics that a group and its members are likely to exhibit are referred to as stereotypic expectancies (Hamilton, Sherman, & Ruvolvo, 1990). Numerous studies have described the stereotypes Americans hold about members of various social categories (e.g., Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Fernandez, 1991; Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989; Jones, 1991). Consistent with self-categorization theory, the evidence reveals that social stereotypes are widely shared, with people tending to exaggerate the degree of similarity that exists among members of groups, especially members of outgroups, and to exaggerate the degree of difference that exists between groups. The dynamics of self-categorization (and its companion, categorization of others), in combination with the strong stereotypes associated with social group membership, set the stage for stereotypic information processing to occur during the process of socialization. These effects are described next.

Social situations are inherently ambiguous, but ambiguity can be heightened even more than usual when the actors in a situation are strangers to each other. Interpretations of situations-including causal attributions and inferences made about people's motives, abilities and values-induce affective reactions and guide behavior. The information acquired about the situation partly determines how it is interpreted. By necessity, information is attended to, retained, and elaborated selectively; stereotypic expectancies play a major role in this process. Furthermore, their effects seem to be greater the more complex the information processing task becomes (Hamilton et al., 1990).

In general, stereotypes operate in ways that bias interpretation of new information in the direction of maintaining consistency with preexisting expectancies. Biased information processing occurs at several points. At the point of initial encoding, ambiguous information is interpreted through the lens of stereotypic expectancies. For example, the same mildly aggressive behaviors are interpreted by both white and black subjects as being less aggressive when the perpetrator is white rather than black (Duncan, 1976; Sagar & Schofield, 1980). Stereotypes influence memory retrieval processes, also. Although researchers disagree about the precise mechanisms responsible for stereotypic bias during retrieval, they agree that a bias operates to distort recalled information in the direction of being consistent with preexisting expectations (Stangor & McMillan, 1992). Even if stereotype-inconsistent information is recalled, it is less likely to impact judgments than is consistent

information (Hamilton et al., 1990). For example, one study found that people gathered significantly less information and spent less time exploring informational cues for targets described as being employed in stereotypic occupations, compared to targets not described as employed in such occupations. These effects of occupational stereotyping persisted even when information that was inconsistent with the stereotype was available (Hattrup & Ford, 1991).

A clear pattern of evidence documents the biasing effects of stereotypes on social information processing. The conclusion from these studies is that interpretations of situations will be biased by stereotypic expectancies whenever a perceiver is relating to another individual as a member of a social group. That is, stereotypic information processing will be more prevalent to the extent social identities (rather than personal identities) are salient. Assuming social identities are more salient when newcomers and oldtimers are demographically dissimilar,

Proposition 8. Stereotypically biased information processing will be more prevalent during socialization to the degree newcomers and oldtimers are demographically dissimilar. This effect will occur for both newcomers' perceptions of oldtimers and oldtimers' perceptions of newcomers.

If diversity includes stereotypically biased information processing, and given that stereotypes held about ingroup members are generally more favorable than stereotypes held about outgroup members, it is nearly inevitable that the evaluations people make of outgroup members, who are perceived as dissimilar, will be more negative (Kraiger & Ford, 1985) and less accurate (Fox, Ben-Nahum, & Yinon, 1989). For example, Tsui and O'Reilly (1989) found that subordinates whose gender was different from that of their supervisor received lower performance evaluations and were liked less well (however, the expected effect of race dissimilarity was not found). Such negative evaluations may account for the negative consequences of diversity on affective reactions to work settings, including dissatisfaction and low organizational commitment (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1991; Wharton & Baron, 1987). The next proposition addresses this phenomenon.

Proposition 9. Newcomers and oldtimers will make negative judgments of each other to the degree their relational dissimilarity is large.

Summary

To this point, our discussion of the effects of diversity has emphasized its cognitive and affective consequences for individuals. We have argued that diversity makes social identities more salient, which in turn causes personal

identity to be submerged, reduces interpersonal attraction among dissimilar team members, increases anxiety, and triggers stereotyping and biased information processing. Next, we extend our discussion to interpersonal relationships and behaviors.

Interpersonal Manifestations: Communications

The preceding section focused mostly on the intrapersonal consequences of diversity. Presumably, these intrapersonal consequences are reflected in interpersonal relationships among team members. That is, intrapersonal consequences are reflected in behavioral manifestations. As Figure 1 suggests, we view communication behaviors as being the most immediate interpersonal manifestations of intrapersonal processes. It is through such communications that somewhat stable relationships among team members are negotiated and stabilized.

Studies of communication in organizations often distinguish between work-related communications, which are instrumental, and friendship-based communications, which are viewed as ends in and of themselves (e.g., Brass, 1984; lbarra, 1990). Figure 1 reflects this distinction, and also differentiates information exchange and support from proactive influence attempts. These specific types of communications are considered next, and propositions are developed to suggest how patterns of information giving and seeking are likely to be affected by the relational similarity between newcomers and oldtimers.

Work-related Communications

The entry of an individual into an organization, unit, or team is usually accompanied by feelings of uncertainty and ambiguity. As newcomers attempt to clarify their role and position within the social milieu and learn the prevailing rules of conduct, they engage in information search behaviors (see Ashford, 1986; E. Morrison, in press a). For newcomers, information acquisition may help relieve role ambiguity and its associated anxiety. Oldtimers are likely to consider information acquisition by newcomers as essential to the socialization process, and *mar'* actively encourage it (cf. Miller & Jablin, 1991). In addition, especially under conditions of interdependence among team members, oldtimers can be expected to seek information about the newcomer.

Communication is often characterized as a social exchange, making salient players' potential rewards and costs. For information seekers, potential rewards related to information search include positive affect and resource acquisition (Blau, 1964), but these are often sought at the risk of social rejection (Roloff, 1981). For the information provider, the experience of positive affect may be an immediate reward. In addition, as described below, perceived rewards may include anticipation of future personal gains that will accrue.

Early discussions of information search behaviors in organizational settings focused specifically on feedback-seeking behaviors and identified two tactics for information search: direct inquiry and unobtrusive monitoring (e.g., Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Cummings, 1983). Subsequent elaboration of the tactics used to acquire information makes more precise distinctions (Miller & Jablin, 1991). Among the different direct tactics available for acquiring information are overt questioning and testing limits (e.g., through intentional rule violation). Less obtrusive tactics include surveillance, observation, indirect questioning, disguised conversations, and use of third parties. Although these tactics have been described as the means by which information seekers acquire information, they can also be considered channels for information dissemination. That is, these tactics represent alternative channels for information *exchange*.

Presumably, individuals choose to use channels that minimize costs and maximize rewards (e.g., see E. Morrison & Cummings, 1992; Northcraft & Ashford, 1990), regardless of whether they are seeking or disseminating information. Relational dissimilarity may enter into this calculus by influencing the anticipated costs and rewards of those involved in the communication. For the information seeker, relational similarity may influence general expectations regarding the tone of evaluative information. Because evaluations of outgroup members tend to be more negative than evaluations of ingroup members, dissimilar newcomers are likely to anticipate receiving more negative information, compared to similar newcomers. Therefore, they are more likely to rely on tactics that offer protection against a negative public image (cf. E. Morrison & Bies, 1991) and one's private self-concept (see Crocker & Major, 1989), suggesting the following proposition:

Proposition 10. When seeking evaluative information, newcomers will rely on unobtrusive tactics to the degree they are demographically dissimilar to oldtimers. That is, dissimilar newcomers will be more likely to seek evaluative information through indirect questioning, disguised conversations, surveillance and third parties; conversely, similar newcomers will be more likely to seek evaluative information through overt questioning and testing limits. [5]

For newcomers, dissimilarity is expected to increase the anticipated costs associated with information search; for oldtimers, it is expected to decrease the anticipated rewards. Several factors may lead oldtimers to anticipate fewer rewards for providing information to dissimilar newcomers. For example, assuming information is valued, some expression of appreciation is likely to be forthcoming from the newcomer. Due to the oldtimers' greater attraction to more similar newcomers, appreciation expressed by similar (vs. dissimilar) newcomers should generate stronger positive affect for oldtimers. Also,

oldtimers may anticipate that greater future benefits will accrue as a consequence of building good relationships with similar newcomers; this is because similar newcomers may be perceived as more likely to succeed in the future and as more likely to include the information provider within a circle of close associates. Therefore,

Proposition 11. Oldtimers will be more likely to consciously provide evaluative information (using either direct or indirect tactics) to similar newcomers than to dissimilar newcomers.

Not all information provided by oldtimers is provided intentionally; often information is provided unintentionally, for example through nonverbal communications or because it is transmitted by a third party. These channels of information exchange usually are not monitored closely so the information they reveal is equally available to relatively similar and dissimilar newcomers. Furthermore, unmonitored channels may provide observant newcomers with more accurate evaluative information. In particular, negative evaluations are more likely to leak through these channels. A consideration of the negative stereotypes held for outgroups and the functioning of unmonitored information channels suggests the next proposition:

Proposition 12. The evaluative information received by newcomers will be more negative to the degree the newcomers are demographically dissimilar to oldtimers. This effect is expected to occur primarily as a consequence of information received through communication channels that are not closely monitored by oldtimers.

The preceding propositions addressed evaluative communications, but these are not the only types of communications that occur during socialization. Upon entering a new job setting, most newcomers are likely to also seek technical information about how to carry out job tasks (see E. Morrison, in press b), for even if the newcomer has held a similar job elsewhere, nuances related to performing in the new context need to be learned. The desire for technical information is not likely to differ for similar and dissimilar newcomers, nor are the costs or rewards associated with the search for such information likely to differ as a result of newcomer similarity to oldtimers. Therefore,

Proposition 13. Demographic similarity between newcomers and oldtimers will not account for significant differences in the information search tactics used by newcomers to obtain technical information.

Just as newcomers seek information about the team they are entering, oldtimers seek information about newcomers, although this phenomenon has

received little attention. In particular, oldtimers are likely to seek information about the job performance of newcomers, especially under conditions of interdependence. Due to the negative stereotypes often held about social groups that are dissimilar to one's own (as discussed above), oldtimers may expect poorer performance from dissimilar newcomers. This, in turn, may lead to closer performance monitoring, suggesting the following proposition:

Proposition 14. To the degree newcomers are demographically dissimilar to oldtimers, oldtimers will engage in more frequent information search behaviors targeted at assessing newcomers' performances.

One way to think of stereotypes is as initial hypotheses (expectancies) that guide information gathering. Adopting this view of stereotypes, several studies indicate a tendency for people to seek information that confirms their hypotheses (Klayman & Ha, 1987). Thus, stereotypes are enacted, creating the pygmalian effect. For example, when subjects were given a list of questions to ask a target person, they chose different questions to ask depending on whether they were testing the hypothesis that the target person was an extrovert (e.g., What would you do if you wanted to liven things up at a party?) or an introvert (e.g., What do you dislike about loud parties?) (Snyder & Swann, 1978). Because such information seeking strategies engage the target person, the behavioral effects of stereotypes are not limited to the behavior of the perceiver; the target person's behavior is influenced as well. This was cleverly illustrated in a study by Snyder, Tanke, and Berscheid (1977). Male students were shown photographs of attractive or unattractive females and led to believe that these were photos of the person with whom they were speaking during a telephone conversation. Men who thought they were speaking with attractive women adopted a more friendly manner and, in turn, elicited more friendly behavior from the women with whom they spoke.

In studies of racial stereotyping, similar communication effects have been shown (Word, Zanna, & Cooper, 1974). In a simulated job interview, white subjects interviewed black and white confederates who were trained to behave in a standardized way. When interviewing black applicants, the interviewers conducted shorter interviews characterized by more negative nonverbal behaviors (less eye contact, more speech errors). To assess the effects of the interviewers' behaviors, the investigators then trained confederates to behave in nonverbally negative and positive styles. Applicants interviewed under these differing conditions were rated by independent judges, who saw only the applicants' behaviors. Those interviewed by someone using a negative nonverbal style were evaluated as performing worse than those who had been interviewed by someone using a positive nonverbal style. Thus, the following proposition is suggested:

Proposition 15. To the degree newcomers and oldtimers are demographically dissimilar, the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of oldtimers toward newcomers are likely to reflect and communicate the oldtimers' stereotypes for the demographic social groups in which the newcomer is a member; newcomers, in turn, are likely to respond by behaving in line with the projected stereotypes.

It is worth noting that this proposition implies that, to the degree relational similarity is high, newcomers are less likely to behave in line with stereotypes held for their demographic membership groups and are more likely to express their personal identities. This is because the behavior of similar newcomers is less likely to be shaped by stereotype-driven verbal and nonverbal communications from oldtimers.

For newcomers, communication activities with peers and senior coworkers are among the most helpful and most important in determining newcomer satisfaction and commitment (Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983; E. Morrison, in press a). Considerable evidence indicates that employees with minority status in terms of ethnicity or gender believe they face special barriers to informal communication networks (A. Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Such evidence is consistent with studies of communication patterns in work organizations, which indicate that demographic diversity is related to lower amounts of communication among coworkers. These studies typically consider only intentional, verbal communications. For example, in one study that examined communication networks in five organizations, demographic homogeneity (on the dimensions of authority, education, sex, race, and organization branch) was consistently found to characterize work-communication chains, suggesting that diversity decreases communication activities (Lincoln & Miller, 1979). Other studies of communication patterns have shown that work-related communications between men and women are less frequent in units that are more diverse with respect to sex (South, Bonjean, Markham, & Corder, 1982); that formal and informal meetings among peers and with immediate subordinates are lower in racially diverse groups (Hoffman, 1985); and that age and tenure similarities between coworkers predict levels of communication among project teams of engineers (Zenger & Lawrence, 1989). These latter results are consistent with the well-established similarity-attraction effect (Byrne, 1971), and suggest the following propositions:

Proposition 16. To the degree newcomers are demographically dissimilar to oldtimers, deliberate communication (although perhaps not unintentional communication) between newcomers and oldtimers will be less frequent, resulting in less information exchange.

Friendship-related Communications

Friendship ties represent an important source of social support, which can be construed as a social reward available through employment. The similarity-attraction phenomenon is a primary force that shapes the development of friendship ties within organizations. Similarity among friendship pairs, referred to as homophily, has been found for a variety of demographic and personal attributes, including age, sex, race, education, prestige, social class, attitudes and beliefs (e.g., Berscheid, 1985; Brass, 1984; Byrne, 1971; Cohen, 1977; McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987; Verbrugge, 1977; Zander & Havelin, 1960).

Team composition provides an arena for the formation of friendship ties. During socialization, relational similarity between newcomers and oldtimers should facilitate the integration of newcomers into existing friendship networks. Given that people are attracted to similar others and tend to evaluate them positively, similarity should increase both the newcomer's desire for acceptance by the team and the team's interest in facilitating the newcomer's adjustment. Demographic dissimilarity between the newcomer and oldtimers may, therefore, restrict friendship opportunities. Furthermore, similarity on less observable attributes may not be easily discovered due to the exaggeration of perceived differences resulting from ingroup-outgroup categorizations, which tend to increase cohesiveness among the similar oldtimers and result in negative evaluations of the dissimilar newcomer. These factors, in addition to the newcomer's anxiety and sensitivity to team members' evaluations, are likely to increase the newcomer's need for the social support afforded by friendship ties. Given this, dissimilar newcomers are likely to turn outward from the team in search of allies (Thomas, 1990). Therefore,

Proposition 17. To the degree newcomers are demographically dissimilar to oldtimers, newcomers will be more likely to seek support through friendship ties outside the team.

Proposition 18. To the degree newcomers are demographically dissimilar to oldtimers, newcomers will be less likely to develop friendship ties within the team.

Stereotypes and self-categorization processes can be expected to influence the search for allies outside the team. Consequently, if the dissimilar newcomer is a member of a demographic minority within the organization, and assuming employees who are members of a minority group generally are not well integrated into organizational friendship networks, it follows that the homophilious friendship ties of the newcomer will provide fewer links to the friendship network of the organization as a whole. Evidence that informal networks are segregated along demographic lines (Brass, 1984; Lincoln &

Miller, 1979) is consistent with this view of communication processes, suggesting the next proposition:

Proposition 19. To the degree newcomers are demographically similar to oldtimers, socialization processes will result in greater centrality of newcomers in the friendship network of the team and the friendship network of the organization.

(The consequences of newcomers' similarity to oldtimers may not be as great for integration into work-related communication networks as it is for friendship networks, however. This is because, regardless of similarity, teams are likely to be concerned about the work-related success of newcomers, particularly when their tasks are interdependent.)

To the extent that the newcomer's relationship to the team approaches a state of marginalization or separation, due perhaps to the fact that friendship networks of dissimilar newcomers are focused outward from the team, newcomer centrality in the informal work-related networks of the organization is less likely. That is, dissimilar newcomers may be more likely to find themselves seeking job-related information and advice primarily from within the team while seeking social support from non-team members. Consequently, they would be more likely to form weak, singular network ties rather than stronger, multiplex ties. Similar newcomers, however, may be able to obtain both job-related information and support from within the team, thereby forming multiplex ties. Therefore,

Proposition 20. The greater the relational similarity between the newcomer and oldtimers, the more multiplex network ties within the team there will be for newcomers.

Influence-related Communications

Team members with multiplex ties may be in better positions to exert influence over one another (Pettigrew, 1973). Friendship ties could be expected to strengthen the degree to which team members attempt to use normative influence (and their responsiveness to such attempts), while work-related ties suggest more opportunities for informational influence (see Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). Alternatively, friendship ties can be viewed as enhancing the referent power of team mates, while work-related ties imply influence primarily through legitimate power and perhaps reward power (French & Raven, 1959). Assuming multiplex ties provide greater opportunities for successful influence attempts,

Proposition 21. The greater the relational similarity between the newcomer and oldtimers, the more influence oldtimers will be able to exert over newcomers.

Interpersonal Manifestations: Relations Established

Reference Orientations of Newcomers

Assuming established work teams have unique histories and partially idiosyncratic patterns of interpersonal relations, the experience of being a newcomer to a work team can be likened to the experience of anyone entering a new and somewhat foreign culture. Just how unfamiliar and different the team's culture is depends on the specific past experiences of the newcomer, although as a general pattern, the new culture is likely to be less familiar and more different for newcomers who are demographically dissimilar to the group as a whole.

For the newcomer, the experience of moving into a new culture is shaped in part by two psychological forces, which can be considered to be somewhat independent (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987): How important is it to the newcomer to maintain an identity based on participation in a culture other than the one defined by the group? and How much participation and contact does the newcomer wish to establish vis-a-vis the new work team? A newcomer who is eager to participate fully in the new team's culture *and* who (a) is unconcerned about maintaining a preexisting identity or (b) seeks to maintain another identity *that is consistent with the team's values and norms for behavior* would be most likely to seek assimilation into the team's culture. Assimilation implies adapting to the team's norms and internalizing their values as given. Condition (a) is unlikely to explain assimilation into work teams, given that social identities are normally developed and maintained throughout the life-course. On the other hand, condition (b) is likely to occur. For example, if the nonwork-related social identities of oldtimers (e.g., those based in family, religious or leisure activities) are similar to those of the newcomer, acceptance by the team would provide some support for these other identities.

When conditions for assimilation are not present, the adoption of an integrationist stance is likely. An integrationist stance would characterize a newcomer faced with a desire to participate as a full team member while maintaining an established identity that is associated with norms and values that are not consistent with those of the new team. The stance of an integrationist essentially involves maintaining a bicultural identity and attempting to conform to the norms of both cultures. Assuming that employees usually prefer to be accepted by their new work team, the integrationist stance is likely to characterize newcomers who are demographically dissimilar to

members of a new work team. These newcomers are most likely to achieve integration by learning and adopting the behaviors approved by the new work team while in that context, temporarily submerging an alternative identity without letting go of the values and behaviors associated with it (e.g., see Ferdman & Cortes, 1991). Alternatively, newcomers who adopt an integrationist stance may attempt social change; that is, they may attempt to change the values and norms of their alternative reference groups to create more similarity between the expectations of these groups for the newcomer's behavior.

Some newcomers may be motivated to maintain a preexisting cultural connection and be relatively unconcerned about acceptance by the work team. Newcomers such as these may be willing to maintain an important social identity at the expense of becoming a marginal member of the work team. Marginalization is most likely to occur when behavior that is consistent with the preexisting identity directly contradicts the expectations of the new (team) culture. Although it may be an unusual orientation for a newcomer in a work team to adopt initially, those who do adopt this stance are likely to be relatively dissimilar to the team's oldtimers. These considerations of how newcomers adjust upon entering a new culture suggests the following proposition:

Proposition 22. Newcomers who are demographically similar to oldtimers are more likely to seek assimilation into a new work team. In contrast, demographically dissimilar newcomers are more likely to adopt the stance of an integrationist or to accept marginalization vis-a-vis the work team.

The attitudinal stance of newcomers during cultural transitions is associated with the amount of stress they experience (Berry et al., 1987). Assimilation and integration are associated with lower stress, relative to marginalization. However, for dissimilar newcomers, integration can also be stressful because it requires either cognitive machinations that justify conforming to team norms defined by members of a demographic outgroup (Bell, 1990) or negotiating a new social reality-that is, it requires convincing reference groups to adjust their expectations for the newcomer in a direction that reduces inconsistency among expectations held by differing groups. The experience of a newcomer who has adopted the integrationist stance would, therefore, be similar to the experience of any employee faced with the burden of resolving conflicting job demands and may lead to some of the negative consequences associated with role conflict (see Jackson & Schuler, 1985). On the other hand, integration may result in the positive consequences associated with role accumulation (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Thoits, 1983).

Roles of Newcomers and Oldtimers in the Team

As Van Maanen and Schein (1979) have described, newcomers entering a group may adopt a custodial stance vis-a-vis the role for their position in the group, or they can innovate and change the role associated with their position. The brief review of research on team diversity and creativity provided earlier in this chapter suggests that entry of a dissimilar newcomer into a group of homogeneous oldtimers sets the stage for role innovation because their entry into the team increases the team's diversity. Despite the group-level finding that heterogeneity is associated with greater creativity and innovation, however, the probability of a single, dissimilar newcomer stimulating much innovation is low. When viewed as an outsider and a "deviant" relative to the team, the lone dissimilar newcomer will most likely be subjected to strong pressures to conform; attempts by the newcomer to convince the team to accept role innovations will likely be resisted (see Nemeth [19861 for a more complete discussion of minority influence effects).

Conditions that create a minority greater than one should enhance the ability of dissimilar newcomers to successfully engage in role innovations. Such conditions include the entry of at least one other newcomer who is both dissimilar to the oldtimers and supportive of role innovations, and/ or diversity among oldtimers themselves, especially if at least one oldtimer is demographically similar to the newcomer who is attempting role innovation. However, even if there is no match between the newcomer and a particular oldtimer, diversity among oldtimers should nevertheless facilitate role innovation because the more diverse oldtimers would likely be less cohesive and present a less formidable barrier to change. Therefore,

Proposition 23. Role innovation by a newcomer is more likely to occur to the degree the newcomer is dissimilar to oldtimers, provided the newcomer's attempts at role innovation are supported by at least one other member of the team. Such support is more likely to be present when at least one other member of the team is demographically similar to the newcomer.

Whereas conditions that increase the newcomer's power within the team facilitate role innovation, conditions that increase pressures for conformity by the newcomer and increase the majority's resistance to influence encourage custodianship. Conditions for custodianship might include a strong desire for acceptance on the part of the newcomer, relatively low newcomer expertise and/or self-efficacy, an entering cohort of newcomers which is itself diverse and therefore not cohesive, and high levels of cohesiveness among oldtimers (e.g., see Chatman, 1989; Cohen & Zhou, 1991; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Levine & Moreland, 1985).

Cohesiveness

Implicit in much of the preceding discussion is the conclusion that team cohesiveness will be influenced by the degree of relational similarity between newcomers and oldtimers. When teams take on new members, the *team* enters a phase of transition and change, as do its individual team members. Thus, there is a temporary unfreezing of norms and relationships, a phase that is likely to he characterized by somewhat lower cohesiveness for all teams, regardless of the degree of similarity between oldtimers and newcomers. Adjustment and refreezing follow, creating the potential for a significant shift in the tenor of relations among team members. (Alternatively, the refreezing phase may solidify the status quo [cf. Staw, Sandelands & Dutton, 1981].) For some teams, socialization processes may stimulate lasting change. If substantial change occurs, the most probable scenario appears to be that a previously cohesive team would become less cohesive. This could occur whenever the salience of social identities is heightened by the arrival of dissimilar newcomers. For example, a homogeneous cohesive team might be transformed into a team of demographically-based conflicting coalitions, or they may experience a modest decline in cohesiveness due to a lack of assimilation or integration of a single newcomer. The opposite direction of lasting change-a group low in cohesiveness becoming more cohesive-appears to be less likely to occur naturally, regardless of the similarity between oldtimers and newcomers. That is,

Proposition 24. The extent to which team cohesiveness is disrupted by the entry of a newcomer is likely to be greater to the degree the newcomer is demographically dissimilar to oldtimers.

Summary

In this section, we described some of the behavioral manifestations of diversity for newcomers and oldtimers. We argued that these behavioral manifestations occur, in part, as natural extensions of cognitive and affective experiences engendered under conditions of interpersonal dissimilarity. Next, we very briefly comment on a few of the longer-term consequences depicted in Figure 1, focusing on consequences for the team as a whole. Then we turn to a discussion of how the phenomena we have described might be impacted by the larger organizational context.

Subsequent Consequences of Socialization Amidst Diversity

Performance

Previously we noted that stereotypes applied to outgroup members often include a negative evaluative component. Because stereotypes elicit

confirming behaviors from those to whom they are applied, this might suggest that dissimilarity is likely to be associated with lower overall job performance. Furthermore, a central tenet of symbolic interactionism holds that a person's self-concept reflects the evaluations that others communicate about the person. Because motivation is enhanced by feelings of mastery and can be undermined by feelings of failure, this line of reasoning also suggests that motivation levels and subsequent performance of dissimilar newcomers, and consequently the performance of the team as a whole, may be negatively impacted (e.g., see Jussim, Brown, Suffin, Ley, & Kohlhepp, 1992). However, there are reasons for not always assuming that dissimilarity and stereotype-driven behavior will translate necessarily into poorer performance. In particular, whenever the stereotypes applied to newcomers include a belief that the newcomer is likely to have task-relevant expertise, the performance of dissimilar newcomers probably will not be negatively influenced (cf. Heilman, 1983). Nevertheless, even when actual performance is not negatively impacted by oldtimers' stereotypes, evaluations of the performance may reflect stereotypic expectancies (Swann & Snyder, 1980; also see Lawrence, 1988).

Power and Influence

In a previous section, we discussed how the similarity of newcomers and oldtimers impacts the development of communication networks within a team, and noted potential consequences of such networks. But the consequences of a newcomer's location within communication networks are not limited to their experiences within the work team. As we described, ties within the team also provide indirect links to the informal network of the organization as a whole. Informal network contacts, including friendship ties, link individuals to a wide array of resources important to the development of power within the broader organizational context. Por example, material resources, mentoring relationships, job mobility information, functional expertise, and political information and access can be gained through informal networks, which are also often forums for informal decision making (Brass, 1984; Ibarra, 1990; Kanter, 1983; Kotter, 1982; Lincoln & Miller, 1979; Pettigrew, 1973; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989; Thomas & Alderfer, 1989). Thus, to the extent individual oldtimers or the team itself are powerful, internal team ties offer opportunities for newcomers to become integrated into the network of the dominant coalition (Brass, 1984, 1985). The following proposition addresses this possibility:

Proposition 25. Greater organizational power will accrue through informal networks to newcomers who are relatively similar demographically (rather than dissimilar) to oldtimers.

Paradoxically, while dissimilar newcomers lose an important source of power by turning outward from the group for friendship ties, these very ties may represent an important alternative external source of potential power for a newcomer's work team. The homophilious external ties of dissimilar newcomers indirectly link the team to information and ideas that would not be available to them otherwise. These "weak ties," which link together members of different groups (Granovetter, 1973), may facilitate the introduction of innovations into the team, which, in turn, may enhance their position of power in the organization. Although evidence that weak ties are related to team power is lacking, the empirical link between weak ties and individual power (Brass, 1985) combined with the above line of reasoning suggests the following:

Proposition 26. Dissimilar newcomers provide the team with a source of weak ties, which offer opportunities for enhanced team innovation and team power.

In general, the potential value of the external ties of dissimilar newcomers may be realized only when the conditions needed for minority influence to occur are present. That is, the team cannot benefit from a newcomer's external contacts unless it uses the information such ties bring to light. The term "minority influence" refers to changes in a group's attitudes or beliefs that are induced by a numerical minority of group members whose views diverge from those of the majority. Research on social influence processes and attitude change reveals that in order for minority influence to occur, the minority position must be communicated consistently and persistently (Nemeth, 1986). Under these conditions, the majority is more likely to attend seriously to the minority's perspective and attempt to understand it. For a newcomer entering an established team, pressure to conform may be especially strong, so persistently advocating a minority opinion would require unusual resolve on the part of the newcomer. Such resolve may be stimulated by a desire to maintain a positive social identity and it can be sustained by the physical presence of just one ally (Allen, 1975), such as a compatriot within the team, or by the psychological presence of a valued reference group (Kelley, 1955), such as a support network that exists outside the team. These conditions should increase the probability that a team will benefit from the alternative perspectives newcomers may bring to the team. Therefore, organizations faced with increasing diversity should attempt to create and sustain these conditions. Human resource management practices may be especially useful in achieving this objective (see below).

Development

As Feldman (1989) points out, "The_ whole question of adaptation and innovation, as outcomes of training and socialization, raises another important

issue: the extent to which the absorption of newcomers into an organization can provide training and developmental experiences for job incumbents" (p. 391). Perhaps the most obvious opportunities for development arise when the skills and knowledges of oldtimers and newcomers are dissimilar, for these situations provide a forum for learning new technical information. As suggested by the hypothetical case presented earlier in this paper, however, the degree of technical learning that occurs may be partly determined by whether team members develop positive interpersonal relations characterized by mutual respect. Socialization processes also offer opportunities for social development, which occurs as a result of being confronted to assess one's habitual behaviors and social stereotypes. Such development, which may be traumatic or occur almost unnoticed, is more likely to occur in an environment of demographic diversity than in an environment characterized by demographic uniformity.

Membership Stability

Another important consequence of socialization amidst diversity-membership stability-is a result of the interplay between the reference orientation of newcomers, member roles, and cohesiveness. Stability requires that both newcomers and oldtimers remain members of the team. Conversely, instability results if either newcomers or oldtimers choose to exit from the team.

The relations established between newcomers and oldtimers are especially likely to influence whether newcomers stay as members of the team. As noted, an integrationist stance, which is more likely to be adopted by dissimilar newcomers, may result in role conflict. Role conflict, in turn, is generally associated with turnover propensity (Jackson & Schuler, 1985). In contrast to integration, assimilation, which presumes a level of newcomer-team value congruence, is likely to enhance membership stability (e.g., see Chatman, 1991).

The role orientations of newcomers are likely to influence membership stability, also. For example, an innovative role orientation may destabilize the team more than would a custodianship orientation. For dissimilar newcomers, role innovation attempts-or even the mere perception by oldtimers that role innovation is likely-may result in strong pressures for newcomers to conform and hence decrease newcomers' satisfaction (cf. Wagner et al., 1984).

It is obvious that the socialization phase which occurs upon the entry of a team newcomer is an important determinant of the newcomer's longevity as a team member, but it is perhaps less obvious that the entry of a newcomer into a team can create a critical period for oldtimers as well. The arrival of a newcomer may stimulate turnover by some oldtimers due to the creation of new factions and alliances, to conflicts, or simply to feelings of being less connected to and less attracted to the team. Turnover among oldtimers may be especially likely when newcomers succeed in their attempts at role

innovation. If an oldtimer is uncomfortable with the implications of role innovation for their own status within the team, the oldtimer's reference orientation may change from one of assimilation to integration or even marginalization, calling into play feelings of value incongruence and role conflict-the precursors of turnover.

Moderating Conditions

Figure 1 includes three moderators likely to impact the specific processes described above. Although space constraints prohibit in-depth discussion of these, the potential importance of moderators deserves some attention. Research on socialization processes that ignores these and other moderating conditions may produce misleading or uninterpretable results.

Team Characteristics

Although our discussion ignores many features of teams that can vary, we do not intend to suggest that differences in the characteristics of teams are unimportant. In fact, several characteristics of teams are likely to accentuate the effects described. For example, closed teams with relatively stable membership are likely to have a more cohesive contingent of oldtimers, in contrast to open teams with more fluid memberships, and this cohesiveness is likely to accentuate the socialization consequences of having a demographically dissimilar newcomer join the team. Several other characteristics of teams are likely to also contribute to cohesiveness among oldtimers, thereby accentuating the consequences of newcomer dissimilarity, including team longevity, homogeneity among oldtimers, and small team size.

The nature of a team's leadership is another contextual factor that is likely to influence the processes described in this chapter. Group members, and more specifically, newcomers, take their cues from all group members, but cues from a leader may have added significance. In situations where a formal or informal leader exists, the type of relationship that develops between the leader and the newcomer can impact the socialization process for better or worse. This notion is supported by research on the leader-member exchange theory (Graen, 1976; Graen & Scandura, 1987), which focuses on the relationship that develops between each member of the group and their leader, that is, the vertical dyad. Because of time constraints, the leader is forced to selectively parcel out his or her time and energy to various members of the group. The result is that leader-member exchanges can be categorized as ingroup and outgroup relationships, with those in the ingroup receiving from the leader greater trust, interaction, support, and rewards than those in the outgroup. This relationship eventually stabilizes through a cyclical process of behavioral reinforcement on the part of the leader and the member (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Thus, the

relational similarity between the leader and both newcomers and oldtimers may be especially important during socialization.

Nature of the Team's Task

McGrath (1984) offers a comprehensive discussion of dimensions that characterize the nature of group tasks. Of these, the degree to which the task structure encourages cooperation versus conflict is likely to be especially relevant to understanding the consequences of diversity. Cooperation is required when the team's task creates interdependency among members. Interdependency and pressures for cooperation are likely to influence several of the processes described (Gaertner, Dovidio, Mann, Murrell, & Pomare, 1990). For example, the initial categorization of dissimilar newcomers may be influenced by the extent to which the performance of the team as a whole depends on the newcomer's performance. When task interdependency is great, the salience of a *team* identity should be heightened for team members (task interdependence may also heighten the salience of the team's identity among other members of the organization). Corresponding to a heightened team identity would be a weaker tendency for oldtimers to use demographically-based social identities to categorize dissimilar newcomers as outgroup members. When social identities are not salient, stereotypes for these social groups are less likely to influence information processing and behaviors toward the newcomer. In addition, task interdependence may increase the frequency of contact between oldtimers and newcomers, thereby encouraging oldtimers to view newcomers in personalized terms. Findings from several studies support the expectation that the effects of relational dissimilarity will be weaker under conditions of high interdependency (Amir, 1969; Brewer & Miller, 1988; Darley, Fleming, Hilton, & Swann, 1988; Gaertner, Dovidio, Mann, Murrell, & Pomare, 1990).

Human Resource Management Practices

We include within this domain of moderators the full range of organizational practices related to how work is managed. Socialization tactics, training, staffing, appraisal and reward systems are all examples of human resources management practices.

Organizational/Group Socialization Tactics. The experiences of newcomers are shaped in part by the socialization tactics in their organization. These may be selected consciously by management, as is the case for formal orientation sessions that process large cohorts of newcomers, or used with little or no explicit planning, as is sometimes the case when organizations adopt a "sink or swim" approach (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Socialization tactics differ

along many dimensions, a few of which may be especially relevant to the consequences of diversity. Because different socialization tactics require, and result in, different psychological responses, they can accentuate or attenuate the effects of dissimilarity between newcomers and oldtimers. For example, collective socialization tactics should serve to encourage the development of communication networks among an entering cohort of newcomers. These networks are likely to stay intact even after newcomers become dispersed throughout the organization. Assuming collective socialization facilitates the development of communication ties outside of the newcomer's work team, the effects of dissimilarity on externally directed communications would likely be magnified for newcomers who are members of a collectively socialized cohort. We would also expect socialization tactics that are less constraining of oldtimers' and newcomers' behaviors to magnify the effects of dissimilarity. Such tactics would include disjunctive socialization, informal tactics, and investiture, which are the tactics most likely to encourage role innovation. On the other hand, collective, formal, or divestiture tactics are more likely to encourage newcomers to adopt a custodianship orientation (for descriptions of these tactics, see Van Maanen, 1978).

Training Programs. Although socialization tactics and the training that occurs upon entry into an organization often are treated as distinct aspects of human resource management systems, the distinction is blurry, at best (Feldman, 1989). For training programs targeted at newcomers, the moderating effects of training are likely to be similar to those suggested above. A second type of training is also relevant, however, namely training for oldtimers. Training oldtimers to attend specifically to newcomers' needs for support (Goldstein & Gilliam, 1990) may attenuate the negative effects of relational dissimilarity. Similarly, traditional sensitivity training, which often emphasizes the unique qualities of individuals, may attenuate the effects of relational demography. The intended effects of sensitivity training are to eliminate the depersonalization that occurs when people are perceived to be members of an outgroup, thereby weakening the cognitive effects of categorization at the social level (see Wilder, 1986). Unfortunately, however, our analysis indicates that the negative consequences of relational dissimilarity may be accentuated by some of the more recently developed "valuing differences" training programs, which often emphasize and encourage the celebration of differences between demographic groups.

Staffing. Feldman (1981) describes the importance of an organization's selection procedures in determining socialization experiences. In particular, valid procedures help ensure that newcomers (as well as oldtimers) have the needed abilities and skills to perform their jobs. Anxiety and negative interactions should be lessened for qualified newcomers, assuming oldtimers

have confidence in the selection system and believe it selects newcomers based on job qualifications. One way to increase oldtimers' confidence in a selection system is to involve them directly. When team members select newcomers or are involved in their screening, the effects of stereotypes are likely to be weaker during socialization, because the newcomer is more likely to be viewed as a unique individual whose characteristics are valued by the group. However, in this case, the effects of stereotyping may be transferred to the selection decision itself (e.g., see Arvey & Campion, 1982; cf. Lindsay, 1990). Even when team members have no direct say in selection decisions, the effects of stereotyping can be reduced by giving oldtimers information about the competencies of newcomers (Heilman et al., 1989).

Appraisal and Reward Systems. Appraisal and reward systems have the potential to mitigate the effects of relational demography in at least two ways. First, they serve as powerful tools for shaping task interdependency among team members. Thus, some of the ways in which they may moderate the consequences of diversity are parallel to those described above. In addition, appraisal and reward systems can be used to focus the attention of oldtimers on the performance of their team as well as to encourage supervisors to fully develop their subordinates and make the most of their talents. Such practices make superordinate goals salient, which should increase cooperation between oldtimers and newcomers (Sherif, 1967) and help attenuate the effects of relational dissimilarity.

CONCLUSIONS

Diversity's consequences pervade organizational life, impacting employees' self-conceptions, work-related communications and social life, performance, and power. Managing diversity effectively requires an understanding of its impact on these phenomena. Our current lack of understanding of the processes through which diversity shapes the psychological experiences and interpersonal relations of employees constrains our ability to improve diversity management, and ultimately, it constrains our ability to understand organizational behavior in general.

To date, approaches to understanding the experiences of the growing pool of employees who are members of demographic minorities in organizations (e.g., women, African-Americans) have emphasized static comparisons between groups of employees with differing demographic attributes. The phenomena discussed in this chapter suggest that this approach is insufficient for building a clear view of the consequences of diversity because it fails to specify the affective, cognitive, and behavioral processes inherent in social interactions. These are the processes through which diversity impacts an organization, in both positive and negative ways.

Interventions for managing diversity may moderate some of the effects of diversity. However, other effects may not be easily controlled-especially those due to fundamental psychological processes such as self-categorization and stereotyping. In addition, the many possible outcomes of diversity mean that interventions can be expected to improve a situation in some ways or in the view of some employees while at the same time creating new **problems. For** example, interventions that enhance the process of assimilation may impede innovation. The challenge for organizations, therefore, is to understand the likely costs and benefits associated with alternative management practices and to consider these in the light of their prioritized objectives. Existing theory and empirical evidence offers some guidance for evaluating the likely consequences of some alternative diversity management practices, but field research that directly examines how diversity impacts organizational behavior is lacking. Our analysis suggests that studies of socialization amidst diversity may be particularly beneficial for improving our knowledge base, because it is during this phase of transition and change that enduring relationships are established.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Larry L. Cummings for his helpful feedback on a previous version of this manuscript.

NOTES

1. When considering the influence of ethnicity on social phenomena, it is important to keep in mind the individual and group levels at which the cognitive and psychological properties of ethnicity operate (Ferdman, 1992). While ethnicity at the group level emphasizes the common features shared by members of a group, large within-group variation can be generally assumed.
2. See Ashford and Cummings (1983) and Miller and Jablin (1991) for detailed discussions regarding the many dimensions along which communications can be described.
3. Because we conceptualize oldtimers as comprising an established, homogeneous group, we assume they have distinct norms and values that guide their behavior and shape their affective reactions. That is, we assume the team has its own culture. The norms and values of the team are not necessarily synonymous with those of the demographic groups to which oldtimers belong. but considerable congruence would be expected when oldtimers are demographically homogeneous.
4. It is possible that minor role innovation can occur in the newcomers role while having relatively little impact on the roles of oldtimers. This may be the case when the newcomer's role is weakly defined and ambiguous. However, even when an existing role is ambiguous, we would argue that significant role innovation (i.e.. creating a new, more strongly defined role) will imply some redefinition of the extant roles for other group members.
5. This proposition does not include a prediction regarding use of observation as a tactic because, as described by Miller and Jablin (1991). observation is used to learn how to perform tasks rather than to obtain evaluative information.

REFERENCES

Adler, N.J. (1990). *International dimensions of organizational behavior.* Boston: PWS-Kent.

Allen, V.L. (1975). Social support for nonconformity. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol.* 8, pp. 1-43). New York: Academic Press.

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin, 71,* 319-342.

Arvey, R. D., & Campion, J. E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. *Personnel Psychology, 35,* 281-322.

Ashford, S.J. (1986). Feedback-seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 29,* 485-487.

Ashford, S.J., & Cummings, L.L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32,* 370-398.

Ashford, S.J., & Taylor, M.S. (1990). Adaptation to work transitions: An integrative approach. In G.R. Ferris & K.M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management (Vol.* 8, pp. 1-39). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ashford, S.J., & Tsui, A.S. (1991). Self-regulation for managerial effectiveness: The role of active feedback seeking. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 251-280.

Ashforth, B.E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14,* 20-39.

Banas, P.A. (1988). Employee involvement: A sustained labor/management initiative at the Ford Motor Company. In J.P. Campbell & R.J. Campbell (Eds.), *Productivity in organizations: New perspectives from industrial and organizational psychology (pp.* 388-416). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

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.

Bell, E.L. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11,* 459-477.

Bell, N.E., & Staw, B.M. (1989). People as sculptors versus sculpture: The role of personality and person control in organizations. In M.B. Arthur, D.T. Hall, & B.S. Lawrence (Eds.), *The handbook of career theory (pp.* 232-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berger, J., Cohen, B.P., & Zeldich, M., Jr. (1965). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review, 37,* 241-255.

Berger, J., Wagner, D.G., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1985). Expectation states theory: Review and assessment. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch, Jr. (Eds.), *Status, rewards, and influence (pp. I-*72). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Berry, J.M. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: Alternatives to segregation and sociopsychological implications. In N. Miller & M.B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Berry, J.M., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review, 21,* 491-511.

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 38,* 185-206.

Berscheid, E. (1985). Interpersonal attraction. In G. Lindsey & E. Aronson, *The handbook of social psychology (Vol.* 2, pp. 413-484). New York: Random House.

Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* New York: Wiley.

Bolick, C., & Nestleroth, S.L. (1988). *Opportunity 2000: Creative affirmative action strategies for a changing workforce*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bontempo, R., Lobel, S., & Triandis, H. (1990). Compliance and value internalization in Brazil and the U.S. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21,* 200-213.

Brass, D.J. (1984). Being in the right place: A structural analysis of individual influence in an organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29,* 518-539.

Brass, D.J. (1985). Men's and women's networks: A study of interaction patterns and influence in an organization. *Academy of Management Journal, 28,* 327-343.

Brett, J.M. (1980). The effect of job transfer on employees and their families. In C.L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.), *Current concerns in occupational stress (pp.* 99-136). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Brewer, M.B., & Miller, N. (1988). Contact and cooperation: When do they work? In P.A. Katz & D.A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy (pp.* 315-326). New York: Plenum.

Butruille, S.G. (1990, April). Corporate caretaking. *Training & Development Journal, pp.* 49-55.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.

Carter, S. (1991). *Reflections of an affirmative action baby*. New York: Basic Books.

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

Chatman, J.A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review,* 14, 333-349.

Church, A.T. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 91,* 540-572.

Cohen, B. P., & Zhou, X. (1991). Status processes in enduring work groups. *American Sociological Review, 56,* 179-188.

Cohen, J.M. (1977). Sources of peer group homogeneity. *Sociology of Education, 50,* 227-241.

Cooley, C.H. (1964). *Human nature and the social order.* New York: Scribner's. (Original work published 1902)

Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96,* 608-631.

Crosby, F., Bromley, S., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of black/white discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin, 87,* 546-563.

Darley, J.M., Fleming, J.H., Hilton, J.L., & Swann, W.B., Jr. (1988). Dispelling negative expectancies: The impact of interaction goals and target characteristics on the expectancy confirmation process. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 24,* 19-36.

Davis, F.J. (1963). Perspectives of Turkish students in the United States. *Sociology and Social Research, 48,* 47-57.

Davis, F.J. (1971). The two-way mirror and the U-curve: America as seen by Turkish students returned home. *Sociology and Social Research, 56,* 29-43.

DeLuca, J.M... & McDowell, R.N. (1992). Managing diversity: A strategic "grass-roots" perspective. In S.E. Jackson & Associates (Eds.), *Working through diversity: Human resources initiatives (pp.* 227-247). New York: Guilford Press.

Denton, T.C. (1990). Bonding and supportive relationships among black professional women: Rituals of restoration. *Journal ol'Organizational Behavior, 11,* 447-457.

DePaulo, B.M. (1992). Nonverbal behavior and self-presentation. *Psychological Bulletin, H],* 203-243.

Deutsch, C.H. (1991, December 8). Don't forget the white males. *The New York Times, p.* F29.

Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51,* 629-636.

Deutsch, S.E. (1970). *International education and exchange.* Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University Press.

Dienesch, R.M., & Liden. R.C. (1976). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11,* 618-634.

Dumaine. B. (1990, May 7). Who needs a boss? *Fortune, pp.* 52-60.

Duncan, B.L. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of Blacks. *Journal of Personality and* Social *Psychology,* 34, 590-598.

Edwards, A. (1991, January). Special report: Cultural diversity in today's corporation. *Working Woman,* pp. 45-60.

Eisenhardt, K.M., & Schoonhoven, C.B. (1990). Organizational growth: Linking founding team, strategy, environment, and growth among U.S. semi-conductor ventures, 1978-1988. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 35, 504-529.

Elder, G.H., Jr. (1975). Age differentiation and the life course. *Annual* Review *of Sociology, 1,* 165-190.

Elder, G.H., Jr. (1974). *Children of the Great Depression.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Fairhurst, G.T., & Snavely, B.K. (1983). Majority and token minority group relationships: Power acquisition and communication. *Academy of Management Review, 8,* 292-300.

Feingold, A. (1992). Good-looking people are not what we think. *Psychological Bulletin, III,* 304-341.

Feldman, D.C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organization members. *Academy of Management* Review, 6,309-318.

Feldman, D.C. (1989). Socialization, resocialization, and training: Reframing the research agenda. In I.L. Goldstein (Ed.), *Training and development* in *organizations* (pp. 376-416). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Feldman, D.C., & Brett, J. M. (1983). Coping with new jobs: A comparative study of new hires and job changers. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 258-272.

Fellin, P., & Litwak, E. (1963). Neighborhood cohesion under conditions of mobility. *American Sociological* Review, *28,* 364-376.

Ferdman, B.M. (1992). The dynamics of ethnic diversity in organizations: Toward integrative models. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Issues, theory and research in industrial/ organizational psychchology* (pp. 339-384). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Ferdman, B.M., & Cortes, A.C. (1991). Culture and identity among Hispanic managers in an Anglo business. In S.B. Knouse, P. Rosenfeld, & A. Culbertson (Eds.), *Hispanics in the workplace* (pp. 246-277). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fernandez, J. P. (1991). *Managing a diverse workforce: Regaining the competitive edge.* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath/Lexington Books.

Fierman, J. (1990, July 30). Why women still don't hit the top. *Fortune,* pp. 40-62.

Filley, A.C., House, R.J., & Kerr, S. (1976). *Managerial process and organizational behavior.* Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Finkelstein, S., & Hambrick, D.C. (1990). Top-management-team tenure and organizational outcomes: The moderating role of managerial discretion. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 35, 484-503.

Fox, S., Ben-Nahum, & Yinon, Y. (1989). Perceived similarity and accuracy of peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 781-786.

French, J.R.P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Fugita, S. S., & O'Brien, D.J. (1991). *Japanese Americans: The persistence of community.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Gaertner, S.L., Dovidio, J.F., Mann, J.A., Murrell, A.J., & Pomare, M. (1990). How does cooperation reduce intergroup bias? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 59, 692-704.

Goldstein, I. L., & Gilliam, P. (1990). Training systems in the year 2000. *American Psychologist,* 45, 134-143.

Graen, G. (1976). Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1201-1245). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

(,raen, G.B., & Scandura, T.A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In L.L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior (Vol.* 9, pp. 175-208). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

(ranovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78,* 1360-1380.

llambrick, D.C., & Mason, P.A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy' of Management Review, 9,* 193-206.

Hamilton, D.L., Sherman, S.J., & Ruvolo, C.M. (1990). Stereotype-based expectancies: Effects on information processing and social behavior. *Journal of Social Issues, 46,* 35-60.

Hattrup, K., & Ford, J.K. (1991, April). *Stereotypes in decision making: Category biases in the acquisition of information.* Paper presented at the Sixth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology, St. Louis, MO.

H aythorn, W. W. (1968). The composition of groups: A review of the literature. *Acta Psychologica,* 28,97-128.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations.* New York: Wiley.

Heilman, M.E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior (Vol.* 5, pp. 269-298). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Heilman, M.E., Block. C.J., Martell, R.F., & Simon, M.C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 74, 935-942.

Heilman, M.E., Lucas, J.A., & Kaplow, S.R. (1990). Self-derogating consequences of sex-based preferential selection: The moderating role of initial self-confidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 46,* 202-216.

Heiss, J. (1990). Social roles. In M. Rosenberg & **R. H.** Turner (Eds.), *Social psychology: Sociological perspectives (pp.* 94-129). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Higgins, E.T., & King, G. (1981). Accessibility of social constructs: Information processing consequences of individual and contextual variability. In N. Cantor & J. Kilstrom (Eds.), *Personality, cognition and social behavior.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hoelter, J.W. (1983). The effects of role evaluation and commitment on identity salience. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 46,* 140-147.

Hoerr, J. (1989, July 10). The payoff from teamwork. *Business Week; pp.* 56-62.

Hoffman, E. (1985). The effect of race-ratio composition on the frequency of organizational communication. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 48.* 17-26.

Hoffman, L. R. (1979). Applying experimental research on group problem solving to organizations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 15,* 375-391.

Hofstede. G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hogg, M.A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications.* London: Routledge.

Howard, A., & Bray, D. W. (1988). *Managerial lives in transition: Advancing age and changing times.* New York: Guilford Press.

lbarra, H. (1990, August). *Differences in men's and women's access to informal networks at work: An intergroup perspective.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management National Meeting, San Francisco, CA.

Ibrahim, S.E.M. (1970). Cross-cultural interaction and attitude formation before and after a major crisis. *Sociological Focus, 4,* 1-16.

Isen, A.M., & Baron, R.A. (1991). Positive affect as a factor in organizational behavior. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior (Vol.* 13, pp. 1-53). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Jackson, S.E. (1991). Team composition in organizational settings: Issues in managing a diverse work force. In S. W orchel, W. *Wood, & J. Simpson (Eds.), Group process and productivity* (pp. 138-173). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Jackson, S.E. (1992). Consequences of group composition for the interpersonal dynamics of strategic issue processing. In P. Shrivastava, A. Huff, & J. Dutton (Eds.), *Advances in strategic management (Vol.* 8, pp. 345-382). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Jackson, S.E., & Associates (1992). *Diversity in the workplace: Human resources initiatives.* New York: Guilford Press.

Jackson, S.E., & Schuler, R.S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role conflict and role ambiguity in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36,* 16-78.

Jackson, S.E., May, K., & Whitney, K. (forthcoming). Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision making teams. In R.A. Guzzo & E. Salas (Eds.), *Team decision making effectiveness in organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jackson, S.E., Brett, J.F., Sessa, V.I., Cooper, D.M., Julin, J.A., & Peyronnin, K. (1991). Some differences make a difference: Individual dissimilarity and group heterogeneity as correlates of recruitment, promotions, and turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 675-689.

James, W. (1890). *The principles of psychology.* New York: Holt.

Jamieson, D., & O'Mara, J. (1991). *Managing workforce 2000: Gaining the diversity advantage.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Johnston, W.B., & Packer, A.H. (1987). *Workforce 2000.* Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Jones, J.M. (1991). Psychological models of race: What have they been and what should they be? In J.D. Goodchilds (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on human diversity in America* (pp. 5-46). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Jussim, L., Brown, R., Soffin, S., Ley, J., & Kohlhepp, K. (1992). Understanding reactions to feedback by integrating ideas from symbolic interactionism and cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62,* 402-421.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kanter, R.M. (1983). *The change masters.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kanter, R.M. (1988). When a thousand flowers bloom: Structural, collective, and social conditions for innovation in organization. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 10, pp.* 169-211). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Kanter, R.M. (1989). *When giants learn to dance.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kanter, R. M. (1991, May-June). Transcending business boundaries: 12,000 world managers view change. *Harvard Business Review, pp.* 151-164.

Katz, R. (1982). The effects of group longevity on project communication and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 27,* 81-104.

Kelley, H.H. (1955). Salience of group membership and resistance to change of group-anchored attitudes. *Human Relations, 8,* 275-289.

Klayman, J., & Ha, Y.W. (1987). Confirmation, disconfirmation, and information in hypothesis-testing. *Psychological Review, 94,* 211-228.

Kotter, J. P. (1982). What effective general managers really do. *Harvard Business Review, 57,* 65-75.

Kraiger, K., & Ford, J.K. (1985). A meta-analysis of ratee race effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70,* 56-65.

Lawrence, B.S. (1991). *The black box of organizational demography.* Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Los Angeles.

Lawrence, B.S. (1988). New wrinkles in the theory of age: Demography, norms, and performance ratings. *Academy of Management Journal, 31,* 309-337.

Levine, J.M., & Moreland, R.L. (1985). Innovation and socialization in small groups. In S. Moscovici, G. Mugny, & E. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Perspectives on minority influence (pp.* 143-169). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, J.R., & Miller, J. (1979). Work and friendship ties in organizations: A comparative analysis of relational networks. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24,* 181-199.

lindsay, C. (1990). *Paradoxes of organizational diversity*. Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, Bloomington.

[illegible] & Lott, B.E. (1965). Group cohesiveness and interpersonal attraction: A review of relationships with antecedent and consequent variables. *Psychological Bulletin, 64,* 259-302.

i,uis, M.R. (1990). Acculturation in the workplace: Newcomers as lay ethnographers. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture (pp.* 85-129). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

louis, M. R., Posner, B.Z., & Powell, G.N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. *Personnel Psychology, 36,* 857-866.

Managing generational diversity. (1991, April). *HR Magazine, pp.* 91-92.

Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

McCain, B. R., O'Reilly, C. A., I11, & Pfeffer, J. (1983). The effects of departmental demography on turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 626-641.

McGrath, J. E. (1984). *Groups: Interaction and performance.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McLeod, P. L., & Lobel, S. A. (1992, August). *The effects of ethnic diversity on idea generation in small groups.* Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Management, Las Vegas.

McPherson, J.M., & Smith-Lovin, L. (1987). Homophily in voluntary organizations: Status difference and the composition of face-to-face groups. *American Sociological Review, 52,* 370-379.

Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (1985). The dimensions of expatriate acculturation: A review. *Academy of Management Review, 10,* 39-47.

Michel, J.G., & Hambrick, D.C. (1992). Diversification posture and top management team characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 9-37.

Miller, V. D., & Jablin, F. M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 92-120.

Moreland, R.L., & Levine, J.M. (1988). Group dynamics over time: Development of socialization in small groups. In J. E. McGrath (Ed.), *The social psychology of time: New perspectives* (pp. 151-181). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Moreland, R.L., & Levine, J.M. (1982). Socialization in small groups: Temporal changes in individual-group relations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol.* 15, pp. 137-192). New York: Academic Press.

Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (1989). Newcomers and oldtimers in small groups. In P.B. Paulus (Ed.), *Psychology of group influence* (2nd ed., pp. 143-186). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Morrison. A.M., & Von Glinow, M.A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist, 45,* 200-208.

Morrison, E. W. (in press a). A longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Morrison, E.W. (in press b). A longitudinal study of newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal.*

Morrison, E.W., & Bies, R.J. (1991). Impression management in the feedback-seeking process: A literature review and research agenda. *Academe of Management Review, 3,* 522-541.

Morrison, E. W., & Cummings, L.L. (1992). The impact of feedback diagnosticity and performance expectations on feedback seeking behavior. *Human Performance, 5,* 251-264.

Morrison, R.F. (1977). Career adaptivity: The effective adaptation of managers to changing role demands. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62,* 549-558.

Murray, A.I. (1989). Top management group heterogeneity and firm performance. [Special Issue]. *Strategic Management Journal, 10,* 125-142.

Mydans, S. (1991, June 30). For these Americans, ties to Mexico remain. *The New York Times,* p. L12.

Nemeth, C.J. (1986). Differential contributions of majority and minority influence. *Psychological Review, 91,* 23-32.

Newcomb, T.E. (1956). The prediction of interpersonal attraction. *American Psychologist, 11,* 575-586.

Newman, J.E. (1974). Sex differences in the organizational assimilation of beginning graduate, students in psychology. *Journal of Education Psychology, 66,* 129-138.

Nicholson, N. (1984). A theory of work role transitions. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29,* 172-191.

Northcraft, G.B., & Ashford, S.J. (1990). The preservation of self in everyday life: The effects of performance expectations and feedback context on feedback inquiry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 47,* 42-64.

Oakes, P. (1987). The salience of social categories. In J.C. Turner (Ed.), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory (pp.* 117-141). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7,* 177-182.

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.

Pettigrew, A. (1973). *The politics of organizational decision making.* London: Tavistock.

Pfeffer, J. (1983). Organizational demography. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 5, pp. 299-357). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Piore, M.J., & Sabel, C.F. (1984). *The second industrial divide: Possibilities for prosperity.* New York: Basic Books.

Race in the workplace: Is affirmative action working? (1991, June 8). *Business Week, pp.* 50-63.

Ragins, B.R., & Sundstrom, E. (1989). Gender and power in organizations: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychological Bulletin, 105,* 51-88.

Reichers, A.E. (1987). An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 278-287.

Rentsch, J.R. (1990). Climate and culture: Interaction and qualitative differences in organizational meanings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 668-681.

Rhodes, S.R. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: A review and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 93,* 328-367.

Roloff, M.E. (1981). *Interpersonal communication: The social exchange approach.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rosenberg, M. (1990). The self-concept: Social product and social force. In M. Rosenberg & R.H. Turner (Eds.), *Social psychology: Sociological perspectives (pp.* 593-624). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Sagar, H.A., & Schofield, J.W. (1980). Racial and behavioral cues in Black and White children's perceptions of ambiguously aggressive acts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,* 590-598.

Schein, E. H. (1971). Occupational socialization in the professions: The case of the role innovator. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 8,* 521-530.

Shaw, M. E. (1971). *Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior* (1st ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shaw, M.E. (1976). *Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sherif, M. (1967). *Group conflict and co-operation: Their social psychology.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Singh, H., & Harianto, F. (1989). Top management tenure, corporate ownership structure and the magnitude of golden parachutes. *Strategic Management Journal, 10,* 143-156.

Snyder, M..& Swann, W.B., Jr. (1978). Hypothesis-testing processes in social interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36,* 1202-1212.

Sn_vder, M., Tanke, E.D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35,* 656-666.

Solomon, C.M. (1991, November). Are white males being left out? *Personnel Journal, pp.* 89-94.

Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (1991). A terror management theory of social behavior: The psychological functions of self-esteem and cultural worldviews. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.). *Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol.* 24, pp. 93-159). New York: Academic Press.

South, S.J.. Bonjean, C. M., Markham. W.T.. & Corder, J. (1982). Social structure and intergroup interaction: Men and women of the federal bureaucracy. *American Sociological Review,* 47, 587-599.

Stangor, C., & McMillan, D. (1992). Memory for expectancy-congruent and expectancy incongruent information: A review of the social and social developmental literatures. *Psychological Bulletin, I1/,* 42-61.

Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C.. & Glass, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62,* 207-218.

Stangor, C., Sullivan, L.A., & Ford, T.E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition, 4,* 359-380.

Staw, B.M., Sandelands, L.E., & Dutton, J.E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26,* 501-524.

Stephan. W.G. (1985). Intergroup relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology (pp.* 599-658). New York: Random House.

Stewart, T.A. (1991, December 16). Gay in corporate America. *Fortune, pp.* 42-56.

Stogdill, R. M. (1972). Group productivity, drive, and cohesiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 8,* 26-43.

Stone, E.F., Stone. D.L., & Dipboye, R.L. (1992). Stigmas in organizations: Race, handicaps, and physical unattractiveness. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Issues, theory and research in industrial/ organi_ationa/ psychology (pp.* 385-457). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.

Swann, W.B., Jr., & Snyder, M. (1980). On translating beliefs into action: Theories of ability and their application in an instructional setting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 38,* 879-888.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223,* 96-102.

Tajfel. H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp.* 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp.* 7-24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Tajfel, H., Flament, C., Billig, M.G., & Bundy, R.F. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1,* 149-177.

Thoits. P.A. (1983). Multiple identities and psychological well-being: A reformulation and test of the social isolation hypothesis. *American Sociological Review, 48,* 174-187.

Thoits. P.A. (1991). On merging identity theory and stress research. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 54, 101-112.

Thomas, D.A. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorship): An intra-organizational study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11,* 479-492.

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

Thomas, R.R., Jr. (1992). Managing diversity: A conceptual framework. In S.E. Jackson & Associates (Eds.), *Working through diversity: Human resources initiatives (pp.* 306-317). New York: Guilford Press.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1991). *Beyond race and gender: Unleashing the power of your total workforce by managing diversity*. New York: AMACOM.

Towers Perrin. (1991). *Priorities for competitive advantage.*

Towers Perrin & Hudson Institute. (1990). *Workforce 2000: Competing in a seller's market.* Valhalla, NY: Towers Perrin.

Triandis, H.C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96,* 506-520.

Tsui, A.S., & O'Reilly, C.A., III (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. *Academy of Management Journal, 32,* 402-423.

Tsui, A.S., Egan, T.D., & O'Reilly, C.A., III (1991). *Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment.* Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Irvine.

Turner, J.C. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E.H. (1978). People processing: Major strategies of organizational socialization and their consequences. In J. Paap (Ed.), *New directions in human resource management.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Van Maanen, J. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 1, pp.* 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Verbrugge, L.M. (1977). The structure of adult friendship choices. *Social Forces, 56,* 576-597.

Voiers, W.D. (1956). Bombing accuracy as a function of the ground-school proficiency structure of the B-29 bomb team (Research Rep. No. AFDTRC-TN-56-4). Lackland Air Force Base, TX: Air Force Personnel and Training Research Center.

Wagner, W.G., Pfeffer, J., & O'Reilly, C.A., III (1984). Organizational demography and turnover in top-management groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29,* 74-92.

Walton, R.E., & Hackman, J.R. (1986). Groups under contrasting management strategies. In P.S. Goodman (Ed.), *Designing effective work groups (pp.* 168-201). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wiersema, M.F., & Bantel, K.A. (1992). Top management team demography and corporate strategic change. *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 91-121.

Welcome to the woman-friendly company, where talent is valued and rewarded. (1990, August 6). *Business Week, pp.* 48-55.

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

Wilder, D. A. (1986). Social categorization: Implications for creation and reduction of intergroup bias. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol.* 19, pp. 291-355). New York: Academic Press.

Wilder, D.A., & Shapiro, P. (1984). The role of outgroup salience in determining social identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47,* 342-348.

Williams, J. (1987, February). A question of fairness. *The Atlantic Monthly, pp.* 71-81.

Wood, W. (1987). Meta-analytic review of sex differences in group performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 102,* 53-71.

Word, C.O., Zanna, M.P., & Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10,* 109-120.

Work attitudes: Study reveals generation gap. (1986, October 2). *Bulletin to Management, p.* 326.

Zander, A. (1979). The psychology of group processes. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology* (pp. 417-451). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Zander, A., & Cohen, A.R. (1955). Attributed social power and group acceptance: A classroom experimental demonstration. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51,* 490-492.

Zander, A., & Havelin, A. (1960). Social comparison and interpersonal attraction. *Human Relations, 13,* 21-32.

Zenger, T.R., & Lawrence, B.S. (1989). Organizational demography: The differential effects of age and tenure distributions on technical communications. *Academy of Management Journal, 2,* 353-376.

Ziller, R.C., & Behringer, R.D. (1961). A longitudinal study of the assimilation of the new child in the group. *Human Relations, 14, 121-133.*