A review of perceived diversity in teams: Does how members perceive their team’s composition affect team processes and outcomes?

MEIR SHEMLA1*, BERTOLT MEYER2, LINDRED GREER3 AND KAREN A. JEHN4

1Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
2Technische Universität Chemnitz, Germany
3Graduate School of Business, Stanford University
4Melbourne Business School, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Summary

In this paper, we review the growing literature on perceived diversity in teams. We aim to clarify the construct of perceived diversity and organize the findings in this emergent line of research. To do so, we develop a framework integrating research emerging on perceived diversity from across several different research fields. We propose that the nature of perceived diversity and its effects can be best understood by identifying the focal point of the diversity perceptions being studied: perceptions of self-to-team dissimilarity, of subgroup splits, and of group heterogeneity. Our review concludes that perceived self-to-team dissimilarity and perceived subgroup splits mostly have been linked to negative effects for individuals and groups, whereas perceived group heterogeneity has been shown to exert both positive and negative effects on group outcomes. Our review also draws attention to the problem that research on perceived diversity varies not only in definitions and conceptualizations, but also in the methodological approaches towards operationalizing perceived diversity. We conclude by discussing potential areas for future research. Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
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Diversity refers to an infinite number of objective and perceived differences among members of an organizational unit, such as age, nationality, and work abilities (van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004). Traditionally, most of the research in the field has focused on objective diversity, or actual differences in member characteristics, and much less attention has been paid to perceived diversity (e.g., Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey, 2002; Shemla & Meyer, 2012; Zellmer-Bruhn, Maloney, Bhappu, & Salvador, 2008), defined as members’ awareness of differences. The historical focus on objective diversity is being challenged by a growing line of research that focuses explicitly on the role of perceived diversity in teams. Given that people react on the basis of perception of reality rather than reality per se (e.g., Hobman, Bordia, & Gallois, 2003), and the central role that is attributed to perceived diversity in the classic definitions and theories of diversity in teams (van Knippenberg et al., 2004), this recent shift in focus in the diversity field has the potential to substantially improve the understanding of diversity in teams.

Namely, the past focus on objective diversity has been challenged by numerous problems associated with studying differences in terms of objective team composition (Acar, 2010) and by the unique advantages that perceived diversity offers (e.g., Hobman, Bordia, & Gallois, 2004; Zellmer-Bruhn et al., 2008). For example, problems with studies of objective diversity include inconsistent effects (van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007) and difficulties in predicting what types of objective diversity attributes may be relevant in certain contexts, groups, and times (Shemla & Meyer, 2012). Another problem associated with studies of objective diversity is their inability to discern effectively among the variety of meanings that people attribute to different compositions. Individuals may substantially differ in their perception of, and reaction to objective dissimilarities, such that similar team compositions may be
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experienced differently by each team member, leading to different team dynamics. For instance, team composition can be perceived differently based on individuals’ diversity beliefs (Homan, Greer, John, & Koning, 2010) or an individual’s membership in either low or high status subgroups within the team (Doosje, Ellemers, & Spears, 1995). To overcome these problems, recent research has begun to examine the role of perceived diversity in teams, with the hope that a focus on perceived diversity may provide more refined insight into the processes relating to diversity in teams.

However, despite its promise, research on perceived diversity has also suffered from its own set of problems. Researchers have utilized a variety of conceptualizations and operationalizations when studying perceived diversity, and existing typologies created in research on objective diversity mostly disregard the differences between forms of perceived diversity. Furthermore, while research on objective diversity has primarily adopted the view that objective diversity can have both beneficial and detrimental consequences (van Knippenberg et al., 2004; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998), the predominant assumption in research on perceived diversity is that it has negative consequences (Harrison et al., 2002; Liao, Chuang, & Joshi, 2008; Zellmer-Bruhn et al., 2008). Therefore, the predictions of research on objective and perceived diversity are difficult to reconcile with each other, and the “business case for diversity”, that is, the assumption that diversity can be beneficial for work units (van Dijk & van Engen, 2013), appears to contradict assumptions underlying perceived diversity research.

Furthermore, the rich and inconsistent research on objective diversity has been explicated in reviews of the heterogeneous landscape of single studies (van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). In the field of studies on perceived diversity, which appears to be at least as diverse as the studies on objective diversity, no such review exists. It is thus the aim of this paper to shed light on the importance of perceived diversity, to explicate and structure the rationales and findings of research on perceived diversity, and to reconcile them with the findings from objective diversity research.

To do this, we first review the past and current state of the literature on perceived diversity by examining the different categories of perceived diversity and their relationships with individual and team outcomes. Second, we provide a first systematic integration of the different conceptualizations of perceived diversity and introduce a framework to organize research in this area. This integrative framework allows the comparison of different conceptualizations of perceived diversity in the literature and a means of organizing our review of the effects of these different conceptualizations of perceived diversity on team outcomes. Third, our review draws attention to the problem that research on perceived diversity thus far has been widely varied not only in definitions and conceptualizations of perceived diversity, but also in the methodological approaches towards operationalizing perceived diversity. These inconsistencies are critical because they reflect substantial divergence in the meaning and role that different researchers attribute to perceived diversity, and can impede the ability of this field of research to be meaningfully integrated into a unified theory of perceived diversity in teams. As Harrison and Klein (2007) pointed out, failure to correctly match conceptualizations, operationalizations, and research design may undermine empirical rigor and theory development. We hope with our review to improve the clarity and understanding of the perceived diversity construct, and to facilitate improved construct validity in future studies of perceived diversity. Lastly, our overview of future directions may help to streamline and guide research on perceived diversity.

**Perceived diversity: definition**

The perceived diversity literature offers various, and at times, inconsistent definitions of perceived diversity. Whereas some defined perceived diversity as broadly as “perceptions of dissimilarity held by individuals vis à vis others on the basis of exposure to others’ readily detectible attributes” (Shrivastava & Gregory, 2009, p. 528), or as “the extent to which members perceive themselves as being similar to the others” (Huang & Iun, 2006, p. 1122), others have offered narrower definitions such as “the extent to which one person believes that another person is similar in terms of underlying attitudes, values, and beliefs, as a deeper level similarity” (Turban, Dougherty, & Lee, 2002, p. 243). Still other papers that investigate perceived diversity do not offer an explicit definition of the construct (e.g., Campion, Papper, & Medsker, 1996). In addition, definitions of perceived diversity also vary with regard to the extent to which they distinguish between the perceived presence of differences (e.g., “the degree to
which members view themselves as having few differences”; Zellmer-Bruhn et al., 2008, p. 42) and the subjective meaning attached to this perception (“perceived diversity captures members’ beliefs about the diversity within their team”; Hentschel, Shemla, Wegge, & Kearney, 2013, p. 35). We argue that the essence of perceived diversity reflects the degree to which individuals are aware that others differ along any salient dimension. In our review, we define perceived diversity as the degree to which members are aware of one another’s differences, as reflected in their internal mental representations of the unit’s composition. These perceptions are theoretically distinct from subjective valuations of diversity that are reflected in constructs such as subjective diversity or diversity beliefs. For example, the term “subjective diversity” captures a broader set of experiences that go beyond perception and awareness and takes into consideration affective and cognitive reactions. However, in practice, this distinction between noticing differences and attributing meaning to them might be less noticeable. There is evidence suggesting that judgments about objective reality are made very quickly, especially when these judgments are relevant to one’s self, and that one’s emotions (Unzueta & Binning, 2012), status (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2007), personality (Liao et al., 2008), and demographical characteristics (Chattopadhyay, 1999) may shape perception of differences. One particular concern that may arise from the difficulty to distinguish between perceived diversity and the subjective experiences of differences in groups is whether subjective diversity may be confounded with individual and team processes and outcomes. Confounding the subjective experience of diversity with its effects could potentially diminish the usefulness of the perceived diversity construct. However, as has been illustrated in relational demography research (e.g., Riordan & Shore, 1997), the meaning that individuals attribute to differences is distinct from the responses to those differences. In support of this idea, our review of the literature reveals that in many cases, the subjective experience of the group (“My team split into subgroups during the exercise”, Jehn & Bezrukova, 2010, p. 31) does not result in consistent findings as it depends on contingency factors.

Perceived Diversity: A Review of the Literature

The key question in the diversity literature has always been how diversity affects group outcomes. Predictions regarding this relationship have been drawn from two theoretical traditions (see Williams & O’Reilly, 1998, for a review). The information decision-making perspective proposes that diversity may positively influence team processes and team functioning via the utilization of an increased range of knowledge and expertise. In contrast, a school of thought that draws on social-categorization theory posits that diversity may result in social divisions and negative intra-group processes that impede performance (Mannix & Neale, 2005). However, support for these theories has been mixed.

A main reason may be that these theories hinge on perception, but studies on objective forms of diversity, which relied on these theories, were mostly tested without taking perception into account. Now, there is an emerging line of work on perceived diversity. The question then arises whether, when considering perceived diversity, these theories will receive more consistent support. We seek to answer this in our review of the literature, which we present herein. We organize this review in line with the typology we introduce here, in which research on perceived diversity is clustered together by the focal point of the perception.

A conceptual framework

Our review of past definitions of perceived diversity shows that researchers vary in whether they define perceived diversity as broadly stated, or confined to a specific focal point of perceived diversity. Further, as described in more detail later, perceived diversity research greatly varies in how perceived diversity is conceptualized and measured and in the degree to which conceptualization and measurement match. Thus, in developing an emerging theory of perceived diversity in teams, we strived to recognize the theoretical basis of diversity perceptions. Our review of
the literature shows that perceptions of diversity are likely to hinge around three different focal points: perceived self-to-team dissimilarity, perceived subgroup splits, and perceived team heterogeneity. We argue here that when considering perceived diversity, these three focal points reflect different theoretical backgrounds and methods of research, and are therefore critical to separate when examining the pattern of effects on team processes and outcomes. We use the focal point of perception as a key dimension around which we organize our review. Accordingly, we group the papers we reviewed along these three points of perception in Table 1. In the same table, we also note differences in the measures used to operationalize perceived diversity. Specifically, as we discuss in the second part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-to-team</th>
<th>Split into subgroups</th>
<th>Team diverse as a whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, 2007 (“how similar are you to other coaches on the staff with respect to age”); Graves &amp; Elsas, 2005 (“Are the other group members similar to you in academic abilities?”); Moore, 2008 (“I would estimate, that ...% of the people I work with in my current or most recent primary workgroup share my basic religion beliefs”); Cunningham et al., 2008 (“I feel I am racially different from others on the team”); Hobman et al., 2003, 2004 (“I feel I am visible dissimilar to other group members”); Van der Vegt &amp; Van de Vliert, 2005 (“I have another educational specialization than the other team members”); Liao et al., 2008 (“How similar are you to your workgroup in terms of personality attributes”); Williams et al., 2007 (“Think of your teammates on your shift. How similar are you to them in terms of age?”); Avery et al., 2007 (Participants indicated the age of their coworkers by classifying them as mostly older, mostly younger, or a mix of older and younger workers); Ragins &amp; Cornwell, 2001 (Participants indicated whether most coworkers are heterosexuals, most coworkers are gay or lesbian, or workgroup about equally balanced)</td>
<td>Greer &amp; Jehn, 2007 (“At our team meetings, subgroups will sit together”); Homan &amp; Greer, 2013 (“During our work, our team splits up into smaller subgroups”); Jehn &amp; Bezrukova, 2010 (“My team split into subgroups during the exercise”); Zanutto et al., 2011 (“My team broke into alliances”)</td>
<td>Giambatista &amp; Bhappu, 2010 (“To what extent do you perceive your group to be similar regarding how open group members are?”); Jehn et al., 1999 (“The values of all group members were similar”); Zellmer-Brunn et al., 2008 (“My team is similar with regard to its cultural background”); Aladwani et al., 2000 (“Group members vary highly in their area of expertise”); Campion et al., 1993, 1996 (“The members of my team vary widely in their areas of expertise”); Hentschel et al., 2013 (“I am very aware of the differences among my colleagues”); Meyer et al., 2011 (“How strong did you perceive difference A in your group?”); Acar, 2010 (“How similar are the members of your team with regard to their age”); Harrison et al., 2002 (“How similar are the members of your project group with regard to their marital status?”); van Dick et al., 2008 (“How diverse do you think your syndicate group is in terms of its ethnic composition?”); Allen et al., 2008 (“Minorities are proportionately represented among this organization’s senior managers”); Fields &amp; Blum, 1997 (“In your work group, are most employees women, are most employees men, or are there about an equal number of men and women?”); Jung &amp; Sosik, 1999; Jung et al., 2002 (“The members of my team have skills and abilities that complement each other”); Miller et al., 1998 (“How strongly do members of the top management team agree or disagree with each other about the best way to ensure the firm’s long-run survival”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sample items in *italics* represent measures ranging from low to high similarity, sample items in **bold face** represent measures ranging from low to high dissimilarity, sample items in **bold and italics** represent measures ranging from similar to dissimilar, and sample items without text decoration cannot be classified along these lines.
of this paper, we distinguish among diversity measures that range from low to high similarity, from low to high dissimilarity, from similar to dissimilar, and those that cannot be classified along these lines.

The first type of focal point, perceived self-to-team diversity, refers to the extent to which individual members perceive themselves to be different from their unit (e.g., “I have another educational specialization than the other team members”; van der Vegt & van de Vliert, 2005, p. 78). This perspective emphasizes the processes and outcomes associated with the experience of individuals within the group that is bounded by their view and understanding of their own position in the group relative to other members. Often, when investigating dissimilarity in teams from the individual perspective, authors relate their findings back to the study of relational demography (Mowday & Sutton, 1993). In this tradition of research, the elemental foundation is that “the relation of an individual’s own attributes to that of all the other members in a particular unit will have an impact on the individual’s experiences in that unit” (Tsui & Gutek, 1999, p. 23). From a social categorization perspective (Brewer & Brown, 1998), it can be expected that individuals who perceive themselves to be dissimilar to other members will categorize those members as part of their out-group, whereas individuals who perceive themselves to be similar to other members are likely to identify those fellow team members as part of their in-group (Chattopadhyay, 1999). This can lead to out-group members being evaluated less positively and less favorable attributions being made about their behavior (Brewer, 1979). We therefore propose that the more dissimilar individuals perceive themselves to be from others in their team, the less likely they are to take the perspective of these team members, to engage in helping behavior, and to be committed to the team. Along similar lines, similarity-attraction perspective (Byrne, 1971) implies that perceived self-to-team dissimilarity is expected to decrease the individual’s task and social exchanges (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Hogg & Terry, 2000), and ultimately decrease cooperation between members and team performance (Harrison et al., 2002). It should be noted, however, that these effects might not be uniform for all. Specifically, in the case of status dissimilarity, it has been shown that low status individuals who work in high status group may feel positively towards their group (Chattopadhyay, Tuchowska, & George, 2004).

The second focal point, perceived subgroup splits, refers to the extent to which team members gauge their team to be split into subgroups (e.g., “My team divided into subsets of people during this exercise”; Jehn & Bezrukova, 2010, p. 31). When understanding the effects of perceived subgroup splits, faultline theory is most frequently invoked. This stream of research explores the effects of the alignment of multiple diversity attributes into (hypothetical) homogeneous subgroups within teams (Lau & Murnighan, 1998). Faultlines can be distinguished on the basis of whether the hypothetical subgroup split is perceived (“active faultlines”) by group members. The psychological processes that have been proposed to explain the potential influence of subgroup divides generally predict negative outcomes. As faultlines can be seen as an operationalization of the comparative fit aspect of the self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), members are more likely to categorize members of other homogeneous subgroups as the out-group in teams with strong faultlines (Lau & Murnighan, 1998). This in turn leads to negative affective and behavioral reactions between members of different subgroups, such as reduced levels of cohesion (Homan, van Knippenberg, van Kleef, & De Dreu, 2007) as well as difficulties in exchanging and integrating information across the subgroup boundaries (Meyer & Schermuly, 2012). These processes contribute to lower levels of cohesion and identification, and ultimately to lower levels of team performance.

In contrast, the third focal point, perceived group heterogeneity, is expected to be associated with a potential for positive outcomes in groups. Perceived group heterogeneity refers to the extent to which members construe their group to be composed of individuals who are different from each other on a certain attribute (e.g., “Group members vary highly in their area of expertise”; Aladwani, Rai, & Ramaprasad, 2000). Whereas subgroup split perceptions imply construing group members in terms of “us–them”, group heterogeneity perceptions entail individuation of group members (Homan et al., 2010). This distinction is critical, because whereas the former perceptions are more likely to be associated with negative effects, group heterogeneity perceptions are more likely to be related to positive diversity effects (e.g., Homan & Greer, 2013; Homan et al., 2008). Individuation of different team members may be beneficial for group outcomes because it has the potential to reduce biases, to condition constructive conflict, and to spur the elaboration of task-relevant information (van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Nevertheless, individuation of team members brings not only additional capabilities and viewpoints but also diverse expectations and social needs that
need to be managed differently (Aladwani et al., 2000). Thus, while perceived heterogeneity provides a potential for positive effects, the realization of this potential is not guaranteed and is likely to depend on contingency factors.

Support for the distinction between these three theoretical bases can also be found in research on the antecedents of perceived diversity. Previous research has shown that diversity perceptions are not reliably linked with objective differences (cf. Allen, Dawson, Wheatley, & White, 2008; Cunningham, 2007; Harrison et al., 2002; Hentschel et al., 2013), thus emphasizing the need to examine individual, team, and organizational characteristics as possible antecedents of diversity perceptions. A first set of findings—related to perceived self-to-team dissimilarity—points to factors that influence group members’ need or willingness to categorize themselves as different from the others in the group. For example, Liao et al. (2008) found effects of enduring personality traits on an individual’s perceived deep-level similarity to coworkers. Specifically, they found that less extraverted and less agreeable individuals perceived a higher self-to-team dissimilarity. Another line of research—closely aligned with the distinction in our framework between perceived subgroup splits and perceived group heterogeneity—is focusing on moderating factors that influence the way in which group members construe their team. For example, Homan et al. (2010) found in two studies that while groups with high prodiversity beliefs were less likely to construe their diversity in terms of subgroups, they were more likely to construe their diversity in terms of individual differences. More recently, Homan and Greer (2013) examined how considerate leadership influences diversity perceptions of team members and team leaders. Results showed that consideration in diverse teams was related to less perceived subgroup splits by team members and to higher individuation of team members by team leaders.

In sum, relying on theoretic conceptualization of perceived diversity, we differentiate between three focal points of perceptions, and we organize the studies that we review into these categories. In the following sections, we review and place the literature on perceived diversity into this framework. We review the patterns of findings that are associated with each category of perceived diversity as well as the relevant contingency factors. This framework then allows us to generate theory on how disparate findings on the effects of perceived diversity may be explained by the focal point of perceived diversity. This theoretical framework is useful because of the pervasiveness of these dimensions across different scientific ages and research areas, which is reflected in their prominent role in research on relational demography, group faultlines, and group diversity. This, in turn, enables us to integrate work on perceived diversity across different fields of research.

**Perceived self-to-team dissimilarity**

Generally, our review reveals support for the theoretical proposition that perceived self-to-team dissimilarity negatively relates to individual and team outcomes. For example, with regard to individual-level outcomes, it was found that perceived self-to-team value, visible, and informational dissimilarity were associated with lesser involvement of members in task-related processes such as information exchange and collaborative decision making (Hobman et al., 2003, 2004). Similarly, Liao et al. (2008) found that perceived self-to-team deep-level dissimilarity was negatively related to an individual’s helping behavior and positively related to work withdrawal behavior as well as voluntary turnover. Other researchers, focusing on the effects of perceived self-to-team similarity on individual-level outcomes, found similar patterns of findings. For example, Graves and Elsas (2005) found that members who perceived themselves to be similar to the team in terms of background, values, academic abilities, and overall, were more willing to engage in social and task exchange, were more satisfied with coworkers, and more committed to the team. Cunningham (2007) found that perceived deep-level similarity (i.e., similarity in terms of personality, values, and attitudes) was associated with higher levels of satisfaction and lower levels of turnover intentions.

Only a few studies examined the relationship between perceived dissimilarity and team-level outcomes. Moore (2008) studied the impact of religion diversity and found that perceived self-to-team dissimilarity resulted in a negative relationship with perceived group cohesion. Another example is a study by Ragins and Cornwell (2001), who examined the interaction between perceived team composition in terms of sexual orientation and the sexual orientation of the respondents. The authors found that homosexual employees perceived less workplace discrimination when they had a high proportion of homosexual workers in their work groups. Thus, higher
perceived self-to-team similarity in terms of sexual orientation was associated with lower levels of perceived discrimination at work. Finally, Hobman et al. (2003) found that value dissimilarity had a positive association with task and relationship conflict.

Despite the consistent negative effects of perceived self-to-team dissimilarity reviewed thus far, this category of research also provides some evidence that the effects of perceived dissimilarity may be shaped by contextual features that motivate individuals to value diversity. For example, it was found that perceived self-to-team skill dissimilarity was negatively associated with helping behavior when task interdependence was low, but when task interdependence was high, perceived dissimilarity increased helping behavior (van der Vegt & van de Vliert, 2005). The authors suggest that high task interdependence necessarily enhances interpersonal contact with dissimilar others, which in turn reduces categorization biases. In another paper, it was found that group openness to diversity moderated the effects of self-to-team dissimilarity on team conflict and group involvement (Hobman et al., 2003). Specifically, while demographically dissimilar members were more involved in groups that were open to diversity, there was a negative relationship between dissimilarity and group involvement in groups with low openness to diversity. Finally, Williams, Parker, and Turner (2007) found an interaction between two types of dissimilarity on perspective taking in teams. They found that perceived self-to-team work style dissimilarity moderated the effects of perceived self-to-team dissimilarity in terms of age, such that there was a stronger negative association of perceived age dissimilarity on perspective taking when perceived work style dissimilarity was low. In other words, negative effects of dissimilarity may be enhanced when distinctiveness on another category is low.

**Perceived subgroup splits**

Several researchers investigated the impact of perceived diversity subgroup splits on team outcomes. In line with the theoretical proposition that perceived subgroup formation negatively relates to team processes outcomes, our review reveals that this category of research is consistently associated with negative outcomes. One example is a study by Greer and Jehn (2007) who measured perceived faultlines by asking members about the degree to which subgroups formed in the team during task work (e.g., “At our team meetings, subgroups will sit together”). They found that perceived subgroup splits were positively associated with intersubgroup conflict and negatively associated with the quality of team emergent states. Further, perceived subgroups were more strongly related to intersubgroup conflict when high objective faultlines were also present—that is, when perception was matching reality. In another study on perceived subgroups, Jehn and Bezrukova (2010) found that groups that were perceived to be divided into subgroups (activated faultlines) were more likely to engage in coalition formation and conflict, resulting in lower levels of performance and satisfaction. Nevertheless, they also found evidence for a moderating impact of team identification on these effects, such that in groups with a strong workgroup identity among members, perceived subgroups were less likely to incite conflict and coalition formation. Finally, recent work by Homan and Greer (2013) examined the influence of leader consideration on how team diversity is perceived by team members and team leaders, as well as on how perceived team diversity influences the preference for leader consideration. In one of the studies they conducted, they found that members who were presented with educational diversity scenario preferred a type of leadership that was characterized with high consideration. This preference was explained by the finding that participants who were in the educational diversity scenario (compared with educational homogeneity) were more likely to anticipate subgroup splits in their team, and therefore, they had a higher desire for a leader who would address the problems and conflicts associated with this type of diversity. In addition, although the correlation failed to reach statistical significance, it was found that subgroup formation was negatively related to performance quality.

**Perceived group heterogeneity**

In contrast to the other focal points, research on perceived group heterogeneity presents a broader range of findings. Some studies found clear evidence for either positive or negative effects of perceived group heterogeneity. For instance, Allen, Dawson, Wheatley and White (2008) investigated the relationship between employee heterogeneity perceptions of management and non-management levels in the organizations and organizational performance. The results indicate that perceived heterogeneity among the senior management level as well as among the non-
management level was positively related with employees’ judgments of their firm’s performance. Similarly, Campion et al. (1996) found a positive impact of perceived information diversity on different measures of group effectiveness. Other researchers found negative effects. For example, a study of diversity among upper-echelon executives revealed that perceived heterogeneity with regard to members’ perspectives and preferred goals for the firms reduced the comprehensiveness of strategic decision processes as well as the extensiveness of strategic planning (Miller, Burke, & Glick, 1998).

However, the majority of research in this category is characterized by inconsistent findings. For example, Jung and Sosik (1999); Jung, Sosik, and Baik (2002) focused in two different studies on group characteristics (functional heterogeneity, preference for group work, group potency, and outcome expectations) as predictors of group effectiveness. The results proved to be inconsistent between the two studies and among the three samples they studied. Whereas in the first study, the relationship between group functional heterogeneity and performance was insignificant, in the second study, the results showed more variety. Specifically, whereas for the Korean sample, heterogeneity increased performance both in Time 1 and Time 2, in the American sample, the relationship was positive in Time 1 but negative in Time 2.

Time and change appear to be a cause of inconsistency in other studies as well. Harrison et al. (2002) argued and found that objective surface- and deep-level diversity influences perceived surface-level and deep-level team heterogeneity that, in turn, were both negatively related to team social integration. However, with more team interaction, the negative impact of perceived surface-level heterogeneity on social integration decreased, while the negative impact of perceived deep-level heterogeneity increased. Acar (2010) tried to replicate some of Harrison et al. (2002) findings by proposing that perceived surface-level heterogeneity (e.g., “How similar are the members of your team with regard to their age?”) is positively related with emotional conflict at the beginning of a team’s life cycle but not in the end, while proposing the opposite for perceived deep-level heterogeneity (e.g., “How similar are the members of your team with regard to their attitudes?”). However, across three measurement time points collected at the beginning, the middle, and at the end of student teams’ life cycle, she found that perceived surface-level heterogeneity was negatively related to emotional conflict at the beginning and at the end of the teams’ life cycle. Perceived deep-level heterogeneity exhibited a positive relationship with emotional conflict only at Time 2. Similar to the Study by Harrison et al., the study by Zellmer-Bruhn et al. (2008) proposed a model that places perceived heterogeneity in the role of a mediator between objective differences among team members and team processes and outcomes. Taking a social identity approach that highlights the benefits of similarity among team members, these authors elicited perceived similarity instead of perceived heterogeneity. These authors measured two different types of perceived similarity, perceived social category similarity (SCS; e.g., “My team is similar with regard to its cultural background”) and perceived work style similarity (WSS; e.g., “My team is similar with regard to personalities”), and found that perceptions of WSS can change over the course of a team’s life cycle and that they are negatively related to team effectiveness. Perceptions of SCS, on the other hand, were unrelated to team effectiveness.

Given these inconsistencies, it is not surprising that this category of research places a great emphasis on examining the role of contingency factors. For instance, a study by Jehn, Northcraft, and Neale (1999) explored the effects of perceived heterogeneity with regard to members’ goals and perspectives in combination with objective information diversity (i.e., objective group heterogeneity in terms of education, functional area in the firm, and position in the firm). They found that while perceived heterogeneity was positively and significantly related to both emotion and task and process conflict, the impact on group performance was most positive when perceived heterogeneity was coupled with high objective information diversity and high interdependence among team members. Similarly, a comparison of the results of two similar studies by Campion, Medsker, and Higgs (1993) and Campion et al. (1996) also points to the central role of moderating factors. In these studies, the authors investigated the relationship between different work group characteristics, including information heterogeneity, on different measures of group effectiveness. Whereas both studies found that perceived heterogeneity with regard to expertise, abilities, and backgrounds had no impact on employee satisfaction, they differed in their findings with regard to team effectiveness. While in the first study, perceived heterogeneity was negatively associated with team effectiveness, in the second, it was found to have a positive relationship with team effectiveness. These differences may be attributed to the fact
that the earlier study investigated employees in administrative support jobs while the later study focused on knowledge workers. This is in line with previous findings that point to the moderating role of task complexity on the relationship between objective diversity and team outcomes (e.g., Wegge, Roth, Neubach, Schmidt, & Kanfer, 2008). Finally, van Dick, van Knippenberg, Hagele, Guillaume, and Brodbeck (2008) measured perceived heterogeneity and found that its effect on team identification was moderated by team members’ diversity beliefs. If team members saw value in diversity, perceived heterogeneity led to more identification (Study 1), whereas it lead to less identification if team members did not see value in diversity (Study 2). In a similar vein, Hentschel et al. (2013) found that perceived heterogeneity was positively related with relationship conflict and negatively with identification, but that these relationships were also moderated by diversity beliefs, such that prodiversity beliefs attenuated the relationships.

Summary
Our review reveals that the direction of the effects of perceived diversity may range and vary. Our conceptual framework has allowed us to generate theory on how disparate findings on the effects of perceived diversity may be explained by the focal point of perceived diversity. Generally and with regard to the main effects of perceived diversity, we find that whereas perceived self-to-team dissimilarity and perceived subgroup splits mostly predict negative effects, perceived group heterogeneity may exert both positive and negative effects on group outcomes.

Across all diversity categories, moderators and boundary conditions were found to serve as the key to understanding the impact of perceived diversity. Specifically, several researchers have emphasized the role of attitudes towards diversity in moderating the impact of perceived diversity. For example, both van Dick et al. (2008) and Hentschel et al. (2013) found that prodiversity beliefs may enhance the positive impact or attenuate the negative impact of perceived heterogeneity, and Hobman et al. (2003, 2004) pointed at the central role of openness to diversity as a moderating factor of the effect of perceived self-to-team dissimilarity. Others have indicated that the nature of the team and the nature of the task may be also relevant moderating factors. For example, when high perceived information heterogeneity was coupled with high task interdependence, high objective information diversity, or high task complexity (Campion et al., 1993, 1996; Jehn et al., 1999; van der Vegte & van de Vliert, 2005), it was found more likely to have positive effects. The central role of contingency factors in understanding the effects of perceived diversity is in accordance with prominent theoretical frameworks (e.g., Categorization-Elaboration Model; van Knippenberg et al., 2004) in the diversity literature that reject the focus on main effects and instead advocate switching to a contingency approach. It is also in accordance with calls for a more nuanced and thorough consideration of the theoretical predictions that can be drawn from social identity theory and self-categorization theory to the effects of dissimilarity (Chattopadhyay et al., 2004).

Finally, our review reveals that some research areas are underdeveloped. Most notably, we were able to find only a few studies that investigated the effects of perceived diversity from the subgroup focal point. Within this category of research, only one paper explicitly investigated the role of moderating factors on the effects of perceived subgroup splits. Given the central role of contingencies in understanding the other categories of research, this is a promising area for future research that can shed light both on the effects of perceived subgroups and on faultline theory.

Perceived Diversity: Exposing Patterns in the Literature

Although most of the research exploring group diversity has focused on objective differences, in recent years, there are more and more examples of researchers who choose to study differences in groups through members’ perception. This growing interest in perceived diversity has highlighted one possible way of overcoming the inconsistencies that characterize findings pertaining to objective diversity (for meta-analyses, see Bell, Villado, Lukasik, Belau, & Briggs, 2011; Guillaume, Brodbeck, & Riketta, 2012; Joshi & Roh, 2009; van Dijk, van Engen, & van Knippenberg, 2012). However, we do note several trends in the literature that spark some concern. Firstly, we note that theoretical conceptualizations of perceived diversity are often somewhat vague and that researchers do not take the same care to
be precise in definitions of perceived diversity, as they now do with objective diversity (due in large part to the pivotal article by Harrison & Klein, 2007 on the conceptualization and operationalization of objective diversity). Secondly, we find that measurement operationalizations of perceived diversity greatly vary between papers.

Variations in the conceptualization of perceived diversity

Much of the theory on diversity within groups refers to perception as a critical component in the process linking diversity and outcomes. For example, the Categorization-Elaboration Model (van Knippenberg et al., 2004) posits that the impact of diversity on performance is dependent upon social categorizations on salient attributes, which requires differences to be perceived. However, our review reveals that not all authors share a similar view and that the conceptualization of perceived diversity and the role attached to it varies substantially between studies. Of the papers we have reviewed, about a third conceptualized perceived diversity as an operationalization of objective group composition (e.g., Aladwani et al., 2000; Campion et al., 1993; Jehn et al., 1999); several have attributed perceived diversity the role of a mediator between objective diversity and outcomes (e.g., Harrison et al., 2002; Zellmer-Bruhn et al., 2008); and the majority of papers have conceptualized perceived diversity as a unique construct, independent from objective diversity, and accordingly positioned it in the role of an independent variable (e.g., Acar, 2010; Allen et al., 2008; Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2007; van der Vegt & van de Vliert, 2005), with possible other antecedents besides objective diversity (e.g., Liao et al., 2008). Thus, two intertwined issues are essential when exposing the different conceptualizations attributed to perceived diversity: differences among authors in their implicit assumptions about the relationship between objective and perceived diversity, and the variety of theoretical justifications that motivate authors to focus on perceived diversity.

The first conceptualization of perceived diversity is characterized by measuring perceptions of diversity as an operationalization of actual diversity. Thus, in this case, perceived diversity is seen to be a mere substitute for actual differences. For instance, although operationalizing diversity with a subjective measure, Campion et al. (1993), Fields and Blum (1997), and Campion et al. (1996) developed their theory with reference to objective attributes and made no reference to possible distinctions between the constructs, thus implicitly assuming that perceived diversity is indistinguishable from objective diversity. Given that different sets of mechanisms may underlie the influence of perceived and objective diversity, an obvious concern in this case is a disconnect between theory and measurement. In addition, using perceived diversity as a substitute for objective diversity may not be a valid way of measuring diversity. As Harrison and Klein (2007) argued, individuals may lack the necessary information to accurately assess diversity, especially for the less visible attributes, and perceived diversity ratings are likely to be biased because of social desirability and out-group homogeneity effects. Indeed, a growing body of research testifies that the relationship between objective and perceived diversity is inconsistent and depends on a long list of contingencies (e.g., Cunningham, 2007; Giambatista & Bhappu, 2010).

The second conceptualization is characterized by using perceived diversity as a mediator between objective diversity and group performance. This research suggests that the substantive effect of diversity is carried through perceptions and that “if unnoticed by members, differences on a particular characteristic are unlikely to influence team behavior” (Zellmer-Bruhn et al., 2008, p. 42). An example for such work can be found in Harrison et al.’s (2002) study on the changing effects of surface-level and deep-level diversity on group performance. They reported that perceived diversity transmitted the impact of actual diversity on team social integration, which in turn affected performance. Another example is a study by Zellmer-Bruhn et al. (2008), who found that perceived similarity carried the effects of informational and social category diversity on subgroup formation. Interestingly, in both cases, the inclusion of perceived diversity was motivated by the notion that time is an important factor in diversity research because some forms of diversity are likely to be more or less relevant at different points in time, and these changes can be best captured by perceived diversity.

A final group of studies in the literature has construed perceived diversity as a construct independent of objective group composition. Perceived diversity in this case is viewed as the mental representation of a group composition...
that may or may not be associated with actual composition and that may differ between individuals, contingent on their goals, status, personality, and attitudes. In other words, this conceptualization characterizes perceived diversity as a dynamic and context-dependent construct. Authors holding such a view on perceived diversity have positioned it in the role of an independent variable (Allen et al., 2008; Avery et al., 2007; van Dick et al., 2008).

An examination of the methods used and justifications provided by authors in this final group reveals that the authors attribute their choice of focusing on perceived diversity to its superiority over objective diversity (Avery et al., 2007; Hentschel et al., 2013; Hobman et al., 2004; Williams et al., 2007). For example, it was argued that while objective assessment of diversity can fail to incorporate all components of differences that may be relevant to a group at a certain point in time, perceived diversity measures capitalize on the intricate and multidimensional nature of diversity and avoid the need to presuppose that certain dimensions of differences are indeed relevant to the specific unit, context, or culture (Allen et al., 2008; Hobman et al., 2004; Homan & Jehn, 2010; Homan et al., 2010). Others have pointed out that when objective measures are used, it is not clear whether the differences being studied are in fact perceived by group members. Perceived diversity, in contrast, takes into account possible individual differences with regard to the extent to which individuals perceive diversity in their groups to exist (Acar, 2010; Hobman et al., 2004; Shemla & Meyer, 2012). Further, other authors argue that perceived diversity is a superior construct because it is more consistent with the tenets of the theoretical frameworks at the heart of diversity research, including social identity theory, self-categorization theory, and relational demography (Avery et al., 2007; Hentschel et al., 2013; Williams et al., 2007). Finally, some authors opted to shift the focus from actual to perceived diversity measures because objective diversity has shown to produce “equivocal findings, small effects sizes, and differential effects for the diversity attributes studied” (van der Vegt & van de Vliert, 2005, p. 74).

Inconsistencies in the measurement of perceived diversity

In addition to variations in conceptualization, the perceived diversity literature is also characterized by several approaches to measurement. Specifically, our review reveals two differences in the way in which perceived diversity is operationalized and measured. First, measures of perceived diversity differ with regard to their specificity, that is, with regard to whether they measure a specific type or dimension of perceived diversity or a more general type of diversity. Second, the measures differ with regard to their dimensionality and anchoring. We discuss these two differences in the following sections.

Measurement specificity

The first dimension of divergence among measurement operationalizations concerns the scope of perceived diversity measures. In this regard, researchers have examined perceived diversity using three different types of measures with different specificities. The first type, general measures, intends to assess the extent to which group members perceive their team to be generally diverse, without referring to specific attributes of diversity (e.g., Homan et al., 2010; Jehn & Beznukova, 2010; Zanutti, Beznukova, & Jehn, 2011). For example, Hentschel et al. (2013) asked team members to the extent to which, when describing their work team, they automatically think about differences among members. The second type, specific measures, requires members to assess the extent to which their group is diverse in terms of specific attributes such as gender, ethnicity, and values. Using this type, researchers employ fixed sets of categories for eliciting measures of perceived inter-group differences (or similarities). For example, Cunningham, Choi, and Sagar (2008) inquired about perceived diversity in terms of race, and Jehn and Beznukova (2010) inquired about perceived subgroup formation based on race (Study 1), and race and gender (Study 2). The last type, mixed measures of perceived diversity, refers to measures that comprise elements from both the general and the specific types. Most often, such measures seek to assess overall diversity by means of summing or averaging across diversity attributes. An example for such measures can be found in a paper by van Dick et al. (2008), who
operationalized perceived diversity as the average of perceived differences in terms of general, age, gender, ethnic background, education background, values, work attitudes, and learning goals. Similarly, Liao et al. (2008) asked their participants how similar they felt to their coworkers with regard to personality attributes, personal values, work attitudes, education, and lifestyle. They subsequently averaged these attribute-specific perceptions into a single measure of perceived deep-level diversity. Finally, Cunningham et al. (2008) and Zellmer-Bruhn et al. (2008) inquired about perceived differences in terms of social category similarity and work style similarity. The former was a composite measure of similarity with regard to cultural background, nationality, and ethnicity, and the latter was a composite measure of work habits, interaction styles, communication styles, work ethic, and personality similarity.

Divergence in measure specificity reflects different understandings of the nature of perceived diversity. For example, with regard to the source of diversity perceptions, the second type of measures, in which researchers employ fixed sets of categories for eliciting measures of perceived inter-group differences, implicitly assumes that the chosen specific diversity attributes are the salient categories that participants employ to judge the perceived diversity of their group. In contrast, the other two types of perceived diversity measures represent the notion that the perception of diversity in teams depends on a wide array of factors that, while shared among group members, often vary among groups and contexts. When researchers employ certain fixed categories for measuring perceived diversity, they oftentimes justify doing so by stating that they have a reason to assume that these specific attributes matter most in the context of the given study (e.g., Harrison et al., 2002; Liao et al., 2008). However, these arguments are rarely empirically tested. As diversity can relate to all attributes that lead to the perception of being different (van Knippenberg et al., 2004), it is at least somewhat questionable that the employed dimensions are the ones that are of most importance in a given task context. This notion is corroborated by qualitative findings showing that if asked with open questions, team members state a myriad of highly contextual attributes that differentiate among team members in a specific task situation (Meyer, Shenla, & Schermuly, 2011). This is no surprise given the assumption that the meaning of diversity depends on the team’s context (Joshi & Roh, 2009).

**Perceptions of similarity versus perceptions of dissimilarity**

Another pattern in the literature that raises concern is the inconsistency and the lack of theoretical reasoning with regard to the dimensionality and anchors of the scales. Specifically, whereas some authors measure perceived diversity by asking about the degree to which members perceive differences (e.g., Cunningham & Sagas, 2006), others inquire about the degree to which members perceive similarities (e.g., van der Vegt & van de Vliert, 2005; Zellmer-Bruhn et al., 2008), some use a mix of similarity and difference items (Cunningham et al., 2008), and some ask respondents about the degree to which the team is diverse using bi-polar scales that range from similarity to dissimilarity (e.g., van Dick et al., 2008).

In all of the papers covered in this review, the authors do not state reasons for their choice of scale anchors, even though this choice might have theoretical and empirical consequences. As Tversky (1977) pointed out, judgment of similarities and differences are not necessarily complementary. According to Tversky’s contrast model, two entities may be viewed as similar to each other to the extent that the two feature sets have many common features and few distinctive features. Thus, judgments of similarity primarily reflect the perception of common features, and judgments of difference reflect primarily the perception of distinctive features. Indeed, Simon, Pantaleo, and Mummendey (1995) showed that scales measuring similarity and differences are independent of each other. Similarly, Cunningham and Sagas (2006) pointed out that inquiring about similarity and dissimilarity may trigger comparisons with different reference groups. Specifically, asking about similarity requires respondents to assess the extent to which members are in their in-group, while asking for dissimilarity requires assessment of the extent to which others can be considered as out-group members. This, of course, may have theoretical implications because any degree of in-group membership should have different outcomes than being categorized as out-group membership (Dovidio et al., 2007).


Discussion and Future Directions

In recent decades, the increased participation of minorities in the labor market, the globalization of organizations, and the increasing shift towards teamwork have turned diversity into a central issue for managers. Correspondingly, diversity has also sparked the interest of researchers, which resulted in a growing body of research aiming at expanding our understanding of the processes and outcomes associated with differences at work. Although most of the research has focused on objective differences, our review suggests that perceived diversity is a growing construct of interest in the literature. Nevertheless, the perceived diversity research is still in dire need of integration and clarification, which we aimed to provide with this review.

Overall, our review suggests that perceived diversity has a promising role in our continuing efforts to study diversity. Indeed, not only does perceived diversity provide an additional set of insights about group compositions that go beyond the information provided by objective differences, but it may even offer a superior substitute to objective diversity measures. Nevertheless, our review also raises some concerns. Most notably, the variations in the conceptualizations and operationalization of perceived diversity point at a possible disconnect between the two and raise the risk of compromising the effectiveness and rigor of the scientific discourse in this field. In this section, we discuss potential future directions for research.

Future Directions

A possible avenue for research concerns the great variance in the degree of specificity of diversity measures. As mentioned earlier, measures of perceived diversity differ with regard to whether they measure a specific type or dimension of perceived diversity or a more general type of diversity. Future research may benefit from investigating whether there is a link between diversity specificity and its effects as well as whether each level of specificity is associated with different psychological processes. Specifically, if the effects of diversity depend on the way they are operationalized, then it might as well be that individuals experience diversity differently depending on the extent they focus on specific attributes or the team as a whole. Also, to what extent can these separate assessments of the group co-occur? In other words, do group members think of their group as being homogenous and diverse at the same time? For instance, it might be that an individual would perceive her team to be diverse in terms of age or gender but at the same time perceive the team to be homogenous overall. Given their possible contrasting effects on individual and team outcomes, it is worth exploring the interaction between the two as well as ways in which managers can influence the extent to which members focus on one over the other.

A second point for future direction concerns the roles researchers assign to perceived diversity. As we mentioned earlier, some authors opt perceived diversity over objective diversity because of its unique features. For example, perceived diversity is more likely than objective assessment of diversity to incorporate components of differences that may be relevant to a specific group at a certain time, and to take into account possible individual differences with regard to the extent to which individuals perceive diversity in their groups. However, given these advantageous features, it is disappointing to find out that researchers have merely employed perceived diversity to investigate very similar questions to those studied with objective measures. This is disappointing because the true power of perceived diversity is in its ability to provide dynamic, nuanced, and idiosyncratic information. There are several areas of research in the diversity field that can make better use of such information.

First, studying diversity from a perceptual point of view can help us to better understand how perceptions of diversity are formed in different contexts, what aspects of diversity are relevant for individuals and groups, and especially what is the impact of time on diversity. The question of time and change is especially relevant here because it pertains to the essential difference between objective and perceived diversity. Thus, a potential avenue for future research lies in the investigation of the temporal dynamics surrounding perceived diversity. Several researchers argue that processes in work teams can only be fully understood if their temporal dynamics are taken
into account in theory and measurement (e.g., Mathieu, Tannenbaum, Donsbach, & Alliger, 2014; Roe, Gockel, & Meyer, 2012). We propose that a promising way for integrating temporal dynamics in diversity research may be studying both changes in diversity perceptions and changes of diversity perceptions outcomes may be. With regard to changes of diversity perceptions, it seems evident that, given a stable team composition, perceptions are more likely to change than the attributes that are perceived: The objective demographic characteristics of team members (e.g., gender, race, and ethnicity) are unlikely to change over time, and informational features will only change slowly. In contrast, people infer less visible psychological characteristics from other people’s behavior. With the passing of time, people’s behavior reveals more about them (Altman & Taylor, 1973), and it is therefore likely that team members update their perceptions of differences accordingly. We therefore believe that perceived diversity, at least with regard to certain attributes, is likely to exhibit within-person variance over time and would therefore be a construct that could accommodate temporal processes. With regard to the outcomes of perceived diversity, prior research has already shown that its impact on team processes changes over time (Harrison et al., 2002).

Second, we believe that an important avenue for future research might lie in the investigation of within-differences of perceived diversity and the employment of within-team dispersion of subjective perceptions as a team-level variable. In other words, we suggest to depart from the understanding of diversity as a group characteristic and instead focus on the sharedness (or asymmetry) of perceived diversity perceptions. Thus, in order to get a better understanding of the processes surrounding diversity in groups, we should study the extent to which group members experience differences in a same way and the conditions that influence this. We base this reasoning on research on team mental models (e.g., Mohammed & Dumville, 2001), which has generally found that a shared understanding among team members of the task, team, equipment, and situation enhances team outcomes and that differences between team performance are partly due to differences in the extent of sharedness (Mathieu, Heffner, Goodwin, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 2000). This proposition is corroborated by findings from research on within-team conflicts that investigated the differences among team members’ perceptions of conflict under the term of conflict asymmetry (Jehn, Rupert, & Nauta, 2006), showing that team members whose perceptions differ from the perceptions of the rest of his or her group experience more dissatisfaction (Jehn et al., 2006). Furthermore, self-verification theory suggests that an inability to verify one’s individual views—as would be the case in the presence of asymmetric perceptions of diversity—may lead to frustration and withdrawal (Greer & Jehn, 2007). In this way, asymmetric perceptions of diversity could have negative effects on team members whose subjective perceptions of team diversity differ from the rest of the team.

However, future research should reconcile this proposition with direct evidence from relational demography research suggesting that asymmetric perceptions of diversity can also lead to positive results, depending on one’s status in the group. For example, nonsymmetrical effects were found for race and sex, with whites and men showing larger negative effects for increased group diversity than nonwhites and women (Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992).

**Conclusion**

While objective differences have always been at the center of attention of diversity research, our review suggests that perceived diversity is a growing construct of interest in the literature. This arising interest in perceived diversity is fueled by the view that people react on the basis of perception of reality rather than reality per se and that the impact of diversity is dependent upon whether differences make subjective sense to members. In this paper, we aimed to provide a clarification of the construct of perceived diversity as well as an integration of the literature. To do so, we developed a framework that helped us integrate research on perceived diversity from a number of research fields. We found that perceived diversity impacts individual and group outcomes and that the nature of its effect is linked with three distinct theoretical bases associated with different focal points: perceived self-to-team dissimilarity, perceived subgroup splits, and perceived group heterogeneity. In addition, our review also draws attention to the problem that research on perceived diversity thus far has been widely varied not only in definitions and conceptualizations of perceived diversity, but also in the methodological approaches towards...
operationalizing perceived diversity. In moving forward, we hope that the construct of perceived diversity will continue to generate research interest and provide insights into how organizations can truly capitalize on the value that diversity has to offer.
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