



Workgroup Diversity and Group Cohesiveness in Nigeria Police

Tende Friday Buradum*

Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Georgewill Tamunotonye Anita

Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Abstract

This study seeks to explore the behaviour of workgroups in terms of their diversity and group cohesiveness in Nigeria Police. The study was conducted in Rivers State; where three hundred and eighteen (318) copies of the research instrument were distributed to the respondents of forty-five (45) workgroups. Nevertheless, only two hundred and seventy-nine (279) copies amounting to forty (40) workgroups returned and was analyzed using the Kendall's tau statistical technique with the aid of SPSS. It was recommended that: Leadership of the group should ensure that deep level diversity or differences amongst members of a group is communicated to all and sundry to bring about mutual respect thereby aiding the attainment of the goals of the group. Leadership of the group should ensure that deep level diversity or differences is well communicated as it would enhance the co-operation of group members thereby enabling group members to keep to the standard norms the govern group activities. Leadership of the group should ensure that surface level diversity is seen as a resource because the peculiar personal experiences of the individual group members are communicated to shape the activities and behavioural conduct of the group. Leadership of the group should ensure that surface level diversity brings about co-operation in the group in that the gains of the differences should be made known even from the point of indoctrination. Since managing diversity is not merely giving lip service to maximizing the differences of groups; leadership of the group should encourage harmonious relationship(s) amongst all group members for cohesive co-ordination in attaining its predetermined objectives.

Keywords: Workgroup diversity; Group cohesiveness; Nigeria police.

1. Introduction

Cohesiveness in groups is not a given, even when it appears to occur when members of a group tend to enjoy relatively robust social network of relationships. The possibility of sticking together borders around the propensity of group cohesiveness, because cohesive groups have several positive qualities that are noticeable with a shared perception of a "we feeling" indicating dependable friendliness among group members, while upholding the standard norms of the group (Bell *et al.*, 2010).

Group cohesiveness as a concept has been around as long as individuals have been interested in collective processes and effectiveness. It refers to bonding or adhesion amongst members of a collective entity or group (Bowers *et al.*, 2000); because the overall cohesiveness of a group enhances the entirety of these positive forces in each member's life-space. Consequently, cohesiveness in this sense tends to represent the resultant forces pressing on all the members to remain faithful in the group per time (Mullen and Copper, 1994). In a clearer picture, group cohesiveness arises when group members demonstrate great level of bonding at any point in the group network with regards to the flair of leadership that may exist within the group using communication and co-operation as veritable tools. It is noteworthy that, the highest commonly quoted citation of the description of group cohesiveness discusses it as the totality of forces which press on members to remain faithful to the group (Festinger *et al.*, 1950a).

Originally, cohesiveness in groups was believed to have arisen from bonding and/or committing to the group task and reputation (Bell *et al.*, 2010), to interpersonal attraction due to differences or group diversity. Unlike in the past, when organizations were generally homogeneous due to sexual category (masculinity or femininity), ethnic group and/or skill; a classic example is a scenario in which functional workgroups (this represents two or more individuals who routinely function as a team, and are interdependent in achieving the predetermined or common goal) in organizations were composed of individuals with similar training and backgrounds from the same ethnic group (Bowers *et al.*, 2000), which is obviously no longer the case as certain dynamic forces now influence diversity in workgroups. These forces are globalization, migration and/or immigration of individuals (which includes potential and actual employees), demographic shifts (e.g. having younger individuals or millennial compete for jobs nowadays), and global economics (collective economic events) etc. These dissimilarities have given birth to an upsurge in the level of survival, success and improved functionality in terms of product or service coverage, and employee and customer satisfaction. However, the inability to translate these dissimilarities into profitable ventures by many organizations has steered the near collapse of such organizations (Robert, 2003).

Within the perspective of organizations, diversity is the variation of social and cultural identities among individuals existing within a definite employment or marketing setting; meaning the amount of heterogeneity among the members of a group on specified demographic proportions (Cox, 2001). This demonstrates that the magnitude of

*Corresponding Author

heterogeneity among the members of the workgroup affects the processes, progress and performance, because the workplace has transcended from being a uniform entity to a culturally diverse entity in order to aid in the attainment of predetermined objectives of the organization (Kelli *et al.*, 2012).

These diversity in groups can be categorized broadly into deep level diversity indicating natural differences impacting during the course of an individual's life, and these represent the core elements that shape their self-image, philosophy about life, and way they view the world; which comes in form of age, race, ethnicity, gender, cognitive or physical abilities, language and sexual orientation, while surface level diversity represents that which can be acquired or changed throughout one's lifetime subject to the present state of affair(s), e.g. experience, religious belief, education, marital status, parental status, work background, income and geographic location (Carrel, 2006).

It is suitable at this point to demonstrate here that various scholars (e.g. (Bowers *et al.*, 2000; Evans and Dion, 1991; Kelli *et al.*, 2012; Ogbo *et al.*, 2004; Owoyemi *et al.*, 2011)), have conducted research on workgroup diversity and group cohesiveness respectively; but there seems to be scanty scholarly research done to inquire the relationship between workgroup diversity and group cohesiveness in Nigeria Police, Rivers State Command. Based on this perceived gap in knowledge, our point of departure from earlier studies is to empirically fill this gap in knowledge using suitable and adequate research technique. Hence, this study seeks to inquire the relationship between workgroup diversity and group cohesiveness in Nigeria Police, Rivers State Command, and Leadership climate was adopted to moderate the relationship between workgroup diversity and group cohesiveness in Nigeria Police, Rivers State Command.

2. Statement of the Problem

Generally, the security situation in Nigeria today is increasingly becoming worrisome as people are still cautious about moving freely within the country, even in broad daylight because the scale of kidnaping, robbery, ritual killing, assassinations, murder and devious crimes, appears to continue on the upward trajectory (The Vanguard, 2015), making the police with the aid of other security agencies to rise up to the occasion by deploying her best efforts to tackle incidences of crime and criminality which can only be attained with "cohesive co-ordination". But, this is a challenge because the obvious lack of cohesive co-ordination due to having its personnel cut across the different ethnic nationalities in Nigeria is worrisome.

Owing to this fact, Nigeria Police makes effort to adjust to the predisposition that workgroup diversity in the workplace can brings about the coming together of individuals from different ethnic nationalities together, age, race, personality, gender, tenure, cognition, work skill set, culture, education, belief, language, attitude, etc. which can result in negative or counterproductive behaviours in the workplace (Graen, 2003). Owing to this fact, such scenario painted above can lead to poor communication, improper role interpretations, poorly harnessing the benefits of workgroup diversity, resistance to change due to superiority or inability of the change group values, groupthink due to reluctance to express dissenting opinions, etc. all this inhibit group cohesiveness leading to distortions in the discharge of functions (Greenberg, 2004).

On the other hand, the discriminatory and prejudiced attitude of some group members owing to individual uniqueness, lack of collaboration amongst members has been demonstrated by workers in the same organization, which inhibits morale with negative functionality index per time. In this case, the success of the organization diminishes because the core values of diversity are not suitably harnessed (Ogbo *et al.*, 2004). The aforementioned issue gradually becomes the standard norm for the workgroup.

2.1. Research Hypotheses

This study is steered by the subsequent testable null hypotheses using the elements of both diversity and group cohesiveness. Thus:

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between deep level diversity and communication and co-operation in Nigeria Police Rivers State command.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between surface level diversity and communication and co-operation in Nigeria Police Rivers State command.

H₀₃: Leadership climate does not significantly moderate the relationship between workgroup diversity and group cohesiveness in Nigeria Police Rivers State command.

2.1.1. Significance of the Study

This study has both academic and practical significance.

- i. The academia, other business researchers, and scholars will be able to borrow from the findings of this research to support literary citations are well as develop themes for further research. Specifically, the study hopes to make theoretical, practical and methodological contributions.
- ii. This study will provide guidelines to government policy machinery and other legislations on Nigeria Police and her activities especially concerning workgroup diversity and group cohesiveness.

2.2. Theoretical Framework

The baseline theory for workgroup diversity is the theory of attraction because it is considered relevant to the variables under review.

2.2.1. Theory of Attraction

The idea of attractiveness in groups was put forward by Festinger *et al.* (1950b) in which they proposes that group attractiveness to individuals is based on social identity and interaction which shows feeling of care within the group as a whole. It was supposed that attractiveness in groups stem from social attraction with self-categorization in which individuals within that state tend to study the similarities and differences that may exist in the group, and mentally categorize themselves as part of that group (Hogg, 1993).

From this categorization, stereotype with regards to the group and its members turn out to be more important in the mind of the individual; because he/she now thinks and behave according to the standard norms of the group (depersonalization). This is the reason why, Hogg (1993) noted that social attraction tends to link depersonalized characteristics which are distinct from interpersonal interaction among individuals in the group; stating that group cohesiveness is associated to group attraction than with attraction to individuals within the group.

2.2.2. Understanding Diversity

Diversity within workgroups creates a paradox because it has been demonstrated that diverse workgroup have better performance. Conversely, diversity within workgroups also intensifies the risk of probable conflict (Garcia-Prieto *et al.*, 2003; Yeager and Nafukho, 2012). While prevailing on the surface level differences to speculates less worth for workgroups than deep-level dissimilarities when the workgroup interacted more consistent over time (Harrison *et al.*, 1998).

The differences between the key and minor characteristics (Garcia-Prieto *et al.*, 2003) denotes inborn versus the learned characteristics that can influence the way individuals see themselves and their environment. The primary characteristics/elements include sexual category, tenure, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and physical circumstance being deep level diversity, while education, religion, geographical foundation, income, marital status and profession fall under the secondary elements being surface level diversity (Corey, 2008).

2.2.2.1. Deep Level Diversity

Deep-level diversity tends to show the degree of similarity in terms of sexual role, age (tenure), ethnicity, sexual orientation, and physical condition indicating homogeneity (Yeager and Nafukho, 2012). For example, group members who are comparable in ages, such as a group for children, adolescents, or older persons, while other homogeneous groups may be established on a common interest or problem. It is essential to note here that short-term groups are usually characterized by homogeneous membership (Corey, 2008). The unitary focus in a homogeneous group tends to foster group cohesiveness, and common problem areas of group members promote sharing experiences and learning from each other. Although homogeneous membership in groups can be more appropriate for the definite needs or with short-term groups (Corey, 2008).

2.2.2.2. Surface Level Diversity

The educational background, religion, geographical origin, income level, marital status and profession fall under a secondary characteristics/elements known as surface level diversity; this reveals some level of heterogeneity in group membership has some definite advantages for many personal growth groups, whether short or long term (Garcia-Prieto *et al.*, 2003). A heterogeneous group represents a small-scale version of the social structure that is existent and offers participants the occasion to testing with new behaviours, develop social skills, and get response from numerous diverse sources (Yeager and Nafukho, 2012). If a simulation of everyday life is desired, it is well to have a range of differences in terms of ages, races, cultural and ethnic back-grounds, gender and sexual identity, and a variety of concerns (Corey, 2008).

2.3. Understanding Group Cohesiveness

Group cohesiveness encompasses a sense of belonging, attachment, harmony, and an attraction of a group for its members, because cohesiveness is the upshot of all the forces pro tem on the members that make them want to continue in the group (Evans and Dion, 1991). Group cohesiveness has been defined in two general ways. The first refers to the degree to which the members of a group desire to remain in the group; this aspect of cohesion refers to the attractiveness of the group for the individual member. It reflects the degree to which group membership is linked to personal rewards (Tannenbaum *et al.*, 1996). The second definition refers to how resistant the group is to disrupting influences; this aspect reflects a degree of member integration or bonding in which members share a strong commitment to one another and/or to/purpose of the group (Tannenbaum *et al.*, 1996). Members experience a sense of being in the right place and of having a link with one another being accepted involves multiple relationships: member-to-group, member-to-member, member-to-leader, and leader-to-members (Evans and Dion, 1991).

Although cohesiveness may begin to advance in the early stages of a group, at the working stage it grows into a key facilitative component of the group process. Establishing cohesiveness in the initial stages may be connected to the ability of members to deal with conflict that often comes during the working stage (Evans and Dion, 1991). The group turns into a cohesive unit once trust has been time-honored and encounter and negative feelings have been communicated and functioned through. Workgroups may not have to experience conflict to become cohesive, but if conflict is present in the group and is smoothed over or somehow ignored, it will get in the way of building cohesiveness (Evans and Dion, 1991).

2.3.1. Communication and Co-operation

First, communication connotes the act of encoding, decoding, and interpreting information, facts and opinion from a source to the audience (Harrison *et al.*, 1998). Information exchange is the mediating variable that apparently changed the perceptions of individuals in groups through frequent interactions. Similarly, (Harrison *et al.*, 1998) established that the interpersonal interactions permitted members of group to develop more accurate information approximately over time.

Members of workgroups who are active in a network of group communication may not only improve their knowledge but also become more skilled communicators and influence others. How to develop a discussion plan, create an agenda, facilitate a meeting, manage conflict, make proficient and in effect decisions, lead others, and collaboratively solve problems are just a few of the skill sets that are presented when real communication is ensued (Harrison *et al.*, 1998).

Second, within the context of workgroups, co-operation represents a joint operation of group members in line with the stated norms of the group (Shang and Croson, 2006); it is relatively straightforward and specified responds to interacting with others in a group. For example, in a group be made of three entities; if only one of two other production personnel in one's group co-operates, one can collaborate if only one other person work together or restrict co-operation to the case in which both others join forces.

In essence, this is in expression of the level of regulation of the diverse essentials of the group into an integrated and harmonious operation at every point in the group life. Indeed, indications from real life experiences suggests that an individuals' support to co-operation in groups are predisposed by information about contributions of the leader of such group, even though the cooperative behaviours come from an enormous amount of group associates (Shang and Croson, 2006).

2.4. Leadership Climate as a Moderator for Workgroup Diversity and Group Cohesiveness

Leaders bring to every group their personal qualities, values, and life experiences and their assumptions and biases. It is believed that, to promote growth in the members' lives, leaders need to live growth-oriented lives themselves (Corey, 2008). To inspire others to break away from deadening ways of being, leaders need to be willing to seek new experiences themselves. In short, group leaders become an influential part in a group when they are able to exemplify actual behaviour rather than merely describe it even in the midst of deep or surface level diversity. The key to achievement as a group leader is a pledge to the journey of becoming a more actual human being and bring about cohesiveness in the group (Corey, 2008).

One major determinant of leadership climate is whether the leader leads a short or long-term group; meaning that as a group forerunner, the role and influence in short-term groups is quite different from the leadership role in long-term groups (Corey, 2008). Most likely the leader will be expected to set up and conduct a variety of short-term workgroups, which means the leader will need to be active, directive, conscious of time limitations, and concerned with assisting members in identifying specific problem areas dealing with their current life situation, because brief groups require a more structured style so that members can attain specific goals (Corey, 2008).

2.5. Empirical Review

A study on workforce diversity was done using secondary information, interview, and spearman's rank correlation coefficient of 0.95 and derived the revelation that it has an affirmative effect on issues bordering around the consumer; noting that learning aid managing workforce (Ogbo *et al.*, 2004). In which the findings came in line with a positive influence of workforce diversity on organizational performance. Deductions and recommendations were drawn along those lines (Ogbo *et al.*, 2004).

A dataset was built for the careers of 139,727 persons who join in project groups making 16,507 video games from 1979 to 2009; on high level of recurring cohesion and stylistic diversity on performance (De-Vann *et al.*, 2015). The findings of the report indicate that groups with more contradictory stylistic know-hows outperform teams with high level of recurring homogenous cohesion in nature. Groups with high diversity and social cohesion are enhanced and able to harmonize loud discord of an extreme number of voices, thus abusing the possible advantageous effects of cognitive diversity (De-Vann *et al.*, 2015).

3. Methodology

Research design represents the sketch, arrangement, and approach of investigation conceived so as to obtain answers to inquiries and to control variances (Sekaran, 2003). This study added the quasi-experimental research design and the cross sectional research design. The quasi-experimental research design was suitable for this study since the respondents were not under the control of the researcher.

Population was the whole of the elements consisting of individuals having characteristics which was of relevance to the researcher from which the sample size of the study was drawn (Sekaran, 2003). The target population for the study comprised of the entire one thousand, eight hundred and thirty-nine (1,839) police officers in Port-Harcourt metropolis; which represents the total number of police officers manning the ten (10) divisional police stations as stated below. However, an accessible population was drawn due to the large number of the population for easy accessibility.

Table-1. Divisions in Port Harcourt, Population of officers and percentage distribution

S/No:	Police Divisions in Port Harcourt Metropolis	Total Population of Officers	Population of Officers Per Group	Number of Groups	Percentage Distribution
1.	State H/Q Division	410	7	59	22%
2.	Area Command Division	119	7	17	6%
3.	Borokiri Division	160	7	23	8%
4.	State C.I.D Division	160	7	23	8%
5.	C.P.S Division	160	7	23	8%
6.	Olu-Obasanjo Division	110	7	16	11%
7.	Old G.R.A Division	160	7	23	8%
8.	Mile 1 Division	260	7	37	14%
9.	Iloabuchi Division	110	7	16	5%
10.	Nkpolu Division	190	7	27	10%
	Total	1839	70	264	100

Source: Researcher’s Field Work. 2018.

A sample represents a predetermined part of a statistical population whose properties are studied to gain information about the whole (Sekaran, 2003). In this study, the simple random sampling technique was adopted; to ensure each sampling unit (or police officer) had an equal chance of being selected.

Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table was used for determining the sample size (S) being three hundred and eighteen (318) police officers (being members of 45 workgroups) of the population size (N) one thousand, eight hundred and thirty-nine (1,839) police officers (being members of 254 workgroups) under review (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970). However, Bowley proportional allocation technique was used to allocate respondents for the sample size for each of the firm (Bowley, 1926).

The formula is;

$$nh = \frac{nNh}{N}$$

Where;

- nh = number of respondents in each sub-group
- n = sample size
- Nh = number of unit apportioned to each sub-groups
- N = population size

The source of data that was used for the study was primary source which was information from the administration of the questionnaire as the data was collected using the relevant information from the selected employees. While, the secondary information for literature review was from publications such as: periodicals, journals, articles, textbooks, bulletins, and dissertation.

In testing the hypotheses, the data was collected and analyzed using the Kendall’s tau Correlation Coefficient (tau), a non-parametric statistical technique. The Kendall’s tau statistical technique was used since the study involved the testing of relationship between the independent variable on the dependent variable (Zikmund, 2003). Further test was carried to ascertain it normality and to guarantee that other assumptions of the technique were not violated. The SPSS version 22 was employed to conduct the analysis.

Validity relates to the notch to which a measuring instrument measures what it is designed to measure; that is discusses to the extent to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure and not another phenomenon; to ensure the correctness of the measuring instruments, the opinions of experts in the field was sought (Sekaran, 2003). However, the work espoused the construct and content validity.

To check for internal consistency of the instrument, the Cronbach alpha values for the variables was conducted. The result of the analysis is shown in table 2.

Table-2. The Cronbach alpha values for the variables was conducted

Constructs	Alpha Value	Number of items
WorkGroup Diversity		
Deep level diversity	.753	5
Surface level diversity	.828	5
Group Cohesiveness		
Communication and Co-operation	.718	5

Cronbach Alpha values for the constructs, using SPSS version 22

Reliability of the instrument was determined through a test-retest technique (Sekaran, 2003). By this method, a sample of 20 respondents who did not form part of the sample for the main study was used to answer the questions. After about one week, additional copies of the research instrument were administered again to the sampled respondents. Their responses to each of the questionnaires items were correlated with their second responses. Pearson product moment correlation formula was used to compute the coefficient of variability which was 0.72.

3.1. Result

A total of three hundred and eighteen (318) copies of the research instrument were distributed to the respondents of forty-five (45) workgroups, however only two hundred and seventy-nine (279) copies amounting to forty (40) workgroups were returned. The table below shows a tabular representation of returned rate.

Test of Hypotheses

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 was used to analysis the data, using the Kendall_tau statistical technique. This non-parametric statistical technique was deemed appropriate for analysis since the study involves ordinal data. Also, the study involved the analysis of correlation between two variables (Creswell, 2009; Nachmias and Nachmias, 1982). The results obtained are shown on table 3, 4, and 5.

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between deep level diversity and communication, and cooperation in Nigeria Police Rivers State command.

Table-3. Correlations between deep level diversity and measures of group cohesiveness

			Deep Level Diversity	Communication	Cooperation
Kendall's tau_b	Deep Level Diversity	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.533**	.649**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.002	.001
		N	279	279	279
	Communication	Correlation Coefficient	.533**	1.000	.208
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.	.001
		N	279	279	279
	Cooperation	Correlation Coefficient	.649**	.208	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.008	.
		N	279	279	279

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The Kendall_tau Correlation Coefficient statistical technique, a non-parametric technique was used in testing the relationship between these variables. The output as shown in table 4.1 reveals that deep level diversity is significantly and positively correlated with communication and cooperation with a (tau = .533, p-value <.05 for communication), and (tau = .649, pv < .05 for cooperation). Therefore, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant relationship between deep level diversity and communication, and cooperation was rejected while the alternative was accepted.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between surface level diversity and communication and cooperation in Nigeria Police Rivers State command.

Table 4. Correlations between surface level diversity and measures of group cohesiveness

			Surface Level Diversity	Communication	Cooperation
Kendall's tau_b	Surface Level Diversity	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.431**	.543**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	279	279	279
	Communication	Correlation Coefficient	.431**	1.000	.222
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	279	279	279
	Cooperation	Correlation Coefficient	.543**	.222	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	279	279	279

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 shows that surface level diversity is positively and moderately associated with communication and cooperation with a (tau = .431, p-value <.05 for communication), and (tau = .543, pv < .05 for cooperation). Therefore, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant relationship between surface level diversity and communication, and cooperation was rejected while the alternative was accepted.

Ho₃: Leadership climate does not significantly moderate the relationship between workgroup diversity and group cohesiveness in Nigeria Police Rivers State command.

Table-5. Moderating effect of leadership climate on the relationship between work group diversity and group cohesiveness.

Control variables			Work Group Diversity	Group cohesiveness	Leadership Climate
-none ^a	Work Group Diversity	Correlation	1.000	.564	.574
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		Df	0	279	279
	Group cohesiveness	Correlation	.564	1.000	.406
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		Df	279	0	279
	Leadership Climate	Correlation	.574	.406	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		Df	279	279	0
Leadership Climate	Work Group Diversity	Correlation	1.000	.447	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	
		Df	0	273	
	Group cohesiveness	Correlation	.447	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	
		Df	273	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

Table 5. shows the result of the moderating effect of Leadership climate on the relationship between work group diversity and group cohesiveness. The section labeled none^a showed the result when there was no moderating effect.

The result showed that partial correlation (removing the effect) of Leadership climate on relationship between work group diversity and group cohesiveness was moderately positive ($\rho = .447$, $n = 273$, $p < .05$), however, the zero order correlation ($\rho = .764$) indicates that moderating for Leadership climate has a positive but moderate influence on the relationship between work group diversity and group cohesiveness. Therefore the hypothesis was rejected.

4. Discussion

The study investigated the relationship between workgroup diversity and group cohesiveness in Nigeria Police Rivers State Command. Three hypotheses were formulated based on the number of dimensions of the predictor variable and the measures of the criterion variable as well as the control variable.

This shows that there is a significant relationship existing between diversity and group cohesiveness. All the dimensions had a significant relationship with our measures. When Leadership climate was also introduced, it proved to have a significant moderating effect on the variables which made us reject the stated null hypotheses.

This result was in consonance with the studies of the other scholars (Harrison *et al.*, 1998), in which they concluded that diversity management practices such as recognizing homogeneity and heterogeneity in all groups is achieved with effective communication which brings about co-operation thereby leading to the cohesiveness of groups or teams at all times.

5. Conclusion

In adequately managing diversity in workgroups in Rivers State Police Command, leadership must demonstrates the capability to enhance a climate to that would meet current task strains of the group or the needs of the workgroup members being addressed per time. This is because, enhanced leadership climates through adequately managing workgroups diversity has shown to influence cohesiveness in groups in Rivers State Police Command thereby leading to success of the organization, which explains how organizations can harness diversity in workgroups to achieve group cohesiveness to maximize success potentials of the organization.

5.1. Recommendations

As established by the review of literature in line with the methodology applied analysis and conclusion drawn. It was recommended that:

- i. Leadership of the group should ensure that deep level diversity or differences amongst members of a group is communicated to all and sundry to bring about mutual respect thereby aiding the attainment of the goals of the group.
- ii. Leadership of the group should ensure that deep level diversity or differences is well communicated as it would enhance the co-operation of group members thereby enabling group members to keep to the standard norms the govern group activities.
- iii. Leadership of the group should ensure that surface level diversity is seen as a resource because the peculiar personal experiences of the individual group members are communicated to shape the activities and behavioural conduct of the group.
- iv. Leadership of the group should ensure that surface level diversity brings about co-operation in the group in that the gains of the differences should be made known even from the point of indoctrination.

- v. Since managing diversity is not merely giving lip service to maximizing the differences of groups; leadership of the group should encourage harmonious relationship(s) amongst all group members for cohesive co-ordination in attaining its predetermined objectives.

References

- Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., Lukasik, M. A., Belau, L. and Briggs, A. L. (2010). Getting specific about demographic diversity variable and team performance relationships: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 37(3): 709-43.
- Bowers, C. A., Pharmer, J. A. and Salas, E. (2000). When member homogeneity is needed in work teams: A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research*, 31(3): 305-27.
- Bowley, A. L. (1926). *Measurement of precision attained in sampling*. Bulletin of Institute of International Statistics: Gallicia.
- Carrel, M. R. (2006). Defining workforce diversity programs and practices in organizations: A longitudinal study. *Labor Law Journal*: Available: www.emeraldinsight.com
- Corey, G. (2008). *Theory and practice of groups counseling*. California State University: Fullerton.
- Cox, J. T. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco. 3-16.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 3rd edn: Sage Publications, Inc.: Los Angeles.
- De-Vann, M., Vedres, B. and Stark, D. (2015). *Disruptive diversity and recurring cohesion: Assembling creative teams in the video game industry*. Department of Sociology, Columbia University: Knox Hall, New York.
- Evans, C. R. and Dion, K. I. (1991). Group cohesiveness and performance: A meta-analysis. *Small Group Research*, 22: 175-86.
- Festinger, L., S., S. and Back, K. (1950a). *Social pressures in informal groups: A study of human factors in housing*. Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA.
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S. and Back, K. (1950b). *The spatial ecology of group formation*. In L Festinger; S. Schachter, and K. Back. *Social Pressure in Informal Groups*.
- Garcia-Prieto, P., Bellard, E. and Schneider, S. (2003). Experiencing diversity, conflict, and emotions in teams. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(3): 413-40.
- Graen, G. B. (2003). *Dealing with Diversity. LMX Leadership Series*. Information Age Publishing: U.S.A.
- Greenberg, J. (2004). *Workplace diversity: Benefits, challenges and solutions*. Alpha Measure, Inc. <http://www.alphameasures.com>
- Harrison, D., Price, K. and Bell, M. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface - and deep-level diversity on work group cohesiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1): 96-107.
- Hogg, M. A. (1993). Group cohesiveness: A critical review and new directions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4(1): 85-111.
- Kelli, A., Green, M., Lopez, A. W. and Karl, K. (2012). *Diversity in the workplace: Benefits, challenges and the required*. Managerial Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences.
- Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. (1970). Deterining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30: 607-10.
- Mullen, B. and Copper, C. (1994). The relation between group cohesiveness and performance: An integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115: 210-27.
- Nachmias, C. and Nachmias, D. (1982). *Research methods in social sciences*. Edward Arnold: London.
- Ogbo, A. I., Kifordu, A. A. and Ukpere, W. I. (2004). The effect of workforce diversity on organizational performance of selected firms in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(10): 90-95.
- Owoyemi, O. A., Elegbede, T. and Gbajumo, S. M. (2011). Age diversity and the future of workforce in Nigeria. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administration*: Available: <http://196.45.48.50/opendoc.php?sno=17318&doctype=pdf&docname=Age-Diversity-and-The--Future-of-Nigeria-Workforce>
- Robert, L. (2003). The new age of competition. *Competitiveness Review*, 13(2): 1-15.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business*. 4th edn: John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, NJ.
- Shang, J. and Croson, R. (2006). The relationship between social comparisons on nonprofit fundraising. In R. Mark Isaac & D. D. Davis (Eds.), *Experiments investigating fundraising and charitable contributions*. *Research in Experimental Economics*, 11: 143-56.
- Tannenbaum, S. I., Salas, E. and Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (1996). Promoting team effectiveness in M.A. West (Ed), *Handbook of workgroup psychology*.
- The Vanguard (2015). Policing Nigeria: The challenges. Available: <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/10/policing-nigeria-the-challenges/>
- Yeager, K. L. and Nafukho, F. M. (2012). Developing diverse teams to improve performance in the organizational setting. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(4): 388-408.
- Zikmund, W. G. (2003). *Business research methods*. 7th edn: Thomson South-Western: Ohio.