THE MODEL OF COHESIVE MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY – A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Anna ZGRZYWA-ZIEMAK[1*], Joanna ZIMMER[2], Marian HOPEJ[3]

[1] WSB University in Wrocław, Poland; anna.zgrzywa-ziemak@wsb.wroclaw.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-6904-8040
[2] Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Poland; joanna.zimmer@pwr.edu.pl,
ORCID: 0000-0003-3060-1432
[3] Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Poland; marian.hopej@pwr.edu.pl,
ORCID: 0000-0002-6120-6024
* Correspondence author

Purpose: The benefits of workforce diversity and diversity management are widely discussed. However, meta-analyses of empirical studies on the relationship between workforce diversity and organisational performance show that it is either very weak or non-existent. This discrepancy between theoretical expectations and empirical results, coupled with the increasing diversity of the workforce in business practice, has stimulated work on a particular type of management to benefit from differences among organisational members, i.e. cohesive management. The purpose of this paper is to propose a model of the organisational cohesive management capacity (CMC).

Design/methodology/approach: The general concept of cohesive management was based on the results of analyses of management activities carried out in top European football clubs – organisations characterised by a high diversity of the workforce and, at the same time, essentially free of discriminatory biases. Extensive literature research was conducted to define and operationalise the dimensions of CMC in relation to business.

Findings: The hypothetical model of the organisation's CMC was developed. It is shaped by four dimensions: game for talent, sense of unity of purpose, shared identity, and transparency of operations.

Research limitations/implications: Research limitations/implications: A limitation of this study is the lack of empirical verification of the hypothesised CMC model.

Originality/value: The value of the article is to adapt the management practices inherent in top football clubs to businesses. It defines the dimensions of CMC in business organisations by grounding them in management science theory. The developed concept seems to be of particular relevance to industries strongly dependent on highly qualified employees, high technology industries. The developed model provides a complete and coherent basis for undertaking empirical research.

Keywords: workforce diversity, cohesive management, talent management.

Category of the paper: Conceptual paper.

1. Introduction

The members of any organisation are diverse in many ways (in terms of their age, level of education, values and beliefs, gender, nationality, position in the organisational hierarchy, etc.). If an organisation accepts differences and tries to manage them, it is more responsive to customer needs; moreover, it is more competitive. Such a belief is the basis for diversity management, which involves "(...) accepting differences in the workforce and transforming them into higher effectiveness of their work, into better results, into promoting the image of the organisation as an attractive employer" (Koźmiński et al., 2014, p. 415). However, as the results of studies in this area indicate, the effects of this management approach are not unequivocally positive. Although organisations have started to pay much more attention to diversity, the programmes to promote it are not easy to instill in them. According to Dobbin and Kalev (2016), the main reason lies in the fact that most of their programmes boil down to controlling management actions. As the studies indicate, the approach tends to exacerbate various biases instead of reducing them. People tend to contest rules that limit their freedom of decision and action. In light of the literature reports, what is unclear is the benefits the organisation is to derive from diversity. The results of the meta-analyses of the relationship between workforce diversity and organisational performance identified from the articles published during the last several years indicate that it is either very weak, non-existent or statistically significant (Schneid et al., 2015; Tworek et al., 2020).

Accordingly, it was decided that further studies were necessary and some authors of this text participated in such studies. The studies pertained to the organisations characterised by a significant diversity of the workforce and yet essentially free of discriminatory bias, and taking into account different dimensions of diversity and the performance indicators which were more appropriate than the financial ones. To a considerable extent, these requirements are met by European football clubs, whose effectiveness is undoubtedly measured by their positions in the final competition table. The analysis revealed no correlation between players' nationality diversity as well as their age and the club's points in the final competition table and position in it. However, the best football leagues have a more diverse workforce than average leagues. On the other hand, in-depth studies covering the best European clubs (from the UEFA ranking), not leagues, revealed an admittedly weak but significant correlation between the nationality diversity of footballers and the position in the UEFA ranking (Tworek et al., 2020).

The results of these studies became the starting point for work on a particular type of management aimed at benefiting from differences among organisational members, i.e. cohesive management. Its concept is based on the results of the analysis of management activities carried out in the best European football clubs, which, as it seems, constitute perhaps the model stage of the organisation improvement process, mainly due to their far-reaching agility. Moreover, their management faces essentially the same problems associated with the management of

contemporary dynamic business organisations (Bolchover, and Brady, 2006; Hopej, and Kandora, 2019). The purpose of this paper is to present the hypothetical model of the organisation's cohesive management capability (CMC). In particular, the paper presents the concept of cohesive management and identifies the factors that shape the CMC in business organisations by grounding them in management theory.

2. The concept of cohesive management – football lesson

The success of football clubs depends mainly on the players they have managed to recruit. Why do such clubs as Real Madrid, FC Barcelona, Manchester City, Bayern Munich and Paris-Saint-German make multi-million dollar transfers practically every year? The answer is simple: winning matches is determined by outstanding footballers and the better the player is, the better he earns. What is more, football is one of the few industries that can effectively compete as there are many sellers and buyers who have access to information about the quality of the players they buy and sell. If the salary is too low, footballers move to another club. Otherwise, they are sold. Therefore, it is not difficult to agree with the opinion expressed by J. Cruijff, a prominent footballer, later also a manager, that management in football is all about finding the best players, because "if your players are better than your opponents, 90 percent of the time you will win" (Kuper, and Szymanski, 2017, p. 109).

Not surprisingly, there is a game, perhaps even a war, planned in all aspects, among the top clubs for football talents. According to Bolchover and Brady (2006), there is a talent cycle process involving the search for, acquisition, development, retention and disposal of talent, each link of this process overlaps with the next one so, for example, selling should include looking for successors. In the retention phase, the manager should already be thinking about selling. While it is true that many clubs do not do badly in some phases, only the best pursue the entire cycle.

It should be stressed that what is visible is that the activities of the talent cycle are at present almost free of various prejudices, including those related to racial aspects. In the 1990s, discrimination against black football players virtually ceased to exist. Perhaps the best example of their acceptance in football is the racism-sensitive L. Thuram, who argues that in "(...) football it is harder to discriminate because we are judged based on specific results. There are no subjective criteria in this area. I really have never met a racist in football. Perhaps they existed somewhere but I did not see them" (Kuper, and Szymanski, 2017, p. 140).

Are the best football clubs differentiated by nationality or skin colour of their players? Even a cursory analysis of their composition indicates that such diversity is significant and, in many cases, very great. Players come from different countries, often from several continents.

Moreover, nationality is not something permanent. Instead, it changes under the conditions of relatively frequent workforce changes.

The players of top football clubs are also distinguished by the fact that on the pitch, and to some extent outside it, they are unified by a sense of the unity of a common purpose. A. Ferguson, a long-time Manchester United manager, comments on it in the following way: "In my business, togetherness is not just a nice concept that you can take or leave according to taste. If you don't have it, you are nothing. Selfishness, factionalism, clique-ishness are all death to a football team. As a manager in football, I have never been interested in simply sending out a collection of brilliant individuals. There is no substitute for talent but, on the field, talent without unity of purpose is a hopelessly devalued currency" (Bolchover, and Brady, 2006, p. 210).

In such clubs, players must have, and – as a rule – they do have, the conviction that the others put into their work as much of similar effort and dedication as possible. If this is not observed, an appropriate response is necessary. In his autobiography, the Manchester United manager refers to a particular first-team player who was very popular among his fans. A. Ferguson, however, believed that the footballer had become arrogant over time in the locker room and on the pitch, playing not for the team but at his whim. Transferring him turned out to be the only rational solution.

The formation of a sense of unity of purpose requires that this purpose be formulated so that players roll up their sleeves and work together to achieve something significant. S. Westerveld, a former Liverpool FC goalkeeper, recalls that before the 2000/2001 season, all players were asked to agree on a common purpose for the season. Almost everyone said it would be good to finish the games as one of the top three clubs. For most of the season, the team was outside the podium but the fight for it lasted until the last round of the competition. In the end, a determined Anfield Road team winning many of their last matches outperformed their rivals, achieving the intention (Bolchover, and Brady, 2006).

Furthermore, it is not uncommon for players in top clubs to feel like family. For example, one of the charges of FC Liverpool manager – J. Klopp – says the following about the manager: "Because of his belief in me, I have played so much and been able to develop. The way he treats us during training practice, the way he builds relationships with the younger players, is unbelievable. He is like a father to all of us. I try to do my part and I hope that (...) he will be proud of me" (Jurgen, zdobywca ludzkich serc, in press). These words are not surprising in the context of the German manager's view that one cannot achieve success in football without respecting or even loving one's players. They feel it and fight for him, as well.

A. Ferguson also had "fatherly" relations with football players. In fact, he was not afraid to treat someone ruthlessly if he thought it would provide the team with something good (e.g., J. Stam, J. Leighton). However, many Manchester United players remember him as a good "father". Particularly significant is the following opinion of D. Beckham, whose relationship with Sir Alex has not always been ideal: "Sir Alex will always be like a father to

me. He has always been and always will be one. It does not matter if he said something good or bad in the past. I only remember the good times. He was the man who gave me the chance to play for the club of my dreams" (Beckham…, in press). C. Ronaldo, R. da Silva and M. Silvestre, among others, have made similar statements.

Unifying players for a shared achievement is also done through organisational culture developed by outstanding managers. B. van Nistelrooy, a Dutch footballer, has admitted that A. Ferguson at Manchester United was one of the most critical factors that made him sign the contract. Sir Alex has shaped a culture that attracts young footballers based on passion, a desire to win and a sense of community. Let us add to that the reputation of a man who can deal with celebrities and, in this way, a powerful instrument of integration emerges.

J. Klopp also implements the effective unification of footballers by means of organisational culture. He requires them to do the same: respect him, the team and what they try to accomplish. His players must commit to a shared value system that includes: unconditional commitment, a passionate obsession, determination, no matter which way the game goes, willingness to support everyone without exception, willingness to seek help, a commitment to contribute 100% effort for the good of the team, and personal responsibility (Wygrywaj…, in press).

There is also the final issue. Football is highly transparent. A former Manchester United chairman once said that there are about 40 meetings of shareholders in each football season, with 40,000 people attending each. As a rule, everything can be seen for what it is, and what is hidden is quickly revealed by insightful media (Bolchover, and Brady, 2006). For example, not too long ago, the media revealed that one of the English club West Ham United activists made sscandalous comments about African footballers, stating that he no longer wanted to employ them in the club because of the problems they cause off the football pitch. Club authorities immediately suspended him because West Ham United does not tolerate discrimination of any kind (West Ham's…, in press).

In light of the above discussion, the following observations emerge. Firstly, the management of top football clubs is based on treating people equally and is focused on winning more games. Secondly, it has four dimensions:

- It affects primarily people whose recruitment is not done under the banner of diversity. However, it refers to a diverse pool of players (in terms of their race, nationality, age, among other factors) resulting from the search for the most talented footballers as part of an ongoing game of talent.

- There is a sense of unity of purpose, requiring the formulation of achievable, quantifiable goals as well as team members' holistic thinking. Moreover, it is necessary to respect the classical principle of subordinating the personal interest to the general interest.

- A shared identity results from focusing on what footballers have in common rather than what divides them. The existing differences between them are then, to some extent, bridged or drowned in a sea of similarities.

- The transparency and openness of the activity, which in football is not a groundless declaration, is primarily due to the relentless media attention. Almost no detail escapes the cameras' attention; everything is repeated, commented on and counted in the statistics.

Finally, as it seems, business is now heading down the road that football went down some time ago. It is a journey towards realising a truth once spoken by Bill Shankly, the former Liverpool FC manager: "(...) the way to live and be truly successful is by collective effort, with everyone working for each other, everyone helping each other, and everyone having a share of the rewards at the end of the day" (Critchley, 2018, p. 9). Incidentally, football sometimes seems to be one of the last bastions of sanity and a place where specific self-evident values that have already ceased to be self-evident elsewhere still apply (Mościcki, 2019). Let us, therefore, try to consider whether enterprises also share the readiness for cohesive management.

Therefore, let us consider whether the readiness for cohesive management, which implies the need to integrate the activities of diverse members of the organisation, is also shared by enterprises.

3. Cohesive management capability – hypothetical model development

The issue of talented organisational members has received increasing attention, thanks – in part – to a group of McKinsey consultants who used the phrase "war for talent" to emphasise the importance of talent for organisational excellence (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2013). According to Chambers et al. (1998), the war for talent among global companies is related to three main challenges: their functioning in a highly complex economy, requiring highly qualified talents prepared to manage multicultural teams; increased competition for talents, including the one from small innovative companies such as start-ups, which limits the pool of available talents; and increased the professional mobility of employees, who, emphasising their development, more often change their employers. These challenges cause "a war once fought as a sequence of recruitment battles to transform into an endless series of skirmishes (...) (for the best workers – authors' note)" (Chambers et al., 1998).

The war or game for talent is one of the best ways to improve organisational performance, the source of competitive advantage and a critical success factor for organisations operating in a complex environment (Collings and Mellahi, 2009; Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2013; Hopej, and Kandora, 2019). However, for globally oriented companies, in addition to the game for talent, diversity management is becoming a strategic imperative (Daubner-Siva et al., 2017; Ozbilgin et al., 2015). In essence, the game for talent will involve developing a diverse architecture of human resources identified as talents while diversity management will

encompass the inclusion of all employees (Ozbilgin et al., 2015). As regards the practices used in football, what becomes the priority in the game for talent is to acquire the most talented players and foster their development and integration with the team of people coming from different backgrounds. Similarities in this regard can be found in organisations. In light of increasing career opportunities, the organisations' need for the development of global orientation, the reduction of barriers to the movement of people and the overall ageing of the workforce in many countries, the need for interaction among workers from different backgrounds will grow exponentially (Tung, 2016). In this context, the game for talent in organisations is more frequently treated as an essential management practice (Gupta, 2019), which will primarily entail creating opportunities for the development of high-potential employees while taking into account the inclusive principles that allow each employee to discover and develop their talents (Daubner-Siva et al., 2017).

As Coffman and Buckingham (2018) note, every employee has talents in the form of thinking and acting patterns that set them apart from other people. It will depend on the manager whether this talent is used and developed by implementing the tasks for which the employee has a natural aptitude or obscured by a given person's knowledge and skills (confirmed by diplomas) (Buckingham and Coffman, 2016). For this purpose, the following activities should be carried out: 1. to conduct talent casting, enabling to transform hidden talents into action; 2. to manage by exception, taking the individual employee's needs into account; 3. to spend the most time with the most productive employees to improve their performance; 4. to provide feedback on performance; and 5. to break through the constraints of the organisation's employee evaluation schemes so that there is focus on achieving excellence (Buckingham, and Coffman, 2016).

The successful game for talent is seen as a significant determinant affecting success or failure in international business (Briscoe et al., 2009; Cappelli, 2008). Therefore, talent acquisition in the market game is a challenge faced by many organisations competing for the same global talent pool, especially in the context of talent scarcity and market diversity (Vaiman et al., 2012). Recruiting and retaining the managerial talent required to run the organisation's global operations also often becomes an issue (Briscoe et al., 2009; Cappelli, 2008; Vaiman et al., 2012). There is a noticeable shift in competition for talents among employers functioning on the national, regional and global levels (Sparrow et al., 2017).

The following hypothesis may be formulated in view of the above considerations: *H1: The more effective the game for talent is, the higher the CMC is.*

Another dimension (the sense of unity of purpose) refers to the goal-setting theory, which is based on the assumption that ambitious (high) but attainable and quantifiable goals motivate individuals to greater effort in achieving them. This occurs as a result of: directing attention to important issues related to the purpose, stimulating employees to exert more effort, increasing persistence in goal achievement and enabling the process of learning and applying action strategies that increase the employees' performance (Locke, and Latham, 2002). Success in

achieving ambitious goals translates into internal effects felt by employees, i.e. lack of fatigue with their work, a sense of accomplishment and increased motivation as well as external effects such as higher organisational revenues, opportunities for promotion and professional development and employment stability (Mento et al., 1992).

Of utmost importance in developing the sense of unity of purpose is the implementation of the idea of contributing to the whole. This contribution is a prerequisite for the operation of the organisation, provides the opportunity for specialists to transform themselves into universalists, is the basis for long-term motivation, and is the path to the organisation with a flat hierarchy (Malik, 2019). It can also be added that if employees and managers strive to contribute to the whole with their skills and experience, this seems to be the key to ensuring that existing differences between people do not affect one another.

Focusing on the contribution made to the whole involves the classic principle of subordinating the personal interest to the general interest. As is known, it reminds that in the organisation, the interest of an employee or a group of employees cannot dominate over the interest of the enterprise. While it is not easy to reconcile the two respectable interests, it is essential. Moreover, the better it is, the more solid the basis for solving many persistent problems in management is.

Focusing on one's contribution to the whole is also the basis of systems thinking. According to Senge, it is a way of thinking about the forces and relationships of systems behaviour and the language for understanding and describing them (Senge, 2006). They are distinguished by perceiving the whole instead of details, relations instead of separate elements and processes instead of individual events. In other words, thinking from the perspective of the whole comes to the fore. It is not always easy but it is possible and, in relation to managers, it means the implementation of management activities taking into account all the conditions of the organisation and facilitating the subordinates to notice the whole. As Malik (2019) points out, this is best seen in good conductors who go to great lengths to explain the piece as a whole to musicians. They require each instrumentalist to become integrated into the whole. Likewise, the solo play is part of the whole but – without it – it becomes meaningless (Malik, 2019).

The above considerations led the authors of the study to formulate the following research hypothesis *H2: The more there is a sense of unity of purpose in an enterprise, the higher the CMC is*.

The third dimension of cohesive management (shared identity among employees) is derived, among others, from Social Identity Theory, which is based on the idea that people perceive themselves and others in terms of belonging to a social group (Porck et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020). Identifying group membership and assigning values and emotions to it is thought to reduce the subjective uncertainty associated with lack of cues about appropriate attitudes and behaviours (Hogg, 2012; Porck et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020). The cognitive component of identification reflects an individual's perception as a member of a group (Ashforth, and Mael, 1989; Porck et al., 2019) while the affective component depicts a sense

of pride in belonging to the organisation. In view of this, a higher level of social identity with the selected group makes individuals want, to a much greater extent, to conform to the norms and values of the group with which they identify (Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Porck et al., 2019). It is worth noting that employees may have multiple foci of identification in the form of a sense of shared identity with more than one group (Hogg, 2012; Mell et al., 2020; Porck et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020) and the degree of identification with different groups may be independent of each other (Ashforth, and Mael, 1989; Porck et al., 2019).

An individual's strong identity with a group is related to understanding and manifesting shared norms and values that provide a basis for self-categorisation and thus enhance the sense of belonging to the group (Zhang et al., 2020). Furthermore, the congruence of group decisions with the personal preferences of group members increases the sense of belonging and unity with the group (Blader, and Tyler, 2009). Employees who identify more strongly with their group are more likely to support it, act for its benefit and pursue common goals (Ashforth, and Mael, 1989; Blader, and Tyler, 2009; Mell et al., 2020). For people with a strong group identity, group success in achieving goals and objectives will be synonymous with individual success (Blader, and Tyler, 2009). In addition, individuals who identify more strongly with a group tend to treat members of their group preferentially, showing a greater willingness to cooperate with them and place more trust in them, focusing on the cohesive sense of closeness (Dokko et al., 2014; Mell et al., 2020). The more individuals identify with a social group, the more they focus on the members of that group and the similarities that exist among them (Blader and Tyler, 2009; Dokko et al., 2014).

In light of the above, another research hypothesis emerges: *H3: The greater the organisation's commitment to a shared identity is, the higher the CMC is*.

The last dimension of cohesive management (the transparency of business operations) was defined based on organisational transparency, which was cited in management science until the end of the 20th century more as a rhetorical device, rather than a mode of management (Schnackenberg, and Tomlinson, 2016). Currently, the interest in this issue is constantly growing and covers more and more new areas of organisational research. For instance, on the level of information systems transparency, it concerns the organisation's relationship with its customers in the digital market (Granados et al., 2011). In the case of organisational behaviours, transparency is studied in the context of organisational trust, leadership or organisational culture (Kaptein, 2008; Pirson, and Malhotra, 2011) while in accounting and finance, transparency refers to the decisions made in financial markets (Bushman et al., 2004). Such a broad approach to transparency in research shows that it is a concept that is often defined depending on the context of the studies.

Transparency is located on a specific continuum, where at one end of the continuum, there is the total transparency of operations, impossible to achieve in an organisation while, at the other end, there is the "hazing" of operations. Total transparency may lead to an uncontrolled flow of information and disclosure of details of competitors' operations (Drucker, and Gumpert,

2007). Non-transparency, on the other hand, contributes, among other things, to corporate malfeasance (Bushman et al., 2004; Schnackenberg, and Tomlinson, 2016), loss of organisational credibility (Pirson, and Malhotra, 2011) and widens the scope of unethical employee behaviours (Kaptein, 2008).

The transparency of operations is expected to result in the increased credibility of the organisation, trust and more effective cooperation among employees as well as cooperation with the environment (Berggren, and Bernshteyn, 2007; Drucker, and Gumpert, 2007; Schnackenberg, and Tomlinson, 2016). In addition, by being more transparent, individual contributions to organisations become more visible. Communicating goals transparently is crucial for employees to understand how their own goals and outcomes relate to those of other employees (Berggren, and Bernshteyn, 2007). Organisations can consciously use information in ways that increase or decrease their transparency (Schnackenberg, and Tomlinson, 2016).

One of the actions leading to transparency of operations is the simplicity of the selected solutions. In management science, the treatment of simplicity, like transparency discussed earlier, will depend on the context of the study. For example, simplicity may relate to the strategic aspect of the organisation, the way products are designed or organisational structures (Hopej-Kamińska et al., 2015). The simplicity of the solutions adopted is linked to organisational complexity whereas undesirable complexity requires simple solutions (e Cunha, and Rego, 2010). However, it should be noted that simplicity and complexity should not be treated as opposing concepts but as parts of a single system that coexist and interact with each other.

Transparency seems to be fostered by adherence to the principle of the simplicity of organisational forms. Not so long ago, it was thought that, according to Ashby's Law, the only answer to the complexity of the environment should be a similar complexity of the management system. The apparent shift in thinking which can be observed is to question this law. It turns out that responding more effectively to what is happening in the environment involves simplifying procedures and structures because following the complication of social interdependence leads to rigidity and complexity (Crozier, 1994). It is not difficult to agree with Welch that "Having great players, you will get the most out of them if the relationship between superiors and subordinates and their responsibilities are transparent. An organisational chart is not one way to achieve this, but it is a necessary first step" (Welch, and Welch, 2005, p. 143). The cited author also believes that the lack of openness is the Achilles heel of business, blocking creativity, quick action, and talented people's potential.

Given the above, there is the following research hypothesis *H4: The greater the transparency of the operations is, the higher the CMC is*.

4. Conclusions

The original concept of cohesive management presented in this article is based on the results of the analysis of management activities carried out in the best football clubs, usually coping very well with a team of players who is diversified in many respects. Extensive literature research was conducted to define and operationalise the dimensions of cohesive management in relation to business organisations. Table 1 summarises the main research hypotheses and the detailed ones related to the structure of each dimension.

Table 1.
Hypothetical model of the CMC

Dimension	Main hypotheses	Specific hypotheses
Game for talent	H1. The more effective the game for talent is, the higher the CMC is.	H1.1. The less hiring takes place under the banner of diversity, the less effective the game for talent is. H1.2. The more talent-oriented the mentality is, the more effective the game for talent is. H1.3. The stronger the market dimensions in talent acquisition and retention are, the more effective the game for talent is.
Sense of unity of purpose	H2. The more there is a sense of unity of purpose in an enterprise, the higher the CMC is.	H2.1. The greater the degree of quantifiability of goals is, the greater the sense of unity of purpose is. H2.2. The greater the degree of the practice of systems thinking is, the greater the sense of unity of purpose is. H2.3. The more the principle of subordinating the personal interest to the general interest is observed, the greater the sense of unity of purpose is.
Shared identity	H3. The greater the organisation's commitment to a shared identity is, the higher the CMC is.	H3.1. The more common values and shared identity are manifested in the organisation, the stronger the shared identity is.
Transparency of operations	H4. The greater the transparency of operations is, the greater the CMC is.	H4.1. The more managers trust in simplicity, the greater the transparency of operations is. H4.2. The more a culture of honesty and openness is fostered, the greater the transparency of operations is. H4.3. The more employees are trusted to be open and honest, the greater the transparency of operations is.

The hypothetical model of CMC needs empirical verification in different business contexts. First of all, the research should be conducted in organizations operating in different countries, in organizations that are diverse in terms of the size and in terms of the degree of technological sophistication. Secondly, it would be highly interesting to deepen the understanding of the concept by analysing selected case studies of organisations. Particularly suitable here would be high-tech companies, characterised by considerable workforce diversity, dependent on employees' high qualifications and talents (professionals ready to change jobs, searching for new challenges and benefits quickly). This would deepen our understanding of the different dimensions of CMC and, perhaps, reveal another dimension not included in the current model. Finally, the direction of research on the contribution of cohesive management in shaping business performance is particularly promising.

References

1. Ashforth, B.E., and Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *Academy of Management Review. Vol. 14, Iss. 1,* pp. 20-39.

2. *Beckham: Ferguson zawsze będzie dla mnie jak ojciec.* Retrieved from https://igol.pl/beckham-ferguson-zawsze-bedzie-dla-mnie-jak-ojciec/, 1.06.2021.

3. Berggren, E., and Bernshteyn, R. (2007). Organizational transparency drives company performance. *Journal of Management Development, Vol. 25, Iss. 5.* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 411-417.

4. Blader, S.L., and Tyler, T.R. (2009). Testing and Extending the Group Engagement Model: Linkages Between Social Identity, Procedural Justice, Economic Outcomes, and Extrarole Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 94, Iss. 2,* pp. 445-464.

5. Bolchover, D., and Brady, C. (2006). *The 90-minute Manager: Lessons from the Sharp End of Management.* Pearson Education.

6. Briscoe, D., Briscoe, D.R., Schuler, R.S., and Claus, L. (2009). *International Human Resource Management.* London: Routledge.

7. Buckingham, M., and Coffman, C. (2016). *First, Break All the Rules: What the world's Greatest Managers Do Differently.* Gallup Organization.

8. Bushman, R.M., Piotroski, J.D., and Smith, A.J. (2004) What determines corporate transparency? *Journal of Accounting Research, Vol. 42, Iss. 2.* John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., pp. 207-252.

9. Cappelli, P. (2008). *Talent on Demand: Managing Talent in an Age of Uncertainty.* Harvard Business Review Press.

10. Chambers, E.G., Foulon, M., Handfield-Jones, H., Hankin, S.M., and Michaels, E.G.I. (1998). The war for talent. *The McKinsey Quarterly, Vol. 3,* pp. 44-57.

11. Collings, D.G., and Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review, Vol. 19, Iss. 4,* pp. 304-313.

12. Critchley, S. (2018). *What We Think About When We Think About Football.* Profile Books.

13. Crozier, M. (1994). *L'entreprise à l'écoute.* Seuil.

14. Daubner-Siva, D., Vinkenburg, C.J., and Jansen, P.G.W. (2017). Dovetailing talent management and diversity management: the exclusion-inclusion paradox. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness, Vol. 4, Iss. 4,* pp. 315-331.

15. Dobin, F., and Kalev, A. (2016). Why Diversity Programs Fail And what works better. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 52-60.

16. Dokko, G., Kane, A.A., and Tortoriello, M. (2014). One of Us or One of My Friends: How Social Identity and Tie Strength Shape the Creative Generativity of Boundary-Spanning Ties. *Organization Studies, Vol. 35, Iss. 5,* pp. 703-726.

17. Drucker, S.J., and Gumpert, G. (2007). Through the looking glass: Illusions of transparency and the cult of information. *Journal of Management Development, Vol. 26, Iss. 5.* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 493-498.

18. e Cunha, M.P., and Rego, A. (2010). Complexity, simplicity, simplexity. *European Management Journal, Vol. 28, Iss. 2,* pp. 85-94.

19. Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Dries, N., and González-Cruz, T.F. (2013). What is the meaning of "talent" in the world of work? *Human Resource Management Review, Vol. 23, Iss. 4,* pp. 290-300.

20. Granados, N., Gupta, A., and Kauffman, R.J. (2011). *Transparency Strategy in Internet-Based Selling. Advances in the Economics of Information Systems.* IGI Global.

21. Gupta, V. (2019). Talent management dimensions and their relationship with retention of Generation-Y employees in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 31, Iss. 10,* pp. 4150-4169.

22. Hogg, M.A. (2012). *Uncertainty-identity theory.* Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology. SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 62-80

23. Hopej, M., and Kandora, M. (2019). The concept of conjoined management. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, Vol. 854.* Springer Verlag, pp. 173-187.

24. Hopej-Kamińska, M., Zgrzywa-Ziemak, A., Hopej, M., Kamiński, R., and Martan, J. (2015). Simplicity as a feature of an organizational structure. *Argumenta Oeconomica*, *Vol. 34, Iss. 1,* pp. 259-276.

25. *Jurgen, zdobywca ludzkich serc.* Available online https://weszlo.com/2018/05/26/jurgen-zdobywca-ludzkich-serc/, 1.06.2021.

26. Kaptein, M. (2008). Developing and testing a measure for the ethical culture of organizations: The corporate ethical virtues model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 29, Iss. 7,* pp. 923-947.

27. Koźmiński, A.K., Jemielniak, D., and Latusek-Jurczak, D. (2014). *Zasady zarządzania* [Principles of management]. Wolters Kluwer.

28. Kuper, S., and Szymanski, S. 2(017). *Futbonomia. Dlaczego Anglia przegrywa, Hiszpania, Niemcy i Brazylia wygrywają i dlaczego USA, Japonia, Australia a nawet Irak staną się piłkarskimi potęgami* [Soccernomics: Why England Loses, Why Germany and Brazil Win, and Why the U.S., Japan, Australia]. SQN Publisher.

29. Locke, E.A., and Latham, G.P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, Vol. 57, Iss. 9,* pp. 705-717.

30. Malik, F. (2019). *Führen Leisten Leben: Wirksames Management für eine neue Welt.* Campus Verlag GmbH.

31. Mell, J.N., Dechurch, L.A., Leenders, R.T.H.A.J., and Contractor, N. (2020). Identity asymmetries: an experimental investigation of social identity and information exchange in multiteam systems. *Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 63, Iss. 5,* pp. 1561-1590.

32. Mento, A., Locke, E.A., and Klein, H.J. (1992). Relationship of Goal Level to Valence and Instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 77, Iss. 4,* pp. 395-405.

33. Mościcki, P. (2019). *Lekcje futbolu* [football lessons]. W Podwórku.

34. Ozbilgin, M., Tatli, A., and Jonsen, K. (2015). *Global Diversity Management: An Evidence-Based Approach*. Red Globe Press.

35. Pirson, M., and Malhotra, D. (2011). Foundations of organizational trust: What matters to different stakeholders? *Organization Science, Vol. 22, Iss. 4,* pp. 1087-1104.

36. Porck, J.P., Matta, F.K., Hollenbeck, J.R., Oh, J.K., Lanaj, K., and Lee, S.M. (2019). Social identification in multiteam systems: The role of depletion and task complexity. *Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 62, Iss. 4,* pp. 1137-1162.

37. Schnackenberg, A.K., and Tomlinson, E.C. (2016). Organizational Transparency: A New Perspective on Managing Trust in Organization-Stakeholder Relationships. *Journal of Management, Vol. 42, Iss. 7,* pp. 1784-1810.

38. Schneid, M., Isidor, R., Li, C., and Kabst, R. (2015). The influence of cultural context on the relationship between gender diversity and team performance: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, Vol. 26, Iss. 6,* pp. 733-756.

39. Senge, P.M. (2006). The *Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of The Learning Organization*. Doubleday.

40. Sparrow, P., Brewster, C., and Chung, C. (2017). *Globalizing Human Resource Management*. Routledge.

41. Tung, R.L. (2016). New perspectives on human resource management in a global context. *Journal of World Business, Vol. 51, Iss. 1,* pp. 142-152.

42. Tworek, K., Zgrzywa-Ziemak, A., Hopej, M., and Kamiński, R. (2020). Workforce diversity and organizational performance – a study of European football clubs. *Argumenta Oeconomica, Vol. 2, Iss. 45,* pp. 189-211.

43. Vaiman, V., Scullion, H., and Collings, D. (2012). Talent management decision making. *Management Decision*, *Vol. 50, Iss. 5,* pp. 925-941.

44. Welch, J., and Welch, S. (2005). *Winning*. New York: Harper Business.

45. West Ham's Tony Henry: Club Avoids African Players Because "They Cause Mayhem" Bleacher Report. Retrieved May 13, 2021, Available online https://bleacherreport.com/articles/2757020-west-hams-tony-henry-club-avoids-african-players-because-they-cause-mayhem, 1.06.2021.

46. Wygrywaj jak Jürgen Klopp* | neocichociemni. Retrieved May 17, 2021, Available online https://neocichociemni.wordpress.com/2016/11/11/wygrywaj-jak-jurgen-klopp/, 1.06.2021.

47. Zhang, L.L., George, E., and Chattopadhyay, P. (2020). Not in my pay grade: The relational benefit of pay grade dissimilarity. *Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 63, Iss. 3,* pp. 779-801.