

From an association of individuals to communities of persons: how to foster complexity to understand diversity in organizations

Diversity in organizations

1

Marie-Noelle Albert and Nadia Lazzari Dodeler
Université du Québec à Rimouski, Rimouski, Canada

Received 27 January 2021
Revised 15 August 2021
Accepted 21 February 2022

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to propose to move from the organization as an association of individuals to communities of persons.

Design/methodology/approach – This is primarily a conceptual paper. However, it nevertheless underlies very practical aspects.

Findings – An organization should recognize each person within it as a human whom we must take the time to know, and with whom we must interact sincerely. One that only focuses on performance-related goals would not perform well. Indeed, it would increase situations that would generate significant stress and therefore significant costs. To conceive of the generalized complexity of persons makes it possible to manage with the paradoxes and the uncertainties related to the human species, in all conscience. Thus, it is possible to move from diversity management to a management for diversity, where we recognize the contribution of the differences of each person to the organization and where everyone can influence the other.

Originality/value – This paper emphasizes theories and practices that seem non-efficient whereas it is the contrary.

Keywords Persons, Diversity, Complexity, Hidden costs, Performance

Paper type Research paper

1. Introduction

Vito and Sethi (2020) conclude that diversity management is just not about employing people from diverse ethnic or underrepresented groups in the organization; nevertheless it is more respecting different cultural perspectives. It allows us to manage human life complexity. So, it would be interesting to inquire how the complexity theory could help to understand diversity. Indeed, diversity is the interaction between the individual and organizational levels. But diversity management is usually studied at an individual or organizational level (Tatli, 2011). Personalism management is consistent with managing diversity (Szandurski, 2016) and understanding both individual and organizational point of view (Frémeaux, 2020). There is a need to understand theoretical and practical aspects of how complexity paradigm (Morin, 2008) and personalism could help understand how to manage diversity and change the diversity management approach. So, this article will propose to move from a diversity management to a management for diversity, where we recognize the contribution of the differences of each person to the organization and where everyone can influence the other. It suggests going from an individualistic perspective to a more complex stance that may appear counterintuitive at first glance. Human nature is intrinsically complex. Many problems facing



organizations could be better understood with a complexity theory approach which recognizes the personal dimension of humans in organizational endeavors. In this article, each section starts by explaining the first perspective, then the way we propose and it finishes by practical implications of using the second perspective. In the first section, we examine the organization as an association of individuals, a nexus of contracts, or as communities of persons. Then, we present the different finalities. In a third session, we look at defining restricted and generalized complexity in organization. The last session exposes the change from diversity management for diversity. This led us to the notions of inclusion and managing for diversity and not simply diversity management as important dimensions implied by organizations as communities of persons.

2. Association of individuals or communities of persons

2.1 *An association of individuals*

Individualism could be explained from different theoretical and empirical perspectives. In a sense, individualism is a way of seeing the world from a uniquely psychological perspective, the world as seen with the focal point of an individual. From Kant rehabilitation and insistence on the importance of the subject, modernity fostered the self and individuality as the best road to freedom (Taylor, 1989) to the point of being the defining human characteristic of this new era. Hence from a sociological standpoint, individualism is the main footing of our current societies which Bauman (2001) termed “individualized societies”. In this type of society, the role of the consumer becomes paramount and shapes behaviors in organizational settings and elsewhere (Bauman, 2007).

The word “individualism” was first introduced in the English language from a translation of De Tocqueville’s book “Democracy in America” (Hayek, 1949). De Tocqueville (1835-1840/1951) expresses the difference between individualism and egoism. Egoism is a passionate and exaggerated love of self. Individualism is a thoughtful and peaceful feeling that disposes of every citizen to isolate himself from the mass of his fellows, and to retire aloof with his family and his friends; of such so that, after having thus created a small society for his use, he willingly abandons the big company to itself. Individualism proceeds from a wrong judgment rather than a depraved feeling (as in egoism). It takes its source in the defects of the mind as much as in the vices of the heart. Egoism is a vice as old as the world. It does not belong to a form of society more than another. Individualism is of democratic origin, and it threatens to develop as the conditions are equalized.

The fundamental assumption of individualism is that individuals are independent one from another (Oyserman *et al.*, 2002). Hofstede (1980) defines individualism as culture in which the ties between individuals are loose. In these societies each individual looks after him/herself and his/her relatives. Individualism puts the emphasis on individual goals, individual uniqueness and individual control and puts social questions at the periphery (Oyserman *et al.*, 2002).

Hayek (1949), distinguishes “individualism” and “true individualism”. True individualism claims to make the formation of spontaneous social products intelligible.

Agency theory is a key constituent of the contemporary of the firm (Pepper and Gore, 2015), even if it is controversial (Eisenhardt, 1989). In this mainly economic theory, firms are viewed as the nexus for complex sets of contracts. According to Jensen and Meckling (1976, p. 310), “most organizations are simply legal fictions which serve as a nexus for a set of contracting relationships among individuals”. These economic contracts could be written or unwritten, between numerous parties. Agency costs are the results of different interests (Pepper and Gore, 2015). These agents are self-interested but it does not mean that it is inconsistent with altruistic behavior (Jensen, 1993). Agency theory reinstates the prominence of self-interested individuals and incentives in organizational thinking

(Eisenhardt, 1989). “The central proposition of agency theory is that rational self-interested people always have incentive to reduce or control conflicts of interest so as to reduce the losses these conflicts engender” (Jensen, 1993, p. 14).

These individualism and instrumentalism perspectives are deeply different from the humanistic and personalistic communities of persons (Latimore, 2020).

2.2 *Communities of persons*

The use of the word “person” makes it possible to take into account the richness of meaning that this word holds (Melé, 2012; Albert and Perouma, 2017). This word comes from the Greek *prosôpon*. In the beginning, *prosôpon* (Housset, 2007) meant the face, afterwards the meaning expanded to encompass the mask worn by an actor, and then became synonymous with the social person. Thus, *prosôpon* means a face, a thing, an individual in the flesh, or a concrete individual who plays a role (Housset, 2007). This is what others see of the self and its identity. Latin has developed the use of the character, which has moved from the mask to the character and character to the bearer of a word (Vernant, 1996). This concrete individuality–its identity–makes this person a unique being. Thus, a person is both unique and multifaceted, different from others. Therefore, a person can not be understood by observing a single facet, and while capturing all may seem difficult, researchers and specialists must keep in mind the multifaceted composition of a person. A person is not an object that we can divide and look at (Mounier and Mairet, 1952). A person is therefore unique without being reduced to a category and understood only in an individualistic way.

Indeed, the notion of “person” rests more specifically on personalism. Despite this last heterogeneous perspective, the personalists agree on the uniqueness and dignity of a person (Melé, 2009a). More specifically, personalism differs greatly from any other form of collectivism since the person retains autonomy and individual freedom in a community. A person is not only an individual who can simply be counted as part of a community, but also a unique being who cannot be replaced or considered as an abstraction (Melé, 2009a). A person also differs from an individual, because a person is not seen as someone leading an isolated existence, bound to others only by a social contract. On the contrary, a person is considered to be a social being intrinsically linked to others and leading an interdependent existence (Melé, 2009a). The ethical personalist opposes the Other to his Self. It aims to obtain from the Other an ethical response with the same intensity to become two people in the same opening. In this reciprocity, there is a change from moral obligation to moral love. The first stops when you meet your own duty. The second is a tension that solicits the Other and attracts it to a creative response (Danese and Dinicola, 1989). In this process, a person is not led by principles deduced abstractly, but by the fulfillment of the Other and the quality of the relationship, in a way that a person wants to create (Danese and Dinicola, 1989). In addition, a person is a complex being interacting with other complex beings in a complex environment. As a result, he can help us use complex thinking (Morin, 2008) to understand communities of people. Morin (2008) demonstrates that a person can be altruistic and selfish, as well as kind and cruel to others. Therefore, it is possible that selfishness inhabits a person who nevertheless opens to others. Instead of denying this phenomenon, it would be better to take it into consideration.

According to Melé (2012) “a ‘community of persons’ emphasizes both individuals and the whole” (p. 89). Mintzberg (2009) explains that individualism is a beautiful idea because it produces incentives, promotes leadership and fosters development. However, persons are also social animals and need social glue to unite them for their own good. This is what Mintzberg (2009) calls “community.” Community entails taking care of work, colleagues and one’s place in the world. Mintzberg positions community spirit between individualistic leadership, on the one hand and collective citizenship, on the other. This view of a community is very similar to the one that Melé (2009a) describes, in which persons share common goals

and goods belonging to the community while maintaining their sense of individuality. [Naughton \(2015\)](#) explains that organizations can be viewed as a continuum between an association of individuals and a community of persons, even if these two notions could be used interchangeably in everyday language. If we view the organization as an association of individuals, we consider it as an aggregate of individuals who are mostly motivated by their own goals and calculations, and bonded by contracts. This point of view uses only economic and legal human conceptions. With a community of persons, there is a move from a “me” to a “we” ([Naughton, 2015](#)).

Organizations as communities endeavor to stimulate the good in each person who is its member ([Tablan, 2014](#)). “Providing a safe working environment free from harassment, bullying, and discrimination is necessary but not sufficient for a genuine community. Rather, workers and managers must try, in the course of their common endeavors, to build authentic human relationships that transcend the limits of their employee-employer contract” (p. 12).

[Tönnies \(1887\)](#) distinguishes two ideal types: *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. The first one could be translated as “community” and the second one as “society.” [Tönnies \(1887\)](#) opposes societies and communities. Societies are just based on individuals’ utilitarian interests and communities assume an emotional social function based on emotional feeling. Such communities are characterized by emotional and special proximity where human relationships are authentic. In these communities, the whole takes priority over individuals. [Tönnies \(1887\)](#) promotes this ideal-type. Societies support a mechanical and egoistic system that does not consider a person as a social human being that could be open to others. [Tönnies’ \(1887\)](#) notion of community does not allow us to recognize the existence of each person. [Adler et al. \(2008\)](#), for their part, distinguish three kinds of communities: *Gemeinschaft*, *Gesellschaft* and collaborative. In the first one, coordination relies on traditional norms. The second has a coordination mechanism that is based on market price and hierarchical authority. The third, a collaborative community, is based on interdependent self-construal, that is, each participant coordinates his or her activities through a shared commitment to a set of finalities. “The procedures are designed collaboratively and used by peers to monitor each other and to work together to improve performance” ([Adler et al., 2008](#), p. 366). Our perspective is that a community of persons is a collaborative community in which persons respect and are open-minded toward one another. Since it leads to being more productive, this cannot be a naïve way of thinking about organizations. According to [Melé and Gonzalez Canton \(2014\)](#), “business as a community of persons is a view of the organization [...] and entails recognizing the organization as a real entity made up by free and autonomous persons. This latter forms a whole, based on common goals, interconnectedness, interdependence, loyalties and even moral commitments” (p. 193). Of course, these communities are not only composed of persons who work in the same organization, they are also developing a business as a community rather than an association. This should have a positive impact on persons and the organization.

A community of persons is very different from communitarianism. Communitarianism rejects strangers of the community. In this case the community is a withdrawal ([Bauman, 1993](#)). The community of persons is not a waterproof box separated from the outside. Boundaries are not fixed.

2.3 Practical implications

In organizations, considering persons who work not as individuals bound by contracts, but as persons that could establish communities, is not just words. It means that we recognize each of person as human. We need to take time knowing everyone and having sincere interactions. These relationships do not signify that persons have to be friend with each other. It is to develop a culture of openness to other. So, persons feel recognized and can communicate

easily with others. Usually, managers want to develop teamwork commit in the organization, but emphasizes on individuals. To have real teamwork need to considered persons included in communities. Working with persons whereas just individuals, represents also working with different finalities.

3. Two different finalities

3.1 Performance finality when we work with individuals

For [Jensen and Meckling \(1976\)](#), principals and agents (the two kinds of individuals recognized in firms) have as a finality, to maximize their utility. Utilitarian economics promote the calculation of advantages and disadvantages (i.e. damages and profits) to obtain the maximum benefit with minimum energy ([Danese and Dinicola, 1989](#); [Melé, 2009b](#)). Behavioral agency theory claims that the microeconomic model of humans in agency theory is too simplistic. For instance, in agency theory, agents are rent seeking. Their utilities are positively linked to pecuniary incentive and negatively to an effort. Whereas, behavioral agency theory adds that they are subject to limitations concerning rationality, motivation, loss risk, uncertainty and time preference ([Pepper and Gore, 2015](#)). Let's note here that even with these aspects in mind, this model remained incomplete and his simplistic stance must be ameliorated.

3.2 Both ethics finality and avoiding hidden cost when we work with persons

Reference to the notion of person does not lead to denying the value of economic rationality; it is more for integrating several rationalities than for referring to the integrality of the person ([Danese and Di Nicola, 1989](#)). According to [Pirson and Lawrence \(2010\)](#), "blended value models show how the economic system can be reconnected to its humanistic root" (p. 563). [Mounier and Mairet \(1952\)](#) explains that taking away what is human in work can lead proletarians to rebel (e.g. when workers are confined in their specialty by a division of labor not accompanied by compensatory participation in the administration of the whole). When persons are managed without benevolence, some costs could increase. For example, the cost of employee burnout has been evaluated over £77 billion per year. [Hassard et al. \(2018\)](#) examine the cost of work related stress. They estimate that it represents \$187 billion. Between 70 and 90% of this cost is explicated by loss of productivity. The work-related stress costs for American companies were estimated at more than \$300 billion per year. In fact, stress can lead to absenteeism, turnover, errors, decrease productivity, encourage burnout, lower morale, increase use of drugs and alcohol, violence at work, and harassment.

[Plinio \(2009\)](#) defines the sustainable performance of organizations as performance that achieves short-term goals while remaining focused on long-term goals. Therefore, all results, in the short term as well as in the long term, increase the benefits for the organization, the parties involved and our civil society. This sustainable development of people can also help reduce the (often hidden) costs associated with turnover, absenteeism, etc.

3.3 Practical implications

The search for individual optimum, does not allow optimization of the system. Persons have some individual and pecuniary goals, but not only. So, it is important to not just focus on these goals. Moreover, if persons do not feel recognize as person they could increase some costs, even if these costs are not visible, avoiding hidden costs. Even if, taking time to know persons, to create a climate of trust, to express their feelings, could seem not productive and expensive for the organization, it is usually less that hidden costs linked to stress and other work atmosphere problems.

These different finalities suppose two different visions of complexity.

4. Restricted versus generalized complexity

4.1 *A first conception of complexity*

Etymologically, the word complexity comes from the French word “complexité”, which comes from the Latin *complexus* which means intertwined (Edmonds and Gershenson, 2015). Alhadeff-Jones (2008) describes three generations of complexity theories. In the first, we can find some theories of information and communication, or cybernetics that emerge from the Second World War. In the second, we find studies developed during the 60s. In the third, Alhadeff-Jones (2008) distinguishes two types of paths: the first was deployed in the English-speaking world with a focus on non-linear dynamics evolutionary biology and the sciences of the artificial; while the second is more related to French thinkers like Le Moigne or Morin. We have aligned our concept of complexity with this last group.

Morin (2005) proposes a difference between two types of complexity. What he calls “restricted complexity” and “generalized complexity”. The complexity is limited because it is limited to systems that are empirically complex, coming from a variety of processes with multiple, interdependent and retroactively related relationships. In fact, the restricted complexity is never questioned or thought from an epistemological point of view. In this kind of complexity, scientists want to “unpack” to find a universal principle.

In this perspective, Pérez-Valls *et al.* (2017) define complexity as the degree of differentiation existing in a system. Hall *et al.* (1967) insist on the importance of the concept of complexity in organizational analyses. They define complexity as “the degree of internal segmentation – the number of separate “parts” of the organization as reflected by the division of labor, number of hierarchical levels and the spatial dispersion of the organization” (p. 906). They proposed indicators to study this organizational complexity. They divided these eleven indicators in four themes: division of labor-general, division of labor specific, hierarchical differentiation, spatial dispersion. Hage *et al.* (1971) use two measures of organizational complexity: the number of occupational specialties and the degree of professional activity. Whereas vertical complexity refers to the number of levels in an organizational hierarchy (Schminke *et al.*, 2002).

4.2 *A generalized complexity*

The generalized complexity “relates to our knowledge as human beings, individuals, people and citizens” (Morin, 2005, p. 321) We have based our choice of epistemological paradigm on this type of complexity is not just an indicator of tensions or conflicts that occur within organizations, if this were the case, it would only be difficulties–albeit complex–that needed to be clarified for good decision-making to occur.

The generalized paradigm of complexity is based on different principles, including the relation of whole-part mutual implication than reduction, reliance than disjunction, emergence and dialogical principle (Morin, 2005).

Persons do not seem to be reduced to a simple source of uncertainty that should be taken into account by good organizational risk management practices, and should not be considered as solvable by improved communication practices. In other words, as a conceptual framework, we refute complexity and ambivalence as negative problem dimensions. Rather, we propose to consider them as fundamental characteristics of managerial situations. At the individual, organizational and institutional level, complexity and ambivalence exist and are always present. Therefore, the challenge facing researchers seems to be to integrate in their thinking the ambivalent nature of their object of study as opposed to studying the factors of complexity, in order to explore the means around it. This paradigm of complexity is based on different principles, including the dialogical principle. This principle is the complex unity between two complementary, competing and antagonistic logics, entities or instances that feed on each other, complement each other, but also oppose and fight (Morin, 2001). This

dialogical principle is central in the notion of person as presented previously. [Morin \(2001\)](#) explains that we have to understand the whole through the parts and the parts through the whole. So we have to understand the organization through the persons and the persons through the organization.

4.3 Practicable implications

Generalized complexity enables us to conceive persons at work in different aspects even if they seem contradictory. Persons are multiple and unpredictable. In organizations, these persons interact. With the generalized complexity, it is not just numerous individuals who interact, but complex persons that act in an uncertain way. So the organization is both less and more than the sum of each person that forms the organization. The more allow creation of emergence. This understanding of communities of complex persons in organizations facilitates the change from diversity management to management for diversity.

5. From diversity management to management for diversity

5.1 Diversity management

We live in an increasingly interconnected world. Managing diversity is an issue that interests more and more researchers and practitioners ([Cho et al., 2017](#)) because the workforce of the 21st century is characterized by more and more diversity ([Roberson, 2006](#)). Diversity means the diverse composition of groups or workforces in terms of observable or unobservable characteristics ([Roberson, 2006](#)). Diversity management uses tools to manage diversity such as offering monitoring, coaching, family/employee friendly policies, alternative work arrangements ([Sabharwal, 2014](#); [Mor Barak et al., 2016](#); [Trittin and Schoeneborn, 2017](#)). The goal is not the diversity *per se*, but using the diverse workforce to achieve organizational goals ([Sabharwal, 2014](#)).

Diversity management (in practitioner literature) establishes a distinction with previous civil rights and social justice arguments, and takes an economic turn ([Oswick and Noon, 2014](#); [Trittin and Schoeneborn, 2017](#)). It shows the benefits that managing diversity can bring to the organization ([Cho et al., 2017](#)). For instance, it could help diversify the client base, increase creativity, innovation, problem-solving, improve corporate image, raise organizational performance ([Oswick and Noon, 2014](#); [Mor Barak et al., 2016](#)). This conceptualization of diversity management is called “instrumental perspective” by [Trittin and Schoeneborn \(2017\)](#).

5.2 Inclusion or managing for diversity

For [Chavez and Weisinger \(2008\)](#), we should stop focusing on the “management diversity” and favor a “management for diversity”. This concept refers to a work atmosphere in which each person is valued for their particular skills, experiences and points of view. It can be defined as the level at which an employee perceives that he is an esteemed member of the working group who satisfies both his needs for belonging and being unique. It is a “me” in an “we” ([Chavez and Weisinger, 2008](#); [Nair and Vohra, 2015](#)). This conception is close to the notion of a person who relies more specifically on personalism ([Albert and Perouma, 2017](#)), based on the uniqueness and the belongings to communities ([Melé, 2009a, b](#)).

Other authors are close to this shift, and use the word “inclusion”. It is more than just a semantic change. This is a true paradigm reversal. This paradigm of inclusion presupposes that all people are considered “normal” in law, regardless of the deviation from an assumed social norm of normality ([Le Capitaine, 2013](#)). Inclusion refers to the process that incorporates differences in business practices and helps to create value ([Oswick and Noon, 2014](#)). Inclusion therefore presupposes the existence of communities. [Ennuyer \(2017\)](#) explains that for a social

organization to be inclusive, it must modulate its functioning, become more flexible to offer within the common set, a place for everyone so that each person can contribute to social life, cultural and community. To be inclusive therefore does not implied inclusion in order to correct *a posteriori* the damage of inequities, categorizations and ostracisms, but first of all, to redefine and give new meaning to social life in a common house, admitting that everyone is a legatee. What society holds most precious, equity, freedom and the feeling of existing (Gardou, 2012). Shore *et al.* (2011) distinguish four notions: exclusion, assimilation, differentiation and inclusion. They build a matrix with the value of uniqueness and belongingness. Inclusion is high in these two dimensions whereas exclusion is the opposite. This inclusion is a “me” in a “we”. It is a person in a community.

Trittin and Schoeneborn (2017) explain that a constructive-critical approach proposes diversity management as both economically successful and socially just. Managing for diversity could create a climate for inclusion. This climate for inclusion permits to develop beneficial outcomes such as job satisfaction, satisfaction with co-workers, affective commitment, professional commitment, organizational commitment, job tenure or retention. And, this climate can avoid detrimental outcomes: turnover, absenteeism, intention to leave, job stress, time stress, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (Mor Barak *et al.*, 2016). These detrimental outcomes are very expensive for organizations. Managing for diversity is not easy and there is no universal or assured recipe for success. Persons and organizations are complex and uncertain, but person need to be recognized as unique and belonging to communities.

5.3 Practical implications

Managing diversity is not viewing the difference in an instrumental way, in performance finality. In this perspective, organizations are formed by complex and interdependent persons, each influencing others. But in this perspective, the emphasis is not on the more visible difference, because all persons are different and share things with others. Managing diversity focuses on some differences (gender, culture, disability) and could increase stigmatization.

For example, when an immigrant arrives, he or she changes, but he or she keeps some part of his/her uniqueness. He/she brings to the organization his/her own color. That could be better for him/her to feel recognized, and for the organization to innovate. He/she belongs to the same community as others. It is a person with other persons. However, this is not a simple recipe, because persons are complex: multiple (e.g. egoistic and altruistic) and uncertain; and they interact together. But when persons are listened to, recognized as a person, and can bring their differences to the organization, it could improve the chance of success.

6. Conclusion

Nowadays most management theories and management researches consider humans at work as an aggregate of individuals. The social and biological dimensions of organizations are not considered relevant. They simply look for how to optimize the workforce. But, at the other side of the continuum in grasping organizations as complex entities, there is a paradigmatic change. Management theory approaches focus on individuals, are often implicit but they are omnipresent in management theories. For instance, organizational behavior theories emphasizes on organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988) as a cause of positive outcomes both for individuals and organization (such as employee performance) (Deery *et al.*, 2017). OCB refers to behaviors optional and beyond the job description (Shin *et al.*, 2017). This indicator measures conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy and altruism (Klotz *et al.*, 2018). This measure is an individual indicator that supposes that organizations

are an aggregation of individuals, but it emphasizes relationship with others. And, for a long time, researchers have known that the whole is not the sum of its parts; the team is not the sum of the individuals that belong to it.

The aim of this article was to inquire about theoretical and practical aspects of how complexity paradigm and personalism could help understanding the diversity management and change diversity management approach. According to Morin (2001), we have to understand the organization (the whole) through the persons (the parts) and the persons through the organization. As a conceptualization of organization, an aggregate of individuals (Naughton, 2015) does not work properly to create a real climate for inclusion (Frémeaux, 2020). Even if utilitarian point of view promotes individual calculation of costs and benefits (Melé, 2009b), when persons are not managed with benevolence, it induces costs: e.g. linked to rebellions (Mounier and Mairet, 1952), stress (Hassard *et al.*, 2018), turnover and intention to leave (Mor Barak *et al.*, 2016). So, hidden costs can change the apparent calculation of costs-benefits. A management for diversity (Chavez and Weisinger, 2008) emphasizes the value of each person in the organization. Each person is different and has not to be viewed as a single facet (Mounier and Mairet, 1952), as an immigrant, for instance.

In an instrumental way, what is created is a fake climate for inclusion that is perceived negatively by persons and could have the contrary effect for what it was intended. The openness to others is important to create a real climate for inclusion but it cannot be imposed by anyone, it could just be promoted by the other members of the community. Even if this conceptualization could appear as less efficient and less scientific, it is essential to go beyond the simplistic way that ignores how humans are. Who wants to be treated in a simplistic way? In that sense, using an approach grounded in complexity theory offers many advantages. First, it takes into account more dimensions that are present in the current model but often neglected. Second, it raises the level of understanding of the phenomena under study. And finally, it shows ties that were at best obscured in the former conceptualization. We believe that this type of approach will deliver more positive results than the former individualistic stance could achieve and has achieved.

References

- Adler, P. S., Kwon, S. W. and Heckscher, C. (2008), "Perspective-professional work: the emergence of collaborative community", *Organization Science*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 359-376.
- Albert, M. N. and Perouma, J. P. (2017), "The dialogue: an essential component to consider organization as a community of persons", *Humanistic Management Journal*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 37-55.
- Alhadeff-Jones, M. (2008), "Three generations of complexity theories: nuances and ambiguities", *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 66-82.
- Bauman, Z. (1993), *Postmodern ethics*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- Bauman, Z. (2001), *The Individualized Society*, Polity, London.
- Bauman, Z. (2007), *Consuming Life*, Polity, London.
- Chavez, C. I. and Weisinger, J. Y. (2008), "Beyond diversity training: a social infusion for cultural inclusion", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 331-350, Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management.
- Cho, S., Kim, A. and Mor Barak, M. E. (2017), "Does diversity matter? Exploring workforce diversity, diversity management, and organizational performance in social enterprises", *Asian Social Work and Policy Review*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 193-204.
- Danese, A. and Di Nicola, G.P. (1989), *Éthique et personnalisme*, Ciaco, Louvain-la-Neuve.

- De Tocqueville, A. (1835-1840/1951), *De la démocratie en Amérique*, Gallimard, Paris.
- Deery, S., Rayton, B., Walsh, J. and Kinnie, N. (2017), "The costs of exhibiting organizational citizenship behavior", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 56 No. 6, pp. 1039-1049.
- Edmonds, B. and Gershenson, C. (2015), "Modelling complexity for policy: opportunities and challenges", *Handbook on complexity and public policy*, p. 205.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989), "Agency theory: an assessment and review", *Academy of management review*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 57-74.
- Ennuyer, B. (2017), "La vulnérabilité en question ?", *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 365-373.
- Frémeaux, S. (2020), "A common good perspective on diversity", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 200-228.
- Gardou, C. (2012), *La société inclusive, parlons-en!*, Érès, Toulouse.
- Hage, J., Aiken, M. and Marrett, C. B. (1971), Organization structure and communications, *American Sociological Review*, pp. 860-871.
- Hall, R. H., Johnson, N. J. and Haas, J. E. (1967), Organizational size, complexity, and formalization, *American Sociological Review*, pp. 903-912.
- Hassard, J., Teoh, K.R.H., Visockaite, G., Dewe, P. and Cox, T. (2018), "The cost of work-related stress to society: a systematic review", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 1, p. 1.
- Hayek, F. A. (1949), "The intellectuals and socialism", *The University of Chicago Law Review*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 417-433.
- Hofstede, G. (1980), "Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad ?", *Organizational dynamics*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 42-63.
- Housset, E. (2007), *La vocation de la personne : l'histoire du concept de personne de sa naissance augustinienne à sa redécouverte phénoménologique*, Presses universitaires de France, Paris.
- Jensen, M. C. (1993), "The modern industrial revolution, exit, and the failure of internal control systems", *the Journal of Finance*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 831-880.
- Jensen, M. C. and Meckling, W. H. (1976), "Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure", *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 305-360.
- Klotz, A. C., Bolino, M. C., Song, H. and Stornelli, J. (2018), "Examining the nature, causes, and consequences of profiles of organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 629-647.
- Latemore, G. M. (2020), "From valuable resource to valued Person: ontologies of human resource management", Doctor of Philosophy, School of Business, University of Notre Dame Australia, available at: <https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/theses/269>.
- Le Capitaine, J.-V (2013), "L'inclusion n'est pas un plus d'intégration : l'exemple des jeunes sourds", *Empan*, No. 1, pp. 125-131.
- Melé, D. (2009a), "Integrating personalism into virtue-based business ethics: the personalist and the common good principles", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 88, pp. 227-244.
- Melé, D. (2009b), "Editorial introduction: toward a more humanistic management", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 88, pp. 413-416.
- Melé, D. (2012), "The firm as a 'community of persons': a pillar of humanistic business ethos", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 106 No. 1, pp. 89-101.
- Melé, D. and González-Cantón, C. (2014), *Human foundations of management*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Mintzberg, H. (2009), "Rebuilding companies as communities", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 87 Nos 7/8, pp. 140-143.

-
- Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M. K., Hsiao, H. Y. and Brimhall, K. C. (2016), "The promise of diversity management for climate of inclusion: a state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis", *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership and Governance*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 305-333.
- Morin, E. (2001), *La Méthode - 5. L'humanité de l'humanité. L'identité humaine*, Edition Du Seuil, Paris.
- Morin, E. (2005), *Introduction à la pensée complexe*, coll. Essais, Points Seuil, Paris.
- Morin, E. (2008), *On complexity*, Hampton Press, New York, NY.
- Mounier, E. and Mairat, P. A. (1952), "Personalism", in Mairat, P., London, Translated by.
- Nair, N. and Vohra, N. (2015), *Diversity and Inclusion at the Workplace: A Review of Research and Perspectives*.
- Naughton, M. (2015), "Thinking institutionally about business: seeing its nature as a community of persons and its purpose as the common good", in Melé, D. and Schlag, M. (Eds) *Humanism in Economics and Business, Revista Empresa y Humanismo*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 179-199.
- Organ, D. W. (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com, MA.
- Oswick, C. and Noon, M. (2014), "Discourses of diversity, equality and inclusion: trenchant formulations or transient fashions?", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 23-39.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M. and Kimmelmeier, M. (2002), "Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses", *Psychological bulletin*, Vol. 128 No. 1, p. 3.
- Pepper, A. and Gore, J. (2015), "Behavioral agency theory: new foundations for theorizing about executive compensation", *Journal of management*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 1045-1068.
- Pérez-Valls, M., Céspedes-Lorente, J., Martínez-del-Río, J. and Antolín-López, R. (2017), "How organizational structure affects ecological responsiveness", *Business and Society*, Vol. 58 No. 8, pp. 1634-1670.
- Pirson, M. A. and Lawrence, P.R. (2010), "Humanism in business - towards a paradigm shift?", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 93 No. 4, pp. 553-565.
- Plinio, A.J. (2009), "Ethics and leadership", *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 277-283.
- Roberson, Q.M. (2006), "Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations", *Group and Organization Management*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 212-236.
- Sabharwal, M. (2014), "Is diversity management sufficient? Organizational inclusion to further performance", *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 197-217.
- Schminke, M., Cropanzano, R. and Rupp, D. E. (2002), "Organization structure and fairness perceptions: the moderating effects of organizational level", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 89 No. 1, pp. 881-905.
- Shin, Y., Kim, M. S., Choi, J. N., Kim, M. and Oh, W. K. (2017), "Does leader-follower regulatory fit matter? The role of regulatory fit in followers' organizational citizenship behavior", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 1211-1233.
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K. and Singh, G. (2011), "Inclusion and diversity in work groups: a review and model for future research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 1262-1289.
- Szandurski, J. (2016), "Personalistic management in age-diversified organisations", *Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie*, Vol. 17 No. 2.3, pp. 111-121.
- Tablan, F. (2014), "Ethical implications of Catholic social teachings on human work for the service industry", *Journal of Religion and Business Ethics*, Vol. 3 No. 1, p. 11.

- Tatli, A. (2011), "A multi-layered exploration of the diversity management field: diversity discourses, practices and practitioners in the UK", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 238-253.
- Taylor, C. (1989), *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*, Harvard University Press, Boston.
- Tönnies, F. (1887), "Community and society", *The urban sociology reader*, p. 13.
- Trittin, H. and Schoeneborn, D. (2017), "Diversity as polyphony: reconceptualizing diversity management from a communication-centered perspective", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 144 No. 2, pp. 305-322.
- Vernant, J. P. (1996), *Mythe et pensée chez les grecs*, La Découverte, Paris.
- Vito, R. and Sethi, B. (2020), "Managing change: role of leadership and diversity management", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 33 No. 7, pp. 1471-1483.

Further reading

- Roberson, Q., Ryan, A. M. and Ragins, B. R. (2017), "The evolution and future of diversity at work", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 102 No. 3, p. 483.

Corresponding author

Marie-Noelle Albert can be contacted at: marie-noelle_albert@uqar.ca