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Preface

The seeds for my interest in inclusion in work groups and organizations were sown years ago. I puzzled over the world of work that I entered at age 16. In hindsight, I believe that I operated under the naive assumption that being hired was inclusion. From elementary through high school, teachers taught me that gaining access to a career in a field with good pay, some respect, and a high degree of job security was one of the fruits of the civil rights era. My job was to do well in school and grab the prize. However, when I began work as a High School Engineering Co-op at General Motors, I quickly experienced a puzzling world in which African-Americans in particular appeared to occupy the periphery. Like women, African-Americans appeared in the company promotional videos, but many I knew were planning to leave, and most I knew eventually left General Motors. Meantime, the conversations among the white male technicians and engineers pointed to wasted talents and a sense of powerless over the framing of decisions most important to their work and work relationships. Thus, I began to see the churning of African-Americans as a symptom of the marginalization and wasted talent produced by the nature of how the organization functioned, or failed to function for people across visible and invisible social/demographic categories. As my career progressed, I had a persistent feeling that there was an unnamed something I was not quite grasping about how the social system of the workplace operated. My white and (a couple) black colleagues, who were either quickly advancing in the organization or at least appeared to be satisfied with their lot, did seem to understand that something. They
referred to it as “the way things are” or “the way things work.” However, this was a “reality” that I could never quite accept.

Another thing that stands out for me is how people would intentionally become different people in the work place in order to fill certain roles, even at high personal cost. I watched in shock one day when I heard my African-American female friend speak in a voice at least an octave higher when she addressed her supervisor. However, the saddest example was of a manager, whom I will refer to as Dick. Dick was a veteran manager at Ford who came up through the ranks when Ford tended to hire men with military backgrounds into the plants and engineering. Dick learned that effective managers screamed, degraded, and bullied to get their way. However, under Don Peterson, the CEO who led Ford from the brink of collapse with the introduction of the Ford Taurus, a new breed of managers began to advance through the ranks in some divisions of the company. These managers emphasized teamwork across functional lines, employee development, and attention to the engineering process. Dick’s upper management reprimanded him for his coercive style of management. Another manager informed me that Dick had been told to shape up or retire, but that Dick really did not know how to get results any other way.

A short time later, Dick was diagnosed with cancer. When I visited him at the hospital, I met a completely different man than the volcano on the verge of erupting in engineering meetings. He was positive, funny, and gracious. All treatments had failed to that point, but he expressed optimism that this next more invasive treatment would work and he would be back at work in a few months. I met a person who few others at work had ever met. And they would not meet him, not only because Dick did not return to work, but also because Dick did not know how to bring his bright humor and optimism
into the workplace, nor had the work environment supported him in pursuing such integration. Thus, to me the challenge of inclusion goes beyond matters of black and white, male and female. Instead, we all can become trapped in some matter of “psychic prison” (Morgan, 1997). The walls of such prisons are created by constantly operating assumptions, beliefs, heuristics for what works or does not. Its foundations appear to be the fears that filter who we were in the workplace and who we allow others to be across the many dimensions of human diversity.

Thus in this study, I use visible difference as a marker of diversity (Williams, K. & O'Reilly, 1998). Visible differences are not the only source of diversity in an organization, but they can provide clues as to the nature of social processes and dynamics within organizations. My own experiences have lead me believe that how organizations create and maintain dynamics around visible differences is not only a reflection of the organization’s capacity for constructively integrating human differences, but it can also reflect costly constraints, even for those apparently in a dominant social identity group or in a position of formal power.
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Inclusion has emerged as a central concept in the practice of creating a diverse 21st century workforce. However, the body of empirical research employing inclusion as a focal concept or variable is surprisingly small, considering the popularity of the concept in management practice. Thus, the objective of this dissertation is to develop a theory of organizational inclusion that addresses the working level of day-to-day interactions. The resulting theory of inclusion in work organizations highlights relationships between three key dynamics of inclusion: inclusion-exclusion dynamics, strategies of integration and power.

The study consisted of case studies of departments within two different knowledge intensive work organizations. The work of the departments involved research, teaching, training, and consulting. Both departments were visibly diverse in terms of gender, age, and ethnicity. I conducted an analysis of 45 interviews, notes from on site
observations and data collected from archival and published sources. I employed both narrative and coding strategies in the analysis of the data.

I found that individuals and organizational in-groups employ three types of integration strategies: assimilation, pluralistic integration, and separation. Use of these strategies depends on the salience of individual personal or social identities and shared in-group identities. Participants’ conceptions of the shared in-group identities influence inclusive or exclusive interactions within organizations. These interactions move participants closer to or away from shared in-group identities and may prompt changes in integration strategies. The match between individual strategies and organizational strategies of integration appear to relate to whether and how organizational members employ or respond to power.

The theory expands the concept of organizational inclusion to include the nature of interactions that individuals experience and power relations within a work organization. The theory also relates multiple forms of power an individual exercises to how they are included through one or more strategies of integration.

The findings and theory point to opportunities for further research exploring the relationship between inclusion dynamics and concepts such as self-monitoring, and social identity complexity. These later concepts have been implicated in diversity research but not directly related to inclusion in work organizations.

Keywords: inclusion, power, qualitative methods, identity, diversity
Chapter 1   Introduction

Though human social differences have been a part of the fabric of organizational life in the workplace since the emergence of the modern work organization, embracing human differences did not become a part of management rhetoric until the closing decades of the twentieth century. The demographic shifts in the 21st century workforce and globalization of work are two clear drivers of this change. Proactive leaders and managers are no long asking, “Does diversity matter?” Instead, they are asking, “How do we do we employ this 21st century work force to strategic advantage?”

The second question organizational leaders and interveners are asking is, “Why do inequities in opportunities and the exercise of power persist, even in organizations that have implemented extensive diversity initiatives?” The practical implications of this question in the U.S. are clear from the steady stream of Equal Employment Opportunity complaints, high profile discrimination lawsuits, and labor force tensions around social/cultural differences (Flynn, 1998; Hansen, 2003; Roth, 2007). These issues arise even within organizations recognized for their progressive diversity policies (Roth, 2007). Apparently, introducing and managing human differences is not as simple as promoting contact among diverse employees, creating written policies, and implementing diversity-training interventions.

The concept of inclusion has emerged in the management literature in response to such questions. The concept of inclusion of diversity is found in a plethora of mission and vision statements, from Fortune 100 companies to non-profit organizations (e.g."About us HP - Diversity and Inclusion”, 2008; "CPOA - Inclusion & Diversity", 2007). Yet,
management research focused on understanding the dynamics of inclusion as it relates to human diversity is scarce. A search of the ISI Web of Knowledge database between 1992 and 2007 yielded 26 citations related to inclusion in the business and management related literature. However, only six empirical studies related to diversity (seven, if a follow-up study by the same researcher is included) explicitly conceptualize and study inclusion as a variable or phenomenon of interest. Within these studies, the definitions and conceptualizations of inclusion vary. Some researchers focus on individual perceptions (Pelled, Ledford, & Mohrman, 1999) and individual and organizational outcomes (Mor Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2001). Another study employs an operationalization of inclusion identical to diversity (Allmendinger & Hackman, 1995). Roberson (2006) points out the confusion as to whether the inclusion as related to diversity in organizations represents fresh thinking about the inclusion of difference in work organizations or repackaging of diversity management approaches, like awareness training. Diversity training, one of the most popular diversity management interventions, appears to do little to create opportunity for groups historically excluded from joining, developing, and advancing within the workplace (Flynn, 1998; Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Chapter 2 will detail the definitions and conceptions of inclusion in the academic literature.

Failed approaches and the managerialization of inclusion have prompted some scholars to assert that the concept obscures the ethical imperative of ensuring access to meaningful work and economic advancement for all (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). Others have asserted that diversity scholarship and practice must move beyond both inclusion and equity (Mirchandani & Butler, 2006). Mirchandani and Bulter (2006) assert that both conceptual approaches have failed to address social relations at the intersection of gender,
race and class, and instead “target specific ‘groups’, such as women, minorities, Aboriginal people or people with a disability” (Mirchandani & Bulter, 2006, p. 475). Thus, within the academic literature, inclusion as it relates to diversity is a contested concept.

Several years ago, I had the opportunity to study the culture of a professional department, which appeared to have accomplished inclusion of a social demographic difference of interest to me – female. Also intriguing was that the department appeared to have developed a cooperative culture. Chatman (2001) had already shown experimentally that the perception of a cooperative organizational culture related to higher performance of demographically heterogeneous teams. She attributed this performance to the norm of cooperation within these groups, which allowed group members to bring different perspectives to the work and thus generate better ideas. What I found was that the cooperative culture was a universal draw for department members across social demographic lines, and that the sort of overt stereotyping and discrimination historically endemic to the Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (i.e. S.T.E. M.) professions in general as well as other professional environments did not appear to be operating in this department. Two women had successively risen to a leadership position within the department, without formal organizational interventions. On the other hand, both men and women discussed times that they felt at odds or observed others who seemed to be at odds with the department in terms of values, beliefs, or particularly professional norms. These reports emerged despite the fact that participants reported many experiences consistent with Pelled, Ledford & Mohrman’s (1999) indicators of inclusion; information access, decision-making influence, and job security. This disconnect prompted me to
wonder if we had adequate theoretical models of inclusion that addressed these apparently conflicting observations. Thus, inclusion itself was more complicated than tracking the recruiting, retention, and advancement of a particular sub-group holding a visible social difference as implied in some conceptions of inclusion (e.g. Kalev, et al., 2006).

With this background in mind, the basic assumption I make in studying inclusion is that it is a viable concept. Inclusion is figural to the goals of creating diverse work organizations, which promote equity (e.g. Bailyn, 2003; Ely, R. J. & Meyerson, 2000), individual and organizational effectiveness (e.g. Mor Barak, et al., 2001; Nishii, Rich, & Woods, 2007), and in the long term, well-being for all stakeholders (e.g. Winstanley & Stoney, 2000). Thus, the objective of this dissertation is to explore the notion of inclusion in work organizations as it relates to not only to who has access to organizational membership, but also the factors advance and embed that membership. I also want to see what insights can be gleaned in contexts in which inclusion of some evident difference had occurred in the absence of formal interventions by management. I believe that that such a situation provides a perspective of organic organizational conditions that support inclusion of difference.

My focus is on participants’ perceptions and experiences of day-to-day interactions with peers as well as their views of how existing social phenomena influence their views. I also wished to understand what differences or similarities were important or salient to them in the work place. These differences and similarities between individuals cluster around social in-group or out-group identities. Therefore, the preliminary overarching question of this study became; How is the inclusion of salient personal and
social group identities accomplished within work organizations, and what are the implications? By answering this question, I hoped to formulate a theory of inclusion in work organizations at the working level of organizations. By working level, I am referring to the day-to-day interactions that constitute people’s experiences and perceptions of themselves and others in a work setting. The working level is of interest because both anecdotal evidence and research studies suggest that day-to-day interactions are a factor in how attractive professional S.T.E.M. environments are to women and minority entrants (Etzkowitz, Kemelgor, & Uzzi, 2000; Fox, 2000; Hoffman-Kim, 1999; Rosser, 1999; Seymour, 1999). Day-to-day interactions also influence the retention and career development of organizational members and are particularly important for individuals representing social category identities historically excluded from professional work organizations (Collective, 1995; Hede, 2009; Lawler, 1999; Rosser, 1999). I suggest that nature of day-to-day interactions filter or promote a wide range of identities representing many dimensions of diversity that converge in work organizations.

This theory would ideally address the concerns of managers and interveners discussed earlier and pull together lines of scholarly thought about inclusion in a diverse workplace. Thus, the goal is integrative, mid-range theory that bridges the gap between organizational level theories of Cox (1993) and Thomas and Ely (1996) and Ferdman’s (2004) concerns about the psychosocial level, “whole self” inclusion in the workplace.

To accomplish this tall order, I begin in chapter 2 with a review of literature that relates the inclusion, diversity, and management literature. I discuss the evolution of the concept of diversity, and the tensions between scholars, which appear to influence inclusion conceptions and research. I present several definitions and concepts of inclusion.
in organizational contexts from outside of the management literature. These definitions and conceptions appear to have had a significant influence on conceptions of inclusion in the management literature. Last, I review the empirical works from the management literature relating to social demographic based diversity, in which inclusion in work organizations is the central studied concept or measured variable.

In chapter 3, I introduce the conceptual framework that I used to guide the empirical study. This framework represents the broad aspects of inclusion that I drew from the inclusion research discussed in chapter 2. The framework is also informed by my personal observations and research, as I outlined earlier in this Introduction. However, in response to a gap I perceived in the work of many inclusion theorists, I also introduce a conception of power as it might operate at the level of day-to-day interactions and relate to various social identities that create salient forms of diversity in work organizations.

In order to develop a theory of inclusion of diversity at the level of day-to-day interactions and relationships, I sought to tap the perceptions and experiences of a bounded set of participants in a natural work setting. The conceptual framework provided conceptual bins for sorting of qualitative data and pointed to possible empirical and theoretical relationships between aspects of inclusion. I employed the conceptual framework to address the following questions:

- What are the relationships between identity, inclusion-exclusion dynamics, and an organization’s culture in creating inclusion?
What are the implications of inclusion strategies employed among individuals and groups within organizations?

How might organizational members’ access and responses to power relate to their salient individual and/or group level identities in a work organization?

This last question concerning power emerged as I noticed that social psychology scholars have linked identity to inclusion or inclusion related phenomenon, including integration (Abrahamson, 1967; Berry, 1984; Levine, Moreland, & Hausmann, 2005). Prasad (2001) and Cox (1993) also linked inclusion to power relations. Furthermore, Turner (2005) and Simon and Oakes (2006) provide theories connecting identity to power.

In chapter 4, I introduce the research study I conducted to explore the aspects of inclusion from the framework and address the three research questions. Because inclusion is a concept in flux, I chose to frame questions and address them with a research approach and methods that allowed broader input from participants in a natural work setting.

The study consisted of case studies of two professional work organizations. Since my interest was in how inclusion can successfully occur in work organizations, I selected the study sites based on their perceived success in developing a diverse work organization. The first organization was a department had been successful in advancing junior faculty into senior ranks and advancing women into formal leadership positions. The second organization, also a department of a larger organization, was notably diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity, and age. They had been successful in attracting and
retaining ethnically diverse women professionals as well as men. Both organizations maintained high performance and cooperative organizational cultures. The case studies for each department are presented in chapters 5 and 6 respectively.

I present a comparison of the two cases in chapter 7. I discuss the study findings that explain the role of identity in the emergence of important interactions, expectations about inclusion (by both entrants and the organization), and how inclusion emerged in the study organization. I will present evidence for why inclusion is not as straightforward as avoiding assimilation and fostering pluralistic or multicultural integration as suggested by some inclusion scholars and practitioners (Cox, 1993; Holvino, 2004; Miller, F. A. & Katz, 2002). Furthermore, I discuss evidence of how salient identities influence power relations, and how power interacts with the inclusion strategies employed by individuals and the organization.

Also in chapter 7, I present the resulting theory of inclusion of human social differences in work organizations. This theory explains how the various aspects of inclusion of difference from the management literature tie together into a more dynamic view of inclusion as an organizational phenomenon. Drawing from definitions of inclusion from chapter 2, I provide an expanded definition of organizational inclusion to conclude chapter 7. This theory supports further research and practice, as discussed in the concluding chapter 8.

Ultimately, I hope to support the advancement of inclusion in organizations as an integral part of leaders’ and managers’ thinking about the strategic capacity and capabilities of the workforce as well as the organization’s role in the larger society. Unfortunately, too often a diversity crisis (i.e. labor dispute, lawsuit) highlights the
interdependence between effectiveness and equity in work organizations. This research will help leaders, managers and organizational interveners assume a more proactive stance in building socially sustainable work organizations in the 21st century.
Chapter 2  Inclusion, Management, and Diversity

Conceptions of Inclusion from the Social Science Literature

Though inclusion has emerged as a popular concept in diversity and management scholarship and practice, it is not a new concept to social science. Here I will discuss conceptions from psychiatry, personal psychology and sociology based literature. The focus here is on conceptions of inclusion that appear to provide threads for the social psychological and management literature conceptions of inclusion that will form the basis of the conceptual framework I will discuss in Chapter 3.

From psychiatry, Schutz (1958) developed a theory linking intra-psychic preferences to group dynamics. Foreshadowing later interest in managing diversity within groups to achieve higher performance, the practical purpose of his work was to understand how to foster high performance work groups in the U.S. military (Schutz, 1958). Schutz (1958) asserted that inclusion, control, and affection were three relations that people needed and that determined groups’ interactions and functioning (Schutz, 1958, p. 14). Individual preferences vary in terms of whether one is more psychologically comfortable when providing these relations to others or receiving them from others (Schutz, 1958). Within this framework, he defined the need for inclusion as “the need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual interest with other people. This feeling includes (1) being able to take an interest in other people to a satisfactory degree and (2) having other people take interest in the self to a satisfactory degree” (Schutz, 1958, p. 18). Schutz (1958) presented inclusion as both positive and negative. In either form, it
could be a basis of relating and fulfilling an individual’s psychological needs. “It [inclusion] has to do with interaction with people, with attention, acknowledgment, being known, prominence, recognition, prestige, status, and fame; with identity, individuality, understanding, interest, commitment and participation. It is unlike affection in that it does not involve strong emotional attachments to individual persons. It is unlike control, in that the preoccupation is with prominence, not dominance” (Schutz, 1958, p. 22). The instrument is still popular for use in practice (Atanasiou & Oswald, 2004).

Scholarly work emerging from a sociological perspective refers to the concept of social inclusion. From the sociological perspective social inclusion is treated as an outcome of societal-level social processes and is viewed as one end of the continuum of inclusion-exclusion (Sennett, 2000; Winstanley & Stoney, 2000). In this vein, Abrams, de Moura, Hutchison, & Viki (2005) traced the concept of inclusion-exclusion in the sociological tradition back to Durkhiem. However, other scholars view inclusion-exclusion as intertwined phenomena (O'Reilly, 2005).

O’Reilly (2005) noted that the many variables that could he could include in a conceptual model of inclusion and exclusion “would be too cumbersome to be useful” (O'Reilly, 2005, p. 83). Instead, O’Reilly (2005) suggested three features that comprise the social inclusion/exclusion link and that could support analysis and development of policies or programs of social inclusion. The first feature is that of material social interactions, which relates to the material resources that enable human relationships (O'Reilly, 2005, p. 85). The second feature is an individual’s value orientations compared to those of the society in which he or she operates. O Reilly (2005) explains: “One aspect of this feature is whether individuals are enabled, through the material resources available
to them, to be interpersonally autonomous (see Doyal & Gough, 1991; Held, 1994); in other words, that they are not adversely included in relationships of domination or dependence (see Wood, 1999).” Related to this second feature is “whether individuals are free to pursue their own ethical ends within society” (O'Reilly, 2005, p. 85). The third feature is that of group value relations in society. O’Reilly (2005) wrote, “The differentiated presence or non-existence of this involvement by groups in the negotiation of co-responsibility in society is the marker of the third feature of inclusion and exclusion” (O'Reilly, 2005, p. 86). These features align inclusion with the concerns of diversity and equity scholars and relate to several aspects of power, which I will discuss later.

Winstanley and Stoney (2000) drew from sociology, humanistic psychology, and ethics to offer a broad conception of social inclusion. Their conception incorporates concepts representing the experience of the individual as well as collective relations and power. From humanistic psychology, they identified attachment and reciprocity, security, acceptance, congruence, self-actualization and meaningfulness. From ethics, they identify Kantian respect for persons as ends in themselves, Gilligan’s (1982) ethic of care, and Etzioni’s (1995) community of care. Last, they identify diversity, equitable resource distribution, voice, and involvement in decision-making as structural and process components. Instead of shareholder outcomes-focused orientation to inclusion, they instead argue for a “stakeholder approach” (Winstanley et al., 2000). In the stakeholder approach, the organization is regarded as an open system, interdependent with society and the environment at large. Thus, organization leaders and members need to consider more than shareholders or sources of capital as the purpose and direction of
organizational benefits. Instead a variety of stakeholders, including employees, society, or even the natural environment, influence the organization. Inherent in this approach is that stakeholders should be heard “through authentic processes for involvement and participation in decision-making” (Winstanley et al., 2000, p. 250). It is interesting to note that Winstanley & Stoney (2000) locate diversity as a structural aspect of the organization, as opposed to an outcome. Thus, they differ from scholars of diversity who view diversity as an input towards the achievement of organizational outcomes (Cox, 1993; Kochan, et al., 2003; Richard, 2000; Richard, Barnett, Dwyer, & Chadwick, 2004; Richard, Murthi, & Ismail, 2007; Thomas, D. A., 2004), or an end in itself (Cross, Katz, Miller, & Seashore, 1994). However, their conception reflects the reality of an increasing number of organizations in which diversity is a given and inclusion has become a question of how organizational managers and leaders will respond to that diversity.

Sennett’s (2000) work moves social inclusion closer to the organizational level or day-to-day interactions. In an approach to social inclusion reminiscent of Winstanley and Stoney (2000), Sennett (2000) asserts that the very structure of organizations and work has diminished social inclusion “by denying to individuals, in their work lives, that experience of mattering to others” (Sennett, 2000, p. 278). He goes on to suggest a least three elements necessary for the practice of social inclusion in any context, including the workplace. First, “There must be mutual exchange; the exchange must involve elements of ritual; and the ritual must generate witnesses who serve as judges of the behavior of individuals” (Sennett, 2000, p. 279). Second, Sennett (2000) suggests that all levels of an organization need to have decision-making power relative to their own work. He continues asserting that “empowerment”, as practiced in contemporary organizations,
actually works in reverse by pushing responsibility for work downward, but actually centralizing decision making about the work and the overall goals of the organization upwards and even outward in to the hands of shareholders. Third, Sennett (2000) suggests that part and parcel of social inclusion is an acknowledgment of dependency across levels of status and an acceptance of responsibility and accountability for processes and outcomes. Thus, Sennett (2000) challenges the conceptions of inclusion from the management literature that frames inclusion as participation in the form of access to work related information and decision-making input. Instead, Sennett (2000) suggests that inclusion is also power to define what information is important and make decisions relative to the work and goals of work.

*Inclusion of Diversity in the Management Literature*

The exact origins of the inclusion concept in relation to management practice, theory, and research relating to diversity are unclear. Roberson (2006) located its origins in the practitioner literature. Popular works such as “The Inclusion Breakthrough” (Miller, F. A. & Katz, 2002) from one of the earliest consulting firms specializing in diversity management support this explanation. However, before this work, ideas from Cox (1993), an academic and consultant, also appeared to have influenced practical thought around diversity management and conceptions of organizational inclusion. Roberson (2006) also found that inclusion and diversity were confounded in the minds of Human Resource managers. Diversity and inclusion have been confounded in research as well. The earliest empirical research employing inclusion as a primary variable dates
back to 1995 (Allmendinger & Hackman, 1995). In this study, inclusion was operationalized as proportion of women within an organizational unit, which is similar to the operationalization of diversity used in many studies (Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003). Perhaps consequently, within the management literature, inclusion tends to fall along two lines of thought, which I will refer to as the Equity approach and the Effectiveness approach. To provide background, I will briefly discuss these two broad interests around diversity in the management literature.

_Diversity: Conceptions and Tensions_

Definitions of diversity appear to vary with the focus and objectives of the beholder. Contemporary definitions of inclusion range from: a “focus on proportional representation of a broad set of human differences in organizations” (Roberson, 2006) to “Diversity refers to the difference, similarities and related tensions that exist in any mixture” (Thomas, R. R., 2006, p. xi). Researchers Jackson, Joshi, and Erhardt (2003) note that the term “diversity” has come to represent the domain of research around human social, cultural, and cognitive-functional differences in organizations (Jackson et al., 2003, p. 801). Merrill-Sands, Holvino, and Cumming (2003) suggest there are three lenses employed within the diversity literature: a social differences lens”, “cultural differences lens and a “cognitive-functional lens” (Merrill-Sands, Holvino, & Cumming, 2003, p. 327). The cognitive functional differences lens relates to how people take in, internalize, analyze, and/or apply information (Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003; Merrill-Sands, Holvino, & Cumming, 2003). Thus, personality differences, styles of interaction,
or differences reinforced by functional training are fodder for diversity. Diversity within the cultural differences lens refers to differences in and between cultural backgrounds related to national origin as well as sub-groups within nations and societies (Garcia, 1995; Merrill-Sands, et al., 2003). Adler (1986, p. 17) explains, “Diversity exists both within and among cultures; however, within a culture certain behaviors are favored and others repressed…A cultural orientation describes the attitudes of most of the people most of the time, not all of the people all of the time.”

The conception of diversity many scholars suggest is more difficult to incorporate in work organizations relates to the human social differences lens (Merrill-Sands, et al.). In this approach, scholars define diversity as individual or group differences derived from salient or meaningful social categories (Merrill-Sands, Holvino, & Cumming, 2003). Some definitions in this vein highlight differences such as race, gender, class, age, or sexual orientation (Cross, et al., 1994; Ferdman, 1995) and in particular the need to ameliorate discrimination towards such identity groups. Others broadly refer to identity groups or categories as any identity based differences that influence how people approach their work and social interactions (Nkomo & Cox, 1996). These are immutable and often visible human differences. Alderfer (1987) suggests that members of identity groups or categories are those who “have participated in equivalent historical experiences, are currently subjected to similar social forces, and as a result have consonant world views.” Thus, identity categories can encompass race, gender or other socially significant differences such as sexual orientation or age. Last, Ely and Foldy (2003, p. 321) note that term diversity has also been used to “capture all manner of differences in the workplace” and thus encompass all three lenses.
The Equity Approach

Some scholars advocating a social differences lens have criticized the broad definitions of diversity (Armour, 2005; Cross, et al., 1994; Edelman, Fuller, & Mara-Drita, 2001; Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). They advocate a conception of diversity more narrowly focused on aspects of human difference that have been historically linked to inequality in the workplace (Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Daus, 2002; Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Prasad, 2001). Scholars of the diversity and ethnics approach assert that differences in race, class, gender, and sexual orientation underpin entrenched systems of inequality in organizations (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). Furthermore, they assert that dismantling of these systems of inequality should be the focus of diversity interventions in organizations. Inequality in work organizations tends to mirror the historical inequalities in the larger society, which also impede the economic and social progress of members of certain social categories and cultural groups. Thus, diversity thought in this vein is also concerned with the relationship between work organizations and society. These scholars see the objectives of diversity in terms of achieving equality and equity for the historically disenfranchised. In other words, they view diversity as an ethical imperative, a necessary way for an organization to operate to fulfill its role in a just and fair society (Pless & Maak, 2004). Scholars suggest that without establishing organizations that treat all members equitably, organizational members will likely define effectiveness, not in terms of quality or accomplishment of organizational goals, but around the needs of dominant social identities within the organization (Green, 2005; Meyerson & Fletcher,
For example, Meyerson & Fletcher (2000) point out that organizational cultures have been designed around the assumption of an ideal employee who is versed in the dominant culture of the larger society, has few external responsibilities to the community or society, particularly in terms of raising children, and thus is available 24/7 for work. Effectiveness is often confused with the traits of the idealized worker and important contributions of workers who do not fit this mold are ignored (Fletcher, 1999; Green, 2005; Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000). Thus, in the diversity and ethnics approach, scholars employ diversity as social category identities, as a standpoint from which they diagnose organizational functioning. They also tend to view diversity as the outcome variable of interest as well as the objective of practical interventions.

The Effectiveness Approach

Alternatively, other scholars have employed conceptions of diversity to develop a line of research that attempts to link diversity and effectiveness (Lobel, 1999; Richard, et al., 2004; Richard, et al., 2007) or as a strategic advantage (Thomas, D. A., 2004). Many scholars in this vein still tend to employ visible social identities as the input variable of interest (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1997; McLeod, Lobel, & Cox, 1996; Richard, et al., 2004). However, the studies in this vein have focused on the question of whether diversity matters in terms of effective organizational outcomes. In practice, this approach to diversity came to be referred to as the business case for diversity and diversity was typically defined in broad terms, encompassing all dimensions of human and social differences (Bryan, 1998).
Recently, those advocating a diversity and effectiveness approach have encountered new stumbling blocks. Results of research establishing a direct effectiveness/diversity link in terms of a “business case” for diversity has been mixed (Giscombe & Mattis, 2002; Kochan, et al., 2003), suggesting other intervening factors. Recently (Kochan, et al., 2003) reported results of a large-scale multi-study research project in which researchers looked for a link between diversity and organizational outcomes. They only found evidence of any link, albeit a positive one, in one of the sub studies conducted by Ely and Thomas. Interestingly, Ely and Thomas were the only researchers who incorporated intervening factors into their study. They found a positive relationship between diversity and effectiveness when the organization had developed a “learning and integration” culture and promoted ways of interacting and processing information that promoted constructive responses to differences (Kochan et al., 2003). In an interview, Kochan suggested that the diversity/effectiveness disconnect lies in the lack of HRM information systems that would support measurement of the contribution of diversity to financial results (Flynn, 1998). But also the results from Kochan and colleagues (2003) study indicate is that nature of social processes within organizations play a key role in creating a positive link between diversity and outcomes in organizations.

Many researchers have shifted to developing a better understanding of intervening factors that help organizations leverage diversity. For example Richard and colleagues (Richard, 2000) found an organization’s strategy and environmental context can play an intervening role between diversity and organizational performance. Furthermore, Cox’s (1993) theory and Ely and Thomas’ (2001) findings suggest that diversity must be
integrated into the design of the social and technical systems within organizations. Creating such a social system increases the organization’s capacity to maintain a diverse workforce as well as reap effective outcomes.

The key shortcoming of pure effectiveness approaches to diversity is that the definitions of effectiveness or performance are not challenged (Ely, R. J. & Meyerson, 2000; Fletcher, 1999). Thus, the social arrangements that maintain the dominance, desirability, or fit of one social group over another are left unquestioned (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999).

Thus, tensions exist between approaches to applying the diversity lens. One approach is to use diversity as a lens for understanding organizations as social systems that replicate societal oppression of certain social identities and maintain the privilege of others, then moving on to ameliorate these conditions and demonstrate inclusion of the subordinated groups within the organization. Another approach is to view diversity, in its broadest terms, as a human resource input, which managers can learn to manage and leverage for organizational advantage.

While diversity scholars have suggested a both/and approach to diversity (Ashkanasy, et al., 2002), contemporary conceptions of inclusion of difference in the management literature tend to align with either of the two general approaches to diversity in the management literature.

*Inclusion in the Management Literature*
An early reference to workplace inclusion in the management literature comes from Schein, who defined inclusion as the degree to which an employee is considered an “insider” within an organization (Schein, 1967). Westley (1990) explores the role of inclusion (or exclusion) of middle managers in strategic conversations and the effects on manager satisfaction and energy around implementation of strategic objectives. He suggests that the middle manager’s role within strategic conversations influences whether her or his inclusion is empowering or is towards securing obedience (Westley, 1990). Helgesen (1995) proposes a “web of inclusion” as a “model for helping us redesign the institutions that frame our lives” (Helgesen, 1995, p. 16). Central to her idea of inclusion is a move away from hierarchical arrangements to constantly expanding and rearranging networks of relationships that distribute information and power throughout the web (Helgesen, 1995).

However, inclusion has become firmly associated with diversity in work organizations. In this vein, Mor Barak (2000) define inclusion as the extent to which individuals can access information and resources, are involved in work groups, and have the ability to influence decision-making processes. Rather than emphasizing difference as an organizational commodity that has exchange value in terms of economic performance, inclusion is focused on the degree to which individuals feel a part of critical organizational processes. Thus, inclusion represents a person’s ability to contribute fully and effectively to an organization.

Cox (1993) provides a conceptual framework that addresses inclusion (as structural and informal integration) and both effectiveness and equity. His theory of how the inclusion of social identities leads to various organizational types, illustrates his view
of the interdependent relationship between effectiveness and ethnics. Cox (1993) proposes three kinds of organizations in terms of how social category and cultural differences are integrated or “the level of inclusion that diverse employees experience” (Nishii, et al., 2007, p. 1). Cox (1993) calls these organizations monolithic, plural, and multicultural. Level of inclusion in Cox’s terms refers to how fully employees can integrate themselves, culturally and structurally (roles, rank), into an organization. In monolithic organizations, one identity is dominant, and those who do not fit that identity are not welcome. In plural organizations, the focus is on increasing diverse representation and fairness, but the organization still expects individuals to assimilate to the dominant culture. In the ideal multicultural organization, policies and practices focus not only on reducing discrimination and increasing representation, but also on “creating a work environment that “feels” inclusive to all individuals, and to facilitating the full utilization of diverse human resources to maximize both the employees’ and organization’s potential” (Nishii et al., 2007, p. 1). Thus, Cox (1993) suggests that composition, in terms of increased representation, should reflect the effectiveness of efforts to promote inclusion of diversity. In Cox’s theory, inclusion leads to increased numerical representation of difference throughout an organization, but it is accomplished via changing the culture of work environment such that unique and shared aspects of individuals are integrated into organizations. This notion of a “multicultural” organization is often central to rhetoric of inclusion of diversity. However, it has been elusive in practice. Pless & Maak (2004) point out that many organizations have readily adopted Cox’s recommendations in terms of changes in policies, systems, and processes. But, organizations have made less progress in terms of the norms and values or culture
change. Thus, the normative aspects of inclusion of diversity remain a practical challenge. What remains unclear are the underlying social dynamics that predicate the multicultural organization.

Empirical Studies of Inclusion in the Management Literature

Consistent with the lines of diversity research, empirical inclusion research falls along the two lines of diversity research. The first line of inclusion of diversity research is consistent with the Equality/Equity approach. Researchers in this vein look at inclusion explicitly or implicitly in terms of understanding its influence on the individual (or a social category or sub-group) of experiencing less favorable treatment or access to opportunity and resources within the organization (Elg & Jonnergard, 2003; Pelled, et al., 1999; Wilson, 2000). The purpose of this research is to identify organizational social factors that impede the inclusion of individuals or groups carrying visible social category differences into an organization. Elg and Jonnergard (2003) explored the characteristics of an academic department and the strategies that women employed in order to gain credentials for an academic profession. They found that structural and cultural aspects of the organization plus the women’s own goals and outside demands shaped whether women assumed the normative strategy of assimilation into the dominant norms in order to gain membership or worked more autonomously. The autonomous approach tended to result in more relationships outside of the department. While both strategies resulted in the women obtaining the degree, the ones who assimilated were offered positions within the department and the non-assimilators were not. However, Is noted that even women
who pursued the assimilation strategy were not offered positions with the same level of resources and/or security as men. This latter finding implies that a focus on what individuals do to secure their own inclusion is not enough. Inclusion, as conceptualized in this work, results from a combination of personal moves and organizational moves (Bilimoria, Zelechowski, & Godwin, 2007).

In another study along the diversity and ethnics line, Wilson (2000) explored inclusion as related to organizational culture with the explicit goal of providing descriptions of cultures within organizations, particularly their social norms around inclusion of salient identities. Wilson’s (2000) study consisted of three case studies of organizations in England. She explored the relationship between organizational culture and a range of inclusion experiences of organizational members. She studied these experiences in terms of identities that were acceptable and well integrated in to the organization’s functioning and covert norms, though sometimes these identities persisted in direct contrast to stated norms and beliefs of management and leaders. The marginalized identities, across cases, tended to be that of parent and female. Wilson (2000) observed that inclusion dynamics linked to the sub-identities perceived to advance the prevailing identity of the organizational in-group. While easier to detect around visible differences like sex, these dynamics influence more subtle identities people hold like parent and also manifest around identities like “professional/non-professional,” engineer/ non engineer or even physical attractiveness (Wilson, 2000, p. 301). The organizational culture, including context, heavily influenced what identities were included or excluded. Wilson (2000) also showed how strongly certain identities could come to be associated with organizational outcomes, based on what worked in the past,
even when there is the recognition of the need to create different responses to a rapidly changing external environment.

However, Pelled Ledford and Mohrman (1999) appeared to have produced the first empirical study in the management literature that attempted conceptualize and operationalized inclusion as a separate concept from diversity. Citing Schein and others, they defined workplace inclusion as, “...the degree to which an employee is accepted and treated as an insider by others in the work system (O'Hara, Beehe, & Colarelli, 1994; Schein, 1967)” (Pelled, et al., 1999, p. 1014). Pelled, Ledford and Mohrman (1999) explored the relationship between individual demographic dissimilarity from co-workers and these three indicators of inclusion: “(1) decision-making influence, that is the influence that an employee has over decisions that affect him/her or the work that s/he does (Steel, Jennings, Mento, & Hendrix, 1992; Steel & Mento, 1987); (2) access to sensitive work information, that is the degree to which an employee is kept well-informed about the company business objectives and plans; and (3) job security, that is the likelihood that an employee will retain his/her job” (Pelled et al., 1999, p. 1015). While job security in itself does not always mean that one is an insider in the workplace, organizations may show acceptance of a person by granting that person stable employment. Indeed, Handy (1994) has argued that modern companies are moving towards a model with concentric circles of job security, such that highly valued workers are in the core circle of stable positions while less valued workers are in surrounding circles of less secure or temporary positions” (Pelled, Ledford, & Mohrman, 1999, p. 1015). Pelled, Ledford, and Mohrman (1999) found that gender and race dissimilarity from peers was negatively associated with the indicators of inclusion, while tenure and
education were positively associated with inclusion. Their explanation for this difference in findings was that gender and race differences were not viewed as task relevant differences, while tenure, as an indicator of experience and education were more likely to be related to task. These findings conflicted with another highly cited study, which demonstrated that differences in the racial make-up of a task group did make a difference in effective task completion given a cooperative culture context (McLeod, 1996). Other findings were that age appeared to have no association with indicators of inclusion. Also, white respondents indicated less access to information networks than non-whites when among dissimilar peers. Thus, an individual’s perceptions or experiences of inclusion in a work organization appear to be related to the presence of other identity, as well as other contextual and perhaps even cultural factors, which were not explored in this study. Also not explored is the intersection of various identities and assessments of inclusion.

The second vein of inclusion research is more concerned with studying or establishing the link between diversity and individual and organizational effectiveness. The ultimate outcomes of interest include individual well-being, organizational commitment, retention, and/or satisfaction, particularly as they relate to achieving organizational performance (Allmendinger & Hackman, 1995). Inclusion is conceptualized in terms of changes in-group composition towards heterogeneity (Allmendinger & Hackman, 1995), the outcome of the intersection of differences in a given context or a systemic intervention which seeks to leverage the advantages of a variety of human differences (Nishii et al., 2007; Roberson, 2006).

Allmendinger and Hackman (1995) provide an early study linking inclusion, social demographic difference, and basic measures of organizational effectiveness.
Allmendinger and Hackman (1995) measured inclusion simply in terms of the change in proportion of women represented in an organization. Their purpose was to explore how several outcome measures change with a change in gender composition within symphony orchestras, an organization that had been traditionally dominated by men. They looked at orchestra functioning, the quality of relationships, and individuals’ own motivation and satisfaction across several Western societies. One of their key findings was that the dynamics of gender integration differed with low to moderate female representation and as a function of national context. Also, when the representation of women was below 50%, outcome measures tended to be lower, then above 50% many measures flattened out or increased. This study also reflects the emergence of the interest in linking composition and effectiveness through inclusion. The interactions and processes that constituted inclusion and/or how women were being integrated into the organizations are areas of inquiry prompted by this study. What stands out about this study is that the researchers operationalized inclusion in terms of what Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt (2003) referred to as compositional diversity. Thus, the confounding of inclusion and diversity is reflected in the earliest empirical literature.

Mor Barak and colleagues (Mor Barak, et al., 2001) developed and tested a theoretical model linking identity, culture and inclusion and effectiveness outcomes. Their measures of organizational effectives focused on individual outcomes. Thus, organizational outcomes were “employee organizational commitment” and “employee job effectiveness” (Mor Barak, 2000, p. 50). Mor Barak and colleagues (Mor Barak, 2000; Mor Barak, et al., 2001) employed the concept of “inclusion-exclusion” from social psychology as a dynamic social process resulting from the interaction between
identity and context, which then leads to individual and organizational outcomes. Mor Barak (2000) defined organizational inclusion-exclusion as a continuum of the degree to which individuals feel a part of critical organizational processes such as access to information, connectedness to co-workers, and ability to participate in and influence the decision-making processes. This conception is more similar to the Pelled, Ledford, and Mohrman (1999) indicators of inclusion than inclusion-exclusion from the social psychological literature, which I will discuss later. Mor Barak and colleagues suggested that individual perceptions of inclusion-exclusion are the outcome of the degree of congruence between personal norms and values (identity) and organizational policies, procedures and rewards, which is how they defined culture. (Mor Barak, 2000, p.59). Next, they suggested that perceived degree of inclusion-exclusion influenced individual and organizational outcomes. Individual outcomes included individual well-being, and job satisfaction (Mor Barak, 2000, p. 59). They also looked at inclusion in two different social contexts, one U.S., and one in Israel. They found that women and minorities experienced less inclusion in the U.S., but in Israel, only women experienced less. Overall, the more collectivist Israel sample reported more inclusion and less job stress. The researchers suggested that the findings in Israel might be due to a broader definition of group found in collectivist cultures (Mor Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2001, p. 85). Mor Barak’s (2000) conception of inclusion as inclusion-exclusion is unique in theorizing inclusion as dynamic process with the possibility of exclusion. However, the actual operationalization of the concept was in terms of perceptual outcomes not the processes or interactions themselves that influenced these perceptions.
Roberson (2006) explored the conceptual differences between inclusion and diversity and moves toward development of a scale to operationalize organizational inclusion (Roberson, 2006). She solicited definitions and attitudes of diversity and inclusion from diversity officers of Fortune 500 companies. The companies varied by industry and size. Sample definitions of inclusion she provided from her sample consistently centered on the theme of inclusion as a facilitator of the link between diversity of the workforce and business outcomes. An example of a sample definition of inclusion from a HR professional: “We define inclusion as seeking out, valuing, and using the knowledge and experiences of diverse employees for business benefit” (Roberson, 2006). Roberson distilled the following definition of organizational inclusion from the entire sample: “The way that an organization configures its systems and structures to value and leverage the potential, and to limit the disadvantages of differences” (Roberson, 2006). She asserts that diversity and inclusion are distinct concepts and she identifies attributes for each (Roberson, 2006). Still, what she identified as attributes of inclusion, for example “diversity education and training” and “employee support groups, networks, or affinity groups” are interventions in what other scholars and many practitioners call “diversity management” (Plummer, 2003). Diversity Management can be viewed as the practice and related processes of understanding and incorporating human differences to achieve desirable organizational outcomes. Thus, in Roberson’s study, inclusion is still conceptually confused with diversity.

In a different move towards development of the organizational inclusion concept and a measure of organizational inclusion, Nishii, Rich, and Woods (2007) developed a framework of organizational inclusion, which uniquely addresses the interface between
the individual and organization. Their model suggests that managers and leaders in organizations can think they are creating an inclusive organization, in terms of practices, policies and even structures and work processes, but in practice they may fail to foster the changes in culture that support an environment that “feels” inclusive to the individual. The stated purpose of their research is “to develop and validate a measure of organizational inclusion that is consistent with Cox’s (1991) pioneering conceptualization of inclusion” (Nishii et al., 2007, p. 1). They identified three factors indicating organization level and individual level inclusion: Employment Practices, Organizational Culture, and Participation. Thus, their model works three key aspects of Cox’s framework into a model for practical application. Gaps in assessment, between participants at the two levels of system, indicate areas of weakness in organizational inclusion. Thus, Nishii and colleagues (2007) attempt to make the normative aspects of inclusion explicit through culture and explicitly introduce participation as a means for developing inclusion. Participation in their model moves beyond presence of a particular social category or group within the organization to assessing whether they exercise influence in decision-making within the organization. Research testing their model is underway.

Thus, inclusion in the empirical literature encompasses representation, structure, and affective outcomes. Theory testing researchers have clearly struggled with its measurement and thus, operationalized inclusion in terms of its outcomes, in terms of either individual effectiveness or perceptions of access/belonging (equality).

Neglected in both approaches to inclusion in the research is the recognition that the meaning of demographic categories and even group identities has shifted in a
shrinking world. Regardless of the focus of diversity and the breath or narrowness of its conception, in the context of organizational research, diversity is subject to ever changing conditions. The differences that matter in interactions are always shifting. The diversity dimensions that seem like relevant variables to the researcher or a macro level of system, may or may not matter or be conscious to participants in their day-to-day interactions depending on context, tasks, or history of interaction. Litvin (1997, p. 206) advocates instead, “…a process-oriented theory of difference. Such a theory would embrace the psychological and sociological complexities at play in the social construction of organizational experience. It would encourage organizational members to approach one another as evolving and multidimensional individuals acting and interacting with a context of history, cultural norms, power relations and social institutions rather than as unidimensional representatives of demographic categories” (Litvin, 1997, p. 206).

Litvin’s (1997) call presents a challenge to all diversity researchers to approach inclusion of diversity research in such a way that the complexity of participants is acknowledged and captured. In this vein Ferdman (1995; 2004), in particular, has offered scholarship asserting a link between multiple identities and inclusion in organizations. However, the question remains of what a process-oriented theory that encompasses multiple identities looks like.

Furthermore, all of these approaches to inclusion appear to neglect or sidestep some basic questions. For example, what day-to-day interactions promote not just a feeling of inclusion on the part of the individual but also signal their membership and/or the legitimacy required to support their actual participation in organizational decision-making? What role do group level interactions play in influencing the inclusion of
multiple identities? When scholars discuss such concepts as decision-making influence, and access to resources are they not suggesting that power is in play? Yet, the concept of power is typically mentioned only in passing, if at all, in inclusion of diversity studies reviewed.

In the next chapter, I will describe a conceptual framework, which represents the myriad aspects of inclusion from the management literature. This framework will provide the basis for development of a theory of inclusion in work organizations that integrates inclusion-exclusion dynamics, strategies of integration and power as aspects of inclusion in work organizations.
Chapter 3 Rethinking Inclusion in Diversity Research

The conceptual framework presented in this chapter draws from the varied literature on inclusion and diversity in work organizations. In this framework, inclusion as it relates to diversity in organizations encompasses three aspects from social psychological literature. First aspect is inclusion-exclusion, that is the day-to-day social interactions and exchanged experiences that signal the individual’s position relative to the prototypical in-group member (Abrams, de Moura, et al., 2005) or an individual’s movements towards or away from full group membership (Levine, et al., 2005).

A second aspect of inclusion reflects various integration strategies. Dovidio, Gaertner, Hodson, Houlette, & Johnson (2005) proposed and tested a theory of four identity integration strategies as part of their common group identity model. The first general strategy, decategorization, requires conditions under which individuals forgo social category distinctions and regard one another simply as individuals. The next general strategy, recategorization, is accomplished via separation, pluralistic integration, or assimilation. Recategorization relies on the emergence or degree of salience of a superordinate identity. A superordinate identity transcends social category and other individual level distinctions and thus allows out-group representatives to be seen to some degree as in-group members relative to an encompassing identity (Dovidio, Gaertner, Hodson, Houlette, & Johnson, 2005).

A third aspect of inclusion involves social power. Within an organizational context, power is both the potential and the act of harnessing and directing people’s energy, talents, and/or skills towards the accomplishment of an end. Turner (2005)
suggests that when power is viewed in terms of identity, an individual’s perceived degree of closeness to the superordinate group identity can determine how an individual is able to exercise power, or acquiesces to power in its three forms: coercion, persuasion, or authority.

Influences on Inclusion in Work Organizations

The identities of organizational participants and the organization’s culture shape how the aspects of inclusion develop, persist, and change (Mor Barak, Findler, & Wind, 2001). Mor Barak and colleagues (2001) demonstrated that the identities individuals bring with them into the organization interact with the organization’s culture to produce inclusion-exclusion dynamics. Identity and culture thus appear to be important factors in shaping inclusion in organizations.

Identities in Work Organizations

Researchers have found that identity in work groups relate to individual inclusion (Ellemers & Rink, 2005; Jordan & Bilimoria, 2007; Lobel, S. A. & St. Clair, 1992; Mor Barak, et al., 2001) as well negative affective experiences (Peterson, et al., 1995; Williams, K. J. & Alliger, 1994). Jackson, Joshi and Erhardt (Jackson, et al., 2003, p. 802) present three identity attributes of interest: “those that can be readily detected upon first meeting a person (e.g. age, sex, racio-ethnicity); underlying attributes that become evident only after getting to know a person well (e.g., personality, knowledge, values);
and attributes that fall between these two extremes of transparency (e.g. education, tenure).” Much of the diversity research has focused on what the researchers refer to as readily detected traits such as sex, race-ethnicity, and age (Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003, p. 804). Furthermore, Weber (Weber, 2004) points out that there is a tendency for researchers to treat social category identities such as race, gender, and age as “discrete variables” in which “individuals are typically assigned a single location along each dimension” (Weber, 2004, p. 125). Weber asserts, “This practice reinforces the view of race, gender and sexuality as permanent characteristics of individuals, as unchangeable, and as polarities – people can belong to one and only one category. The practice cannot grasp the relational character, the historical specificity, or the conflicting means that arise in everyday life (Omi & Winant, 1994)” (Weber, 2004, p. 125). From Weber’s perspective, categories such as race, class, gender, and sexuality are “social constructs, whose meaning develops out of group struggles over socially valued resources” (Weber, 2004, p. 125). Ferdman (1999) notes that “every person has both gender and ethnic or racial identities, which together with a range of other group memberships make up the individual’s social identity (Deaux, 1996; Ferdman, B. M., 1995; Nkomo & Cox, 1996)” (Ferdman, 1999, p. 19). Complicating identity is the move of members of social categories, which provided “the other” against which a dominant identity was defined (Smith, K. K. & Berg, 1987), towards assuming organizational identities traditionally held by members of dominant groups within the larger society. These “others” have assumed many of the identity characteristics of dominant social category members within organizations. Thus, identity is less reliably defined in terms of single set of visible characteristics of a social category. Therefore, the multiple identities of the individual are
important to consider in social science research. But how is this to be accomplished? Not only are the social category identities discussed by Weber possibly in play, but also the group identities resulting from influences such as nationality and culture, as well as organizationally induced functional and position based identities (Ellemers & Rink, 2005).

Several scholars have suggested that salience of a given combination of identities is what determines behavior in a given situation (Ellemers & Rink, 2005; Randel, 2000). Thus, salience of identities is important to understanding what aspects of diversity are in play in inclusion dynamics. Stryker (1968) defined identity salience as “… the probability, for a given person, of a given identity being invoked in a variety of situations. Alternatively, this concept may be defined as the differential probability among persons of a given identity being invoked in a given situation” (Stryker, 1968, p. 560). Identities that become salient appear to play a large part in the outcomes of the ordering of multiple identities at the individual and group levels (Ellemers & Rink, 2005; Randel, 2000). This ordering in turn influences the aspects of inclusion, as I will discuss later.

Several scholars offer ideas for how this ordering of identities due to salience can operate as “cross-cutting” or “nested” (Brewer, 1995; Ellemers & Rink, 2005) identities. Brewer (1995) describes cross-cutting identities as occurring when “social categorizations are external to the organization and overlap only partially with membership in the organization itself” (Brewer, 1995, p. 51). These kinds of identities can be associated with differences from the dominant identity group(s) in gender, culture, or age (Brewer, 1995, p. 51). However, it can also occur around other internal
organizational sub-group identities, such as department or functional group membership (Ellemers & Rink, 2005). Ellemers and Rink (2005) note that when individuals hold cross-cutting identities, “people can find themselves in an “either-or” situation, as different identities seem incompatible, and place conflicting demands on their time and efforts” (Ellemers & Rink, 2005, p. 6).

Brewer (1995) describes hierarchical or nested identities as occurring when “the salient categories are interdependent subgroups nested within a superordinate unit. This is most characteristic of organizations divided into functional units such as departments or divisions that are not only outcome interdependent at the superordinate level but also functionally interdependent at the subordinate level” (Brewer, 1995, p. 51). Nested identities would seem to be the form of multiple identities that would best support organizational objectives. However, Ellemers and Rink (2005) point out that many studies that indicate that sub-group identification tends to trump superordinate, larger group identification as it offers “a more distinct and salient identity (Ellemers & Rink, 2005, p. 5).

Ellemers and Rink (2005) note that situational factors or context plays a significant role in what identities become salient and influence positive or negative effects of nested or cross-cutting identities in work organizations. A serious threat to the organization can make a superordinate identity salient, and the nested or cross cutting subordinate identities may lose salience. On the other hand, for example, an individual’s religious identity may be cross-cutting, such as when they are absent for holy days while the organization is overloaded with work. However, such an identity can provide value to the organization in terms of understanding customers who share that identity.
Contemporary organizations are designed and managed to influence conceptions of identity (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006). However, organizations are populated by human beings with an agenda of meeting basic human social needs of belonging (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), self-esteem, control, and meaningful life (Williams, K. D., 1997). Thus, there is an inherent motivation to tie individually held identities to organizational identities. Multiple identities represent the ingredients constantly being added, subtracted and in some way integrated when an individual joins a work organization. The social identities in play can be categorically, culturally, or organizationally based, but they are defined and become salient in terms of the values, beliefs, norms of behavior and expectations embedded in an organization’s culture.

The Organization and its Culture

Hogg and Terry provide this definition of organizations at the level of intergroup processes: “Organizations are internally structured groups, which are located in complex networks of intergroup relations that are characterized by power, status, and prestige differentials “ (Hogg & Terry, 2001, p. 1). Organizations provide the social and physical infrastructure that brings and holds multiple groups together to accomplish goals that a single individual or group cannot accomplish alone (Clegg, et al., 2006). In this sense, organizations are inherently diverse in terms of the identities of its members. Within organizations, members come to some explicit and implicit understandings of how much diversity is permitted and how it is handled within. These understandings eventually become embedded in culture.
In the management literature, culture generally refers to the organization’s social infrastructure as well as processes, including cognitive, emotional, and interactive that embed and order relations within organizations. However, culture has eluded a single conceptualization and operationalization in the literature (Aaltio, Mills, & Mills, 2002; Davey & Symon, 2001). Pettigrew (1979) one of the forbearers of the concept of organizational culture, suggests that an organization’s culture encompasses a “family of concepts,” which include symbol, language, ideology, belief, ritual, and myth (Pettigrew, 1979, p. 574). Culture emerges as the group’s response to “functional problems of integration, control, and commitment” (Pettigrew, 1977, p. 574). Later scholars conceptualize culture as a context within organizations (Cox, 1993). Denison (1990, p. 2) defines organizational culture as “underlying values, beliefs and principles that serve as a foundation for the organization’s management system, as well as the set of management practices and behaviors that both exemplify and reinforce those principles.” O’Reilly and Chatman (1996) suggest that culture is a form of social control based on shared views and expectations about appropriate behavior of members of a group or organization. Members who uphold strong cultural values gain their colleagues’ acceptance; those who deviate are excluded (Chatman, J. A., Boisnier, Berdahl, & Spataro, 2005). Parker (2000) alludes to the connection between culture and identity saying that culture is process whereby claims are made that produce divisions between who is in and out of groups. Thus, organization culture reflects how members have come to resolve their differences as well as respond to the external demands and internal needs that brought them together in the first place. Culture provides the backdrop, in terms of structures and habitual social processes. Culture guides how work is done as well as the implicit
understandings of identity roles. Culture also reflects the prevailing values, beliefs, and behaviors to which organizational members adhere. I suggest that culture functions as a set of boundary conditions, which ends the negotiation (or fights) around identity and thus provides the stability needed for an organization to function and address (to varying degrees) a variety of internal needs of its members and external stakeholders. In relation to the organization, I suggest culture is best understood as the social dynamics that order relations in an organization.

The organization through its culture provides internal social structures around work processes (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006; Meyerson & Fletcher, 2003). It is also the location of policies that effect how different identity groups perceive their treatment (Cox, 1993; Nishii, Rich, & Woods, 2007), and is the location of practices that reinforce certain identities and marginalize others (Ely, R. J. & Meyerson, 2000; Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000). The culture influences what identities (individually held or shared by a group) become salient within and across sub-groups and the larger organization as members interact (Randel, 2000).

Culture can also maintain hierarchies of identities, and thus power relations. Depending on context, both in terms of culture and the presence of other groups, identity group boundaries can also blur, creating strange bedfellows in terms of coalitions and interest groups in organizations (Pfeffer, 1994). Conversely, the perceived need to establish or clarify in-group boundaries through culture can move even established in-group members towards exclusion (Chrobot-Mason & Thomas, 2002; Levine, et al., 2005). The way these interactions between salient identities and culture plays out relates
to three core aspects of the inclusion of difference in work organizations at the working level of day-to-day interactions.

Aspects of Inclusion in Organizations

Inclusion-Exclusion

Inclusion-exclusion provides a concept that separates individual or group level dynamics from policy, practices, and procedures, other contextual factors and culture (Levine, et al., 2005; Mor Barak, 2000). The concept of inclusion-exclusion, as described by social psychologists, encompasses the dynamics around an individual’s (or sub-group’s) movements closer to core, prototypical or full membership relative to a salient in-group identity. It also includes individual moves away or towards marginality and/or outsider status (Levine et al., 2005). Abrams, de Moura, Hutchison and Viki (2005, p. 167) explain, “Inclusive and exclusive reactions to particular group members will depend on whether they appear to be and in-group or out-group member and whether their behavior undermines or validates the in-group prescriptive norm.” The researchers differentiate between “denotative norms” and “prescriptive norms” (Abrams, de Moura, Hutchison and Viki, 2005, p. 165-166). Denotative norms relate to perceptions of an individual’s category membership based on visible characteristics such as physical appearance. “Norms that denote category membership may be strongly associated with judgments, but are not the sole basis for evaluation of in-group and out-group members (Abrams, de Moura, Hutchison and Viki, 2005, p. 166).” The other evaluation component
is prescriptive norms. These norms dictate the values, attitudes, and behavior for the in-group and out-group, as well as uphold “the validity of the group’s social standing (Abrams, de Moura, Hutchison and Viki, 2005, p. 166)”. Thus, violations of prescriptive norms will elicit a strong response from in-group members (Abrams, de Moura, Hutchison and Viki, 2005, p. 166). Prototypicality of in-group members is based on how well the member validates prescriptive norms of the group. The prototypical in-group member is viewed as a “pro-norm deviant” who is an exemplar or ardent supporter of the in-group prescriptive norms.

Inclusion-exclusion dynamics occur within the social boundaries of the organization and can shape or maintain the organization’s culture (Mor Barak, 2000; Wilson, 2000). Furthermore, Abrams, Hogg, and Marques (2005) also suggest that inclusion-exclusion is a dynamic phenomenon that occurs within several “contexts” or levels of analysis: transnational, societal, institutional, inter-group, intra-group, inter-personal, and intra-personal. Thus, inclusion-exclusion in this framework is assumed to occur relative to multiple identities with varying degrees of overlap.

One way to think about inclusion-exclusion within groups is as a go/no-go type of phenomenon, in which what Levine, Moreland and Hausmann (2005, p. 138) refer to as “boundary management.” Boundary management enforces the selection of individuals for group membership (Levine et al., 2005). In extreme cases of violation of group norms or threats to the identity of a group or organization, group boundaries can be quickly and publicly enforced via selection (or deselection) - for example, the very public and swift suspension of a U.S. National Football League star football player from the league for dog fighting. However, as Levine and colleagues (2005) point out, ongoing composition
management via inclusion-exclusion is not usually that simple or overt. Alternatively, inclusion-exclusion can be thought of as a continuum, in which even group members can vary in degree of inclusion in the group as a function of many factors, from social demographic or personality characteristics to seniority or prior group affiliations (Levine et al., 2005).

Levine, Moreland, and Hausmann (2005) offer three basic assumptions underlying the study of inclusion-exclusion in groups. “First we assume that both inclusion and exclusion occur in the context of an ongoing relationship between the individual and the group, during which the individual moves through several phases of group membership. Second, we assume that inclusion occurs when the individual’s perceived contributions to group goal attainment are positive, whereas exclusion occurs when the individual’s perceived contributions are negative. Finally, we assume that the valence and intensity of inclusion and exclusion are signaled by the individual’s role transitions between different phases of group membership” (Levine et al., 2005, p. 139). The researchers emphasize that the individual is not passive in these dynamics. The individual can embrace the efforts of the group, resist, or outright reject inclusion or exclusion efforts (Levine et al., 2005).

Research, mainly of a quasi-experimental nature, indicates that inclusion-exclusion dynamics can be induced around interactions such as who communicates directly with whom, who works or socializes together, who is invited or allowed to witness interactions between others, or who or what groups share and generate resources (McLaughlin-Volpe, Aron, Wright, & Lewandowski, 2005). Other inclusion-exclusion dynamics can occur in interaction with signs, symbols, and physical space. Such visual
inputs serve to signal identity boundaries (Elsbach, 2004). Other inputs to inclusion-exclusion dynamics are induced via context, like the presence of other groups, real or implied, (Abrams, de Moura, et al., 2005) and cultural cues (Wilson, 2000). However, the kinds of activities, the nature and quality of interactions and/or social processes that comprise inclusion-exclusion dynamics in more complex natural settings is underexplored in the management literature relating inclusion and diversity.

Integration Strategies

Early U.S. researchers and scholars studying what would come to be known as diversity in organizations refer to “integration” as central to the social inclusion of minorities into all aspects of work organizations (Fromkin & Sherwood, 1974). In terms foreshadowing an ongoing argument for the relevance of diversity to work organizations, Fromkin (1974) asserts that

“…the survival of modern organizations is dependent in part on their capacity to respond to current social problems, such as the successful integration of minority members of society. This objective can only be accomplished by providing them with real opportunities for achievement, recognition, and advancement into all managerial levels” (Fromkin, 1974, p.3).

Furthermore, Fromkin (1974) proposes that the key impediments to integration are prejudice and discrimination. Consistent with Allport’s (1954) contact hypothesis, Fromkin (1974) theorizes that prejudice and discrimination could be moderated by
creating organizational conditions, which reduces displays of prejudice and
discrimination, via tactics ranging from clear organizational sanctions for such behavior
to creating opportunities for positive contact. The result would be that, with respect to
race relations, “members of minority and majority groups [would] tend to know each
other as individuals rather than “whites” and “blacks” (Fromkin, 1974, p. 39).

Cox (1993) presents one of the most widely cited scholarly works linking
diversity with a broader conception of integration (before integration morphed into
inclusion). Cox (1993) outlines two forms of integration in organizations. First is
structural integration, which is defined in terms of diversity throughout levels of an
organization and particularly the attainment of formal positions of authority (Cox, 1993).
Structural integration tends be used as an indicator of equality both by some
organizational and management scholars (Cross, et al., 1994; Kalev, et al., 2006). Cox
(1993) also uses structural integration as indicative of the overall culture of an
organization, as he posits that mono-cultural organizations would have little structural
integration of under-represented categories and social groups from the larger society. On
the other hand, a multicultural organization would have significant representation of a
variety of social categories and social groups at the highest ranks of the organization
(Cox, 1993). Structural integration is used as an important indicator of advancement in
terms of equality and equity of marginalized social categories and groups in organizations
and society. For example, in a recent study, sociologists Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly (2006)
use structural integration as a measure of the effectiveness of diversity interventions.

Cox (1993) describes a second form of integration, which he refers to as informal
integration. Informal integration, according to Cox (1993), refers to access to
participation in informal groups within an organization. This participation consists of an individual’s access to informal communication networks and friendship ties (or social networks) and/or mentoring activity (Cox, 1993). Cox (1993) asserts, “Thus, full contribution of all organization members can be enhanced by action to facilitate equal access to, and effectiveness of, informal networks of organizations” (Cox, 1993. p. 206). Cox highlights the role of informal integration in promoting contributions from all members of a diverse workforce. Informal integration is assumed to support the structural integration of diverse organizational members by supporting improved effectiveness and improved qualifications for advancement.

Fromkin’s (1974) and Cox’s (1993) approach to integration focuses on how the organization and its culture can influence the integration of individuals representing various social categories and/or groups derived from outside of the organization. However, other scholars have looked at integration as more of a two-way dynamic between, for example, an individual and a group or organization (Dovidio, Gaertner, Hodson, Houlette, & Johnson, 2005). Quasi-experimental research conducted by these researchers suggests that individual or sub-group identities, culture (or context) and inclusion-exclusion dynamics influence social integration. Dovidio and colleagues (Dovidio et al., 2005) assert that these factors can result in strategies of social integration that an individual might assume to achieve or maintain membership in a larger social unit. These strategies are rooted in ideas from social identity theory (SIT). Per SIT, people categorize their own identity group(s) as superior to other groups and display a favorable bias towards their own group relative to other groups (Tajfel & Turner, 2007). Thus, in order to get individuals or groups to interact constructively, this inter-group bias
has to be overcome. The researchers offer two sets of general processes for reducing inter-group bias: one is decategorization the next is recategorization.

Decategorization can occur when individuals put aside each other's group identity(ies) and instead view each other as distinct individuals (Dovidio et al., 2005). Thus, people are de-identified in terms of social category groupings. One can argue that this would still require some recognition of the other person as belonging to the human category. However, the thrust of the theory is that negative or exaggerated positives about any category are avoided. Thus, category-based conflict is eliminated.

Recategorization, on the other hand, refers to a process of individuals or groups moving to a higher, more inclusive identity, referred to as a superordinate identity (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 248).

Explains Dovidio and colleagues, “In each case, [decategorization or recategorization] reducing the salience of the original inclusive-exclusive group boundaries is expected to decrease inter-group bias” (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 249). Experiments supported both decategorization and recategorization as strategies for reducing inter-group bias, suggesting that either can be the basis of integration of human social differences in the field (Dovidio et al., 2005).

The Common Group Identity Model (CGIM) suggests that both individuals and larger social units employ integration strategies based on decategorization and recategorization to achieve inclusion (Dovidio, Gaertner, Hodson, Houlette, & Johnson, 2005). Borrowing from a framework of the integration of minority groups into host societies by Berry (1984), Dovidio and colleagues (2005) blended the forms of social integration with the CGIM to create a model of strategies of recategorization to achieve
integration into an in-group (See Figure 1). This model reflects the ordering of multiple identities and produces cognitive, affective, and behavioral effects on the social unit assuming the strategy (Dovidio, Gaertner, Hodson, Houlette, & Johnson, 2005). Dovidio and colleagues (2005) present the model in terms of an individual seeking some degree of inclusion into a larger social unit. However, several of the strategies map to Cox’s (1993) organizational level strategies of inclusion, as well as Ely and Thomas’ (2001) findings on organization approaches to inclusion of diversity, suggesting that these strategies may be employed by the individual relative to an organization or the organization, via its culture, relative to the individual.

The first strategy of social integration involves decategorization. For example, individuals from several functional areas in an organization could disassociate from conceiving themselves as manufacturing, marketing, or engineering, and begin to view themselves and other in the work group as individuals with various characteristics unrelated to any particular functional identity. Dovidio and colleagues (2005) referred to this form of social integration as “Me/You” (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 249), in which subgroup and superordinate group identities both are of low salience (See Figure 1). The key problem with this approach is that it implies no identification with any group, even the larger organization, which in turn can produce marginalization relative to the larger social group. From my own experience, social categorization via decategorization could have been occurring in dedicated collocated work teams at my former employer. These teams frequently managed to overcome bias against members of the various functional areas and work together as individuals. However, sometimes these individuals also became isolated from their functional peers and, in the perception of some upper
managers, from the larger organization in terms of connecting to resources or meeting program-timing demands.

The next strategies of social integration all relate to the recategorization processes in which there is a superordinate identity, which is, to some degree, salient (See Figure 1). The first strategy is referred to as a two-group categorization, separatism, or “we/they,” in which subgroup identity is of high salience and superordinate identity is of low salience (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 249). At the individual level, an individual may hold, for example, a religious identity that becomes highly salient when s/he encounters cultural practices contrary to that identity in the workplace. The individual may maintain his or her organizational role (the less salient superordinate identity), but refrain from the organization’s cultural practice.

Based on my early observations of my former workplaces in the mid-to late 1980s, separatism at the organizational level was a strategy aimed at maximizing outcomes of different functional activities and avoiding conflict (See Figure 1). The thinking was that if each activity optimized its part, the product would come together in the end. Interacting with other functions simply produced conflict. Thus, separation was used as a form of reducing inter-group conflict that would otherwise have to be managed throughout the design process. Separatism also theoretically aided in reinforcing professional competency in specific skill areas, producing people who were very skilled in narrow areas. These identities were maintained together under a common organizational umbrella, with their ability to stay under that umbrella predicated on their very separation. The disadvantages of this approach became clear when it was time to
launch products, the components of which often did not go together without many modifications and a heavy hammer!

This approach to integration can also be seen at an organizational level in sex segregation of work roles or specialty divisions of organizations, which focus on a particular ethnic market, as Pepsi did with the “Negro salesmen” of the 1950s (Knowledge@Wharton, 2007). Again, it can be argued that this approach allows specialization and reduces identity conflict and conflict from differing approaches to the work. The organization can also generally appear to be diverse and inclusive. In terms of culture, Ely and Thomas referred to organizations with this approach to diversity as maintaining an “access and legitimacy perspective” on diversity (Dovidio et al., 2005).

The next form of social integration, is referred to as “one group” or assimilation, in which a superordinate identity is highly salient and sub-identity salience is low or discarded completely (Dovidio, Gaertner, Hodson, Houlette, & Johnson, 2005) (See Figure 1). At the individual level, this involves assuming an organizationally defines or evokes identity, such as company employee, over an individual or subgroup identity such as Muslim woman or project team member.

Cox (1993) suggests that the dominant approach to the integration of social demographic differences like race and gender has result in what he terms “monolithic” and “plural” organizations. Recall, these are organizations in which members of various categories are expected to assume the norms, behaviors, and even appearances of one dominant social category or cultural identity within the organization (Dovidio et al., 2005). Dovidio and colleagues’ (2005) studies support Cox’s assertion. They found that whites, who were members of the dominant identity group in the organization, tended to
prefer “emphasis on a single, assimilated, colorblind entity for the majority group” (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 260). A strong superordinate identity does appear to better support organizational outcomes.

Dovidio et al. (2005) referred to the forth form of social integration as “two subgroups in one group” or “Us+them = We”, “same team” or “pluralistic integration” (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 249, 251) (See Figure 1). In this form, salience of a superordinate identity and sub-group identity is high. Dovidio and colleagues (2005) found that minority group members who held strong sub-group identities tended to prefer this approach to integration, at least initially. Cox’s multicultural organization perhaps best exemplifies the results of this form of integration. This concept is also very similar to the idea of full inclusion, as the integration of valued aspects of the individual’s held identities into her or his work (Ferdman, 2004). Pluralistic integration would seem to be the idea approach to social integration. However, as indicated earlier, pluralistic integration may not be the preferred form of integration for majority group members (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 260). Also, another interesting finding is that even when the organization supported a same team approach to integration of minority identities, the best predictor of longer-term retention in the university they studied was whether these individuals eventually assimilated into a superordinate identity (Dovidio et al., 2005). Therefore, either organizational social systems are not able to sustain the same team approach over time, or minority members eventually choose success within the larger group over maintaining a sub-identity. Alternatively, perhaps the sub-group identity becomes so integrated in to the superordinate identity, that there is no basis for maintaining it as unique to the sub-group (Davidson & Ferdman, 2001). In other words,
the superordinate identity itself is redefined, such that more individuals are included and can contribute to the group. This last possibility is elaborated on by Ely and Thomas (2001) in what they call the learning and integration approach to diversity in organizations. They suggest that organizations that truly integrate differences learn and change in response to the differences offered by various identity groups and incorporate this learning into work processes and organizational functions.

Figure 1 Strategies of Integration
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Last, the shift in form of integration over time could also indicate that multiple forms of social integration can be at play within and between organizational subgroups. This later factor complicates the project of full acceptance of capable individuals in work organizations and thwarts efforts to understand how a given form of integration that occurs within organizations may influence individual and/or organizational outcomes (Suarez-Orozco, 2002).

Little research explores how inclusion-exclusion dynamics are linked to different strategies of social integration that may occur in work organizations. Studies by Dovidio and colleagues in laboratory and in university settings suggest that both assimilation and pluralistic integration play a role in the inclusion of socially marginalized identities (Dovidio et al., 2005). They suggest that pluralistic integration might result when early interactions between in-group and out-group members are characterized by openness to the differences of the out-group. However, over time, out-group members appear to assimilate to in-group norms. What is not clear from their study is whether out-group members are assimilating to an unchanged in-group identity, or if the in-group identity has shifted to facilitate integration of the out-group member(s). The former outcome implies that pluralistic integration is not sustainable, which would call into question one of the key tenets of inclusion and diversity rhetoric. If everyone eventually assimilates to the status-quo, where is the impetuous for innovation and creativity via new ideas and perspectives? Increasing the chances of sustained pluralistic integration appears to require a shift the in-group identity.
Thus, the interaction between perceived strategies of integration employed by the individual and/or those of the organization is under-explored. Nishii and colleagues (Nishii, Rich, & Woods, 2007) touch on this in their model of inclusion, which attempts to compare the perceptions of individuals on their own degree of inclusion, to those of organizational managers, and then assess any perceptual gaps. However, this approach does not inform us either of how identity might shape these respective perceptions nor inform us of integration strategies being employed by the individual. Thus, creating interventions addressing any perceptual gap remains a challenge.

*Power*

Several social psychologists have suggested a different approach to power that may shed light on the implications of integration strategies in work organizations. This conception of power is not based on in-group (or aspiring in-group) members’ ability to control resources, ostensibly through formal positions of authority. Instead, these scholars suggest the source of power in organizations is based on the degree of adherence by targets of power to a superordinate identity. Thus, the nature of the superordinate identity becomes pivotal in the development and maintenance of power relations.

“Power is inscribed in the core organizational achievement. If it were not, there would be nothing to remark on because, *whether for good or evil*, the social relations that constitute organization, the collecting together and coordinating of
individual wills, endeavors and energies, would not occur” (Clegg, Courpasson & Phillips, 2006, pp. 2-3).

Some scholars assert that power is inherent in organizational life (Clegg, et al., 2006; Pfeffer, 1994; Turner, 2005). In sociology-based definitions of inclusion, it is defined in relation to both exclusion and power. In defining inclusion, Dictionary of Sociology refers the reader to “closure” ("Inclusion", Scott, & Marshall, 2005). The entry for closure states: “Closure functions through the twin mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion and can be founded upon individualistic or collective criteria. It is based on the power of one group to deny access to reward, or positive life chances, to another group on the basis of criteria which the former seek to justify” ("Closure", Scott, & Marshall, 2005). Hence, inclusion can be understood as an individual or collectively based phenomenon that is dialogically in relation to exclusion and is inextricability linked to the exercise of power in human relationships.

However, as (Mirchandani & Butler, 2006) points out, power is not directly considered in conjunction with inclusion in management literature concerning diversity, except perhaps in terms of attainment positions of formal authority (Cox, 1993) or works alluding to influence via participation (Pelled, et al., 1999; Prasad, 2001). Particularly, in the diversity and effectiveness research, the analysis of power appears to have explicitly fallen by the wayside. Given the possible interdependent nature of diversity, effectiveness, and power, the practical implication of this omission is that a significant influence on the success of inclusion initiatives, whether intended to be ethical or improve effectiveness may be missed.
Power, depending on how it is defined, has long been of interest to organizational scholars and managers. Inclusion of diversity is inherently about the collecting, coordinating and direction of, what can be different wills, endeavors, and energies. Who can initiate, and constitute these efforts and whose goals prevail is essentially what power is about in a work context. It would seem that a full conception of inclusion in relation to diversity cannot be accomplished without considering power. However, power does not play a prominent role in theories of inclusion of diversity, when it does; it appears to be treated in ways consistent with what has been called a dependency-based model of power. The dependency-based model obscures our understanding of how power relations can emerge and change.

The dependency based model of power posits that, to use Dahl’s (1957) nomenclature, one individual or group labeled B, needs material or social resources from individual or group labeled A. Therefore, B must comply with A’s directives, desires or wishes in order to have access to the needed resource (Blau, 1986; Clegg, et al., 2006; Simon & Oakes, 2006). Because of A’s control of resources needed by B, A can control the flow of rewards (or punishments) relative to B and maintain an ability to exercise power, whether it be directly through interaction or indirectly via the design and implementation of social systems. Thus, power is framed in terms of outcome control and as a “structural characteristic of social interaction rather than an outcome of social interaction” (Simon & Oakes, 2006, p. 107). Turner (2005) notes that the “standard theory” of power from social psychology, “…defines power as the capacity to influence and argues that it is based upon the influencing agent’s control of resources desired or valued by the target“ (Turner, 2005, p.2).
Scholars note several weaknesses of the dependency-based view of power. The first involves “power over” vs. “power through.” Both Turner (2005) and Simons and Oakes (2006) note that whereas dependency-based power assumes conflictual relations and power as control over others, there is also “power through,” which characterizes “collective organization” and the direction of a “collective will” (Turner, 2005 p. 6) or “consensus” as asserted by Simon and Oakes (2006). This difference is particularly important with respect to contemporary work organizations in which surveillance and control of a worker’s movements is expensive and counterproductive, particularly in work requiring real-time decision-making, creativity, and innovation.

Another interesting weakness of the dependency-based model of power is that it appears to ignore the possibility that the exercise of power through, whether consensual or conflictual, might occur based on some prior relationship between A and B. Otherwise, the resources in play would have no shared meanings to either party. In conceptualizing power as structurally based and embedded in formal positions of authority or in status relations, the shared meanings made around rewards and punishments are ignored (Simon and Oakes 2006). These shared meanings take theorizing back to some prior shared identity, not the resources themselves.

The Traditional Location of Power in Diversity Theory. Embedded in the concept of inclusion is the idea that different individuals have unique perspectives and experiences that they can bring to the work and that managers and leaders in organizations the need to create work cultures in which people feel they belong (Cox, 2001; Ferdman, 2004; Miller & Katz, 2001; Nishii et al, 2007). The objective of these efforts being increased representation of a diverse range of social category identities
throughout organizational ranks and effectiveness of the individual in executing organizational objectives. In other words, inclusion of diversity in the management literature is about the recruitment of human agency towards organizational objectives. Thus, also embedded in the concept of inclusion is power and power relations. However, since the elicitation of human agency is in the name of organizational objectives, such power falls under the purview of what scholars have viewed as the legitimate exercise of management authority (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006). Thus, “inclusion” in management thinking as been generally been viewed as the opportunity to offer one’s agency, skills, abilities, experience, or perspectives to the organization, but not material participation in determining how this agency will be directed. Power as authority is linked to attainment of some formal position within an organization’s hierarchy. Cox (1993) is most explicit in linking power as authority to formal positions in organizations with his explanation of “structural integration” or the objective of diversifying the people within formal authority ranks within an organization. The goal of moving underrepresented, socially less powerful representatives into positions of formal power in organizations has also been linked to the goal of empowering these groups within the larger society. If inclusion ultimately relies on structural integration, prospects for equality and equity are increasingly bleak as organizations become flatter. Green (2005) points out that the flattening of organizations has made formal positions scarcer, thus reducing opportunities for the exercise of power through such means.

Furthermore, task completion, communication, and social power have come to depend on informal social networks within these flatter organizations. Green (2005) points out that women and people of color tend to be outside of these social networks,
which operate like a new boys and (and girls) club. Thus, the flattening of organizations has perhaps not only pushed down decision-making, but also strengthened the influence of informal power networks at lower levels of the organization. A purely structural view of power is not adequate for supporting or assessing the career success of individuals in organizations, particularly those who may be more likely to be excluded from such networks due to social category or other personal identities.

Diversity scholars have not ignored these informal relations. Cox’s (1993) informal integration represents an attempt to pull informal relations of power into the spotlight of authority relations via several structural and process interventions such as formal mentoring programs, diversity councils, and affinity groups. Lack of access to informal relations has been cited as an impediment to structural integration (Cain, et al., 2001; Fort, 1993; Johnsrud, 1994; Murrell, 1999; Powell, 1999; Smith, D. M., 2000). Again, however, the resource-based view of power leaves open the question of the basis of selection of resources to deploy as well as where this personal influence comes from. In short, the social basis of power, whether power is called authority or influence, is missing.

However the most threatening implication of the dependency-based power approach for inclusion of diversity theory and practice is that pluralistic integration, which inherently depends on some renegotiation of a superordinate identity, could never take place without the “Us” and “Them” in play having either equal power or no dependence on each other. For example, assume there is interest in the pluralistic integration of a minority group into an organization. Minority group members tend to populate lower ranks and exercise less power via authority than majority group members.
(Ragins, 1997, p. 488). Per a dependency-based power model, minority group members must therefore be dependent on resources controlled by the majority members. In the case of an organizational context with the goal of efficiency, would not the majority members (A) simply exert their will over minority members (B) and maintain the subordination of B’s identity via assimilation? Would this not be a rational and logical course of action and be in the interest of organizational objectives? Countering the argument for assimilation, diversity scholars and practitioners have advocated for an equalizing of power between salient identity groups, through top-down structural and informal integration initiatives, such as mentoring, diversity councils, training and management objectives (Fromkin & Sherwood, 1974). It is interesting to note the intervention found to be most effective, mentoring, which is aimed at informal integration, results in the structural integration of those who share social category identifications with the dominant identities vs. those who do not (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). This finding suggests that some other social process at work besides dependence in power relations.

As an alternative, other scholars suggest that dependency relationships are a red herring (Turner, 2005). They assert that the dynamics that left A with valued resources began well before a dependency relationship with B was established. These scholars relocate power in identity instead of dependency.

Identity as the Basis of Power in Organizations

Based on literature from political science, sociology, and political philosophy, Turner (2005), and Simon and Oakes (2006) propose alternative approaches to power.
Furthermore, consistent with trends in the diversity literature (Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003), identity is not viewed as a single self conception, but in terms of an ordering of multiple identities based on outcomes of social interactions and resulting collective constructions of reality.

**Turner’s Theory of Identity and Power.** Turner (2005) suggests “a three-process theory of persuasion, authority, and coercion” in which the nature of power is defined as “having more to do with the basis of organized, collective action, than to do with a dependence relationship” (Turner, 2005, p. 2). In Turner’s model, psychological group formation (the emergence of a shared identity) is the beginning of the path to power in the form of both influence and control, and subsequent access to command of resources. This does not preclude other identities an individual or group may hold, but identities are superordinate or subordinated in a given context. Turner (2005) asserts the widely accepted role of social identity in the formation of a shared identity and group processes of influence, cooperation and cohesion, and explains that it is this shared identity that leads to influence derived from “collective attempts by the group to develop a consensual response to some stimulus situation” (Turner, 2005, p.10).

In Turner’s theory, group members seek to influence each other via persuasion, exercise of authority and, if all else fails, coercion. Persuasion, per Turner (2005), is power as influence and is about convincing people that the exercise of power by A is “correct, right, moral, and appropriate” (Turner, 2005, p. 6). It is about “changing people’s private beliefs and attitudes” (Turner, 2005, p. 8). Thus, persuasion is around “negotiating and validating reality collectively within one’s reference groups” (Turner, 2005, p. 5). People act of their own free will as motivated human agents. (Turner, 2005,
Persuasion is employed “to the degree that they [the influence target] are perceived as relatively prototypical of the emerging consensus” (Turner, 2005, p.10.). Or in other words, persuasion is used when individuals or groups are viewed by members of reference groups as being a group member. The closer to prototypicality relative to the desired group identity, the more likely power-exercising agents are to employ persuasion as a means to recruitment of agency.

Next Turner (2005) suggests that power can also be exercised as control, and one way this is accomplished is via legitimate authority. In this case Turner defines control as “the capacity to get people to do what one wants where they are not persuaded or are uninterested in validity of the specific belief or act” (Turner, 2005, p. 8). A legitimate authority is one who is seen as having a right to define beliefs, attitudes, or actions of the group. The ability to influence via authority is also based on relative prototypicality, but hinges on group members’ belief “that it is right for a certain person to control them in certain matters” (Turner, 2005, p.11). This authority can be conferred via formal role, group norms, or group values (Turner, 2005, p. 8). However, Turner (2005) asserts that acquiescence to authority is still voluntary relative to the collective will, thus, it is not necessarily experienced as oppression or loss of power by the target. In fact, this acceptance of the will of authority can be experienced as empowering in that it advances the goals of one’s group. Turner explains, “Because the power of authority flows from its designation as expressing the collective will of the group, obedience can produce pride and a sense of empowerment when one’s collective identity is salient” (Turner, 2005, p. 11).
Turner (2005) describes coercion as “authority in a dark mirror” (Turner, 2005, p. 12). Control is exercised against the will of the target, but is still consistent with higher order collective goals. This is a tricky conception, thus an example follows. In the U.S., many people oppose the U.S. role in Iraq and do not wish for their tax dollars go to fund an operation that they oppose. However, as U.S. citizens, they may view it as their obligation to pay taxes, thus they voluntarily, without the need for the government to actually impose penalties or jail time, pay the full tax. Thus, Turner (2005) asserts, “Being controlled is not the same as acting against one’s will.” He differentiates between acting based on a collective will and personal will. Power in the form of control and exercised as authority or coercion both depend on some degree of people’s identification with a higher order identity and response to a collective will, with authority eliciting a response viewed as consistent with one’s goals and coercion conflicting with or limiting the target’s goal attainment.

Last, coercion does require the deployment of human and material resources to control behavior. However, Turner (2005) emphasizes that this control “is not based on resource control, but a conflictual attempt at control given that one cannot influence. It is defined more by the conflictual relationship than the deployment of resources” (Turner, 2005, p. 12). Turner (2005) asserts that the nature of the identity relationship constitutes a reward or punishment. In other words, rewards and punishments moderate the conflict, not produce it. Even A’s ability to exercise power through coercion depends on their influence and authority with respect to other Bs. “Coercion depends on influence and authority in that the source must have influence and authority over those willing to be its coercive agents” (Turner, 2005, p. 12.). Thus, again power is not possible without a
shared identity. However, now Turner begins to hint at how identity dynamics of
categorization can influence who becomes the coercive agent and who is the coerced
target. The separation of an identity group from a superordinate identity makes them a
target of coercion (Turner, 2005).

Overall, Turner suggests that, “Any group facing complex task and changing
realities is likely to require all three processes of power to organize its activity and
preserve its integrity” (Turner, 2005, p. 14).

**Simons and Oakes on Identity and Power.** Simon and Oakes’ (2006) model of
the identity basis of power expands some of the ideas presented by Turner (2005). They
also note the generative aspects of power, suggesting that, “… the base definition of
power of social power cannot restrict the process to ideas about ‘power over’, but must
start with specification of the nature of social ‘energy’ then consider its production and
consequences” (Simon & Oakes, 2006, p. 113). Thus, in their model power itself is a
neutral force, but can be deployed in ways that create relations of domination or mutual
benefit. Like Turner (2005), Simon and Oakes (2006) assert that the basis of social power
is the recruitment of human agency through a shared identity. Simon and Oakes (2006)
elaborate explaining, “…social actors access multi-level identities and associated
interests, goals, values, and so forth. Shared identity provides the vital social
psychological infrastructure for consensus and influence; where identity differentiates;
there is the potential for conflict and the resort to coercion. This produces a dynamic
social psychological context in which power – agency recruitment- must adapt its tactics
to identity conditions” (Simon and Oakes, 2006, p. 116)
Simon and Oakes suggest that power is produced through both “consensual processes (influence) and conflictual processes (coercion)” (Simon & Oakes, 2006, p. 116). Furthermore, “Salient higher-level identification increases the likelihood of consensual power, …Salient identities as A and B make conflictual power – the domination of B – more likely” (Simon and Oakes, 2006, p. 116). Simon and Oakes are quick to note that this “domination” “still involves consensus, because the resources or types of capital that A uses to dominate B must still be anchored in a consensus concerning their meaning, value and legitimacy. Such consensus, in turn, is indicative of, and made possible by, a higher-level identity shared by A and B” (Simon and Oakes, 2006, p. 116-117).

Simon and Oakes suggest that consensual and conflictual aspects of power relations are manifest through four “faces” or dimensions of power. The first face of power is employed when relations are conflictual due to the salient different identities and relate interests of A and B. Thus, for A to recruit B’s agency, A must use available resources. However, the value of these resources to B is still based on some higher-level identity shared with A. Similarly, face two power is employed when different identities of A and B are salient. In this case, however, the conflict organized out via organizational systems and A’s ability to recruit B’s agency is organized in. Again, a shared superordinate identity between A and B makes face two power possible. Thus, face one and two power can be viewed as corresponding to Turner’s (2005) cohesive power and the ordering of identities within the integration strategy of separation.

Simon and Oakes’ (2006) third face of power corresponds to Luke’s (2005) third face of power in that some notion of shared identity and interests between A and B is in
play. However, Simon and Oakes find Luke’s assertion of B’s lack of consciousness of his or her real interests to be problematic. Instead, they suggest that lower level identities can still be salient and a source of conflict, but a shared superordinate identity stimulates real shared interests. In so far as the superordinate identity is salient, A can exercise power through B. As conceived by Simons and Oakes, the third face of power corresponds to Turner’s (2005) influence and persuasion. Simons and Oakes (2005) do not address how the salient, superordinate identity might emerge between A and B, thus leaving open the possibility that such an identity might be based on pluralistic integration.

Face four power involves the advancement of salient and superordinate identity, which overrides and marginalizes subordinate identities as in assimilation in the Dovidio and colleagues model (2005) and use of authority in Turner’s model (2005). Rather than manipulating or seeking shared interests, A may attempt to legitimize the use of authority by targeting (or making salient) a shared superordinate identity with B (Simon & Oakes, 2006). Thus, “consensual agency recruitment” that is power through others with no deployment of resources, system assistance, or shared interests is made possible (Simons & Oakes, 2006, p. 119). This form of power is easily seen in appeals to a national identity in the political arena during wartime. However, it can also be seen in organizations within functional areas or professional domains. Simon and Oakes (2006) note that exercise of this form of power is still possible, even when conflictual relations between A and B are present. If Bs hold an identity related, connected, or nested in the superordinate identity, even when Bs hold a sub-identity, their attachment to the superordinate identity can still be more salient, thus, face four power can still be deployed by A (Simons & Oakes, 2006).
Thus, the identity approach to power suggests that the degree of inclusion of
difference in work organizations is reflected, not only in access to resources or in a secure
position in the organizational system, but also in the degree of shared interests and
influence in shaping a prevailing shared identity.

Members of 21st century work organizations face the challenge of finding ways of
incorporating the multiple identities of individuals and groups into their organizations.
This conceptual framework attempts to capture the concepts central to the social process
of incorporating differences, into work organizations. By bringing power explicitly into
the framework, the purpose of organizations as human agency directing social entities is
acknowledged and linked to the project of inclusion.
This framework summarized in Figure 2 stimulates the following more detailed research questions about organizational inclusion:
What are the relationships between identity, inclusion-exclusion dynamics, and an organization’s culture in creating inclusion?

What are the implications of inclusion strategies employed among individuals and groups within organizations?

How might organizational members’ access and responses to power relate to their salient individual and/or group level identities in a work organization?
Chapter 4  Research Study

In the prior chapters, I explored the concept of inclusion as it has been conceptually developed and researched thus far in the management literature. Then in Chapter 3 I introduced a conceptual framework of inclusion that identified and elaborated on three aspects of the inclusion concept important to the project of including difference in work organizations. This chapter begins the presentation of a research project that I designed as an empirical exploration of the connections between the concepts within the conceptual framework. I then used this exploration to support the development of an expanded theoretical model of organizational inclusion.

Study Approach

The research study reflects the following assumptions about diversity in work organizations:

- Salient identities in work organizations may or may not map to social demographic categories such as age or gender.

- Identities can pre-exist membership in an organization, but can also be reshaped or even redefined through organizational interactions.
- Social units at any level of system (individual, group, organizational) engage in two-way integration strategies with regard to a target social unit.

- Identity based power is endemic to processes of organizational inclusion.

I chose the case study approach because it allowed me to address several goals in the research design. The first goal was to allow exploration of what Livtin (1997) described as “the psychological and sociological complexities at play in the social construction of organizational experience” (Livtin, 1997, p. 206). Since the elements within the conceptual framework likely interacted in complex ways in ongoing work settings, an approach open to exploring that complexity was called for.

Second, I wanted to collect data from participants that allowed them to articulate the identities that were salient to them in their terms. The case study approach allowed exploration of identities as expressed by participants, as opposed to guesses or assumptions on the part of the researcher. This is particularly important when looking at multiple identities and salience. While a demographic identity might attract the researcher to a setting because it presents an important variable, that same identity might not be salient or relevant to participants. The lack of salience or relevance of an identity might be of interest in and of itself. By collecting qualitative data and employing qualitative analysis approaches, I was able to locate value, belief, and norm configurations, which pointed to different identities in hierarchal relationship to each other that might otherwise have gone unexplored.
Third, the cultural aspect of the conceptual framework required an understanding of the context. As much as possible, I wished to keep context constantly on the table throughout the project. Johns (2006) argues that context is not adequately recognized or its influence appreciated by management and organizational researchers. Abrams and colleagues (2005) showed that context, even in the form of referent groups within a social system, is important in intra-group inclusion-exclusion dynamics. Among John’s recommendations for remedying this absence of context, is the use of qualitative data, which can allow for a fuller identification of context influences and their interactions (Johns, 2006, p. 402). Case studies can be employed as a qualitative approach that is suited to the study of the range of contextual factors within the case boundaries (Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003). Yin (2003) explains, “...you would use the case study method because you deliberately wanted to cover contextual conditions – believing that they might be highly pertinent to your phenomenon of study” (Yin, 2006, p. 13). The particular contextual conditions for this study relate to culture as discussed in an earlier chapter.

Fourth, cases studies are not limited to any particular type of data or qualitative method. Data used in case studies can be qualitative or quantitative in nature. Case studies can employ primary or secondary data. The data analysis is not limited to a long narrative account, such as in ethnographic studies. It can be employed to answer “what” and “how” questions relative to particular phenomena occurring in the field under conditions I that cannot control (Yin, 2003). These features made the case study approach appealing, given the questions, settings, and data that comprise this study.
The Professional Context

The study departments were drawn from two professional sub-groups. One department was basic science focused, the other applied science focused. I refer to participants from both departments as scientists. These general descriptors allowed me to present more data and protect anonymity of participants (APA, 2001). This approach also allowed me to consider the data relative to the larger context of professions and professional identity. These departments were embedded in organizations, and subject to organizational constraints. However, the construction of the professional identity influences the prospects of entrants to professions (Abrahamson, 1967). Professionalism creates an intergroup context that influences individually held personal and social identities (Abrahamson, 1967; Bruni & Gherardi, 2002). Social scientists have traced the similarities between professionals in knowledge intensive fields such as scientific research, medicine, law, and engineering (Abrahamson, 1967; Dent & Whitehead, 2002; Derber, Schwartz, & Margrass, 1990). As such, I will discuss the professional context shared by the two study departments.

In the twentieth century, professions emerged and became coveted occupations in the U.S. and other industrialized, knowledge-based economies (Derber, et al., 1990). Professions are viewed as providing a path toward development of full human potential, because a professional identity is based on acquisition of expert knowledge, not capital or use of physical might (Derber, et al., 1990). Advancement into professions by women and socially excluded minority groups in the U.S. represented a ticket out of social
oppression and access to status, high income, and power. In phrasing that reflected the times (mid-1960s, U.S.), Abramhamson (1967, p. 18) reported, “Even in the slums of St. Louis, poverty-stricken Negro teenagers indicated that they would rather be a doctor than anything else! They feel that this would gain them more status from their friends and please their mothers.”

The nature of the construction of professions afford professionals status, privilege, and autonomy, which is typically not enjoyed by out-groups who Derber, Schwartz and Margrass (1990) refer to as “the uncredentialed” (Derber, et al., 1990, p. 4). The classic view of professions positions the professional as holding status in society and in organizations based on expert knowledge and the associated formal credentials (Derber, et al., 1990). These credentials are earned via a course of extensive formal education, under three conditions described by Abrahamson. Conditions generally include "smaller classes, more seminars in place of lectures, and greater personal contact between students and professors,” the higher the level of professional training. Furthermore, professional training promotes formation of “solitary peer groups.” These groups include fraternal associations, distinctive titles, and dress characteristics (Abrahamson, 1967, p. 17) These groups act to develop "professional self concepts" (Abrahamson, 1967, p. 17). This socialization "results in the student's development of a self-concept which is tied to his profession, this internalized conception becomes manifest in overt behaviors which communicate to others the professional competence of the actor” (Abrahamson, 1967, p. 19). Central to the conception of a professional is expertise, and expertise means autonomy. It is this autonomy that organizational structural framing of tasks most threatens. Yet, despite the onslaughts of Business
Process Reengineering, information technology and regulation, professionals at the highest levels still maintain status, command high compensation, and eke out a degree of autonomy that lower and non professionals do not enjoy (Derber, et al., 1990; Kerfoot, 2002). However, this privilege is never secure. The pressures of the work itself, the need for social validation and information from peers, particularly in science, the maintenance of expert knowledge (or its appearance), and visible commitment to the craft in terms of long hours, present constant threats (Derber, et al., 1990).

The Settings

The settings were selected with several factors in mind. One was the desire to work with a social unit with an ongoing culture, purpose, and structures indicative of an organization, but also being the location of ongoing interactions. These interactions could determine an individual’s or sub group’s inclusion within that organization. This criterion was met by targeting departments within larger organizations. These departments at sizes of 16 and 18 respectively were large enough to function as organizations and contain multiple identity sub-groups, but small enough to provide a reasonable scale for a single researcher project. The second factor was a desire to study organizations reflecting some indicators of successful inclusion of multiple social categories. Though social category distinctions such as race, do not always mesh with the identities an observer may assume an individuals of that category may hold (Cox, 1993), social category differences do track to certain culture, life stage or social roles, which reflect various personal identities. Thus, my assumption was that organizations, which had been successful in attracting,
retaining, and advancing individuals from a visibility different social category than traditional incumbent members, might have successfully incorporated aspects of these identities or created strong cultures of assimilation. Either case was of interest to me. Third, the practical problem underpinning this entire study is that of including social category differences in work organizations, thus organizations that had significant success in achieving this might yield useful insights.

In the course of conducting funded research and consulting, I found the two sites from which to collect data. Both were knowledge intensive departments, which employed scientists at the PhD level. The activities in both departments centered on research, teaching, training, and support for applied science. I will refer to activities in support of applied science as client consulting in this study. However, the prioritization of the mix of activities was different between the departments. One department was basic science research oriented and operated within a university. The second department focused on client services within a research and teaching hospital. One department was also about 10 years older than the other was. However, the work in both departments represented relatively new fields of science. Both departments maintained a record of accomplishment of excellent performance, with members earning awards and recognition in their respective scientific areas.

Study Participants

Though the identities of interest in this study were to be defined by the participants as much as possible, several social demographic features of members of the
respective departments did provide markers of difference (Merrill-Sands, et al., 2003).

Each department had retained 100% of its female members across ethnic and racial origins. In one of the departments, a woman had advanced to chair. Both departments had retained and had advanced women, one across racial and ethnic categories. The Chairs of both departments at the time of the study were white, as were their successors.

Demographically, women represented approximately 41% of the total study participants, but 30% of the professional scientists. 82% of the participants were white. 74% were also U.S. born. Between both departments, 26% of participants were non U.S. born from Western European, Pacific-Rim, and Middle Eastern countries.

In setting one, twenty-six participants were interviewed including the department chair, all scientists at all ranks, active secondary scientist to the department, research staff, administrative staff, s, and scientists in training referred to as fellows.

The department in the second setting consisted of 18 scientists. All 18 consented to interviews. The one senior administrative staff person was also interviewed. Access to other individuals in the setting was limited by the administrative constraints and the scope of contracted work in the setting. However, three of the scientists had also been fellows in the department, thus providing some perspectives on the pre-full scientist experience within the department.

Data Collection

During case study research, the range of methods of obtaining data is open to the researcher and gathering data from as many sources as possible is encouraged (Maxwell,
Most of the data was collect through interviews. In addition, archival data, department records, and direct observation data was collected in both sites.

The data collection for setting one occurred as follows. I obtained the history of the department, from its inception to 2002, from department annual reports, various archival documents relating to the founding of the department, and university reports that profiled the department and its accomplishments. The archival records also contained eleven years of the chair’s Annual Reports and included arrivals and departures of faculty, goals, and accomplishments of the department. I also obtained data from the department website, which included faculty backgrounds, student outcomes, department activities, contact information, and reported rankings.

Following Bickman & Rog’s (1997) recommendations, I conducted direct observation of department seminars, meetings, routine lab work, and casual interactions in halls and offices. Direct observation consisted of overt observation, occasional inquiry about observed activities and recording of descriptive, non-interpretive notes. Participants were notified of the observation schedule in advance. The researcher also engaged in observation between scheduled interviews and at various times during and after regular work hours.

A semi-structured interview protocol was employed through which participants were asked to describe critical incidents of engagement, interactions with the chair and other faculty, and perceptions of their work. Most of the interviews were taped and then transcribed. Seven interviews were not taped due to participants’ discomfort; in these cases, I made notes during the interviews. After each interview, whether taped or not, I
wrote notes regarding ideas, emerging concepts, additional questions, and other general
observations. See Appendix 1 for the General Interview Guide used in setting one.

In setting two, the original objective of data collection was to create a current
state analysis of the impact of one of the department chair’s initiatives. I conducted
recorded interviews with all but one of the scientists with primary affiliations with the
department. The recorded interviews were approximately 40 minutes to 1.5 hours in
length. Each interview was transcribed and de-identified. I collected information about
each participant, such as years of service, rank, ethnicity, and gender. However,
individual names and references to the organization were deleted. This study will employ
this de-identified data. The interview guide itself consisted of five questions with
structured prompts and structured and unstructured probes based on the same interview
guide used for Site One. See Appendix 2 for interview guide.

I gathered public documents to confirm the effectiveness of the department in
terms of its scientific work. Observations of the environment at the case study site were
also conducted before, during and after interviews. Consistent with recommendations for
non-participatory observation, during visits to the site, I noted the physical setting,
working conditions, symbols and displayed artifacts, coffee room communication and
interactions between participants.

The consulting aspect of data collection only required solicitation of the
scientist’s perspectives about the impact of the initiatives. However, in anticipation of
possibly using the data for dissertation research I based the interview protocol on the
interview guide used in for setting one. This open-ended protocol provided the
opportunity to collect additional data about participants’ interactions with peers in the
department, the emergence of the department’s culture, perceived relations with other organizational subgroups and organizational leadership, work processes, and values, beliefs and norms which participants held individually and/or believed were held collectively within the department.

After an extensive review of the literature on culture and inclusion in the social science literature, I recognized that the data from both sites could perhaps yield further insights around the concepts of interest in this framework. Thus, both data sets, which consisted of interviews, secondary data, and observation data were employed in this study.

Data Analysis

There are many approaches to case study analysis (Creswell, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003) depending on whether the purpose is exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory. However, Yin (2003) emphasizes that what is most important to the researcher to have a strategy for analysis of the data. Strategies help to keep the analysis aligned with the central purpose of the study, even as additional questions and interesting trends in the data may surface (Yin, 2003, p. 110). In this case, study the analytic strategy was the case description (Yin, 2003). The conceptual framework was used as a structure for the initial organization of the data. However, case descriptions aided in keeping the data in context. Early in the analysis, the descriptions helped in maintaining the association of themes, concepts and/or ideas as the
organizations were described over time. The case descriptions also provided a temporal template for the case reports discussed in the upcoming chapters.

Three basic analytic techniques were employed in this analysis as well. Maxwell (2005) identifies three basic qualitative analytic options: memos, categorizing strategies and connecting strategies (Maxwell, 2005, p. 96). I describe the use of these techniques in a linear fashion. However, in practice I alternated between techniques as new questions surfaced within the data, at points when the analysis seemed to be stalled, or in order to generate different explanations or consider different perspectives on the data.

The initial step in qualitative analysis, according to Maxwell (2005), is an initial read of the qualitative data. However, concurrent with this reading of the data, memoing was employed to develop ideas about potential categories and initial relationships within the data. Memoing was used to help me generate and clarify insights and possible theoretical connections in the data (Glaser, 1978; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Memoing was employed throughout the coding process in order to capture connections that both the participants and I are making.

More typically discussed in qualitative analysis are categorization strategies; Maxwell (2005) discusses two such strategies. In this study, I sought to “fracture” the data, or remove it from its context, in order to, eventually, identity abstract concepts that could be employed to develop theory (Maxwell, 2005, p. 96). Maxwell explains, “In qualitative research, the goal of coding is not to count things but to “fracture” (Strauss, 1987, p. 29) the data and rearrange them categories that facilitate comparison between things in the same category and that aid in the development of theoretical concepts” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 96). Furthermore, Maxwell identifies types of categories: from the
more concrete “organizational categories” that are anticipated before the research begins, to substantive categories, which are primarily descriptive, and finally theoretical categories, which place the coded data in to a more general or abstract framework (Maxwell, 2005, p. 97).

Unlike, purely inductive research studies, the objective in this study is to explore how the concepts from the conceptual framework might relate together using empirical data. Thus, in this study, the conceptual framework provides the organizational categories of interest. These boarder concepts were used to code reported observations, experiences, and perceptions of participants and researchers as well as data from secondary sources. This coding also assisted in refining or expanding the key concepts within the contexts studied. Refining and expanding the concepts was an interactive process that continued throughout the analysis of the data.

However, in order to address the social process oriented research questions, some understanding of how these concepts interacted or connected was desired. Maxwell also discusses the use of a connecting strategy, such as vignettes and case descriptions, which can aid in the understanding of the data in context by identifying the relationships between individuals and/or the situation (Maxwell, 2005, pp. 98-99). Maxwell (2005) explains, “…these strategies…look for relationships that connect statements and events within a context into a coherent whole” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 98). Thus, a case report was developed for each research site. These reports describe the timeline of events participants reported as well as how they viewed the development of the organization, the sub-groups, and associated identities within it. The reports also indicate how participants fit or assumed various identities and/or points at which they exercised various forms of
power. In this way, the various patterns of interaction or interconnection between concepts within the conceptual framework emerged.
Chapter 5  Case Report One: The Research Department

Introduction

This case report presents the findings from Site one. The department members enjoyed a high degree of autonomy around the goals, processes, and timing of their own work. However, members viewed cooperation as vital to maintaining a vibrant science department.

Opening Vignette

It was 197x and DW wondered if he would be able to keep his job. DW, a white male of the Veteran Generation (born before 1955), was a self-described American. He described his parents’ aspirations for his career in science saying they, “…had no ambitions for me in terms of science. They didn’t really pay for my education.” As a junior scientist in pursuit of his research interests, he had left a position at a prestigious organization in order to work with an expert scientist in the same field at a Midwest organization. After some funding setbacks, he began to get his research on track. However, later, under a new chair, support for his area of science began to wane. Attrition set in as scientists sought environments more conducive to their research. DW recalled, “We were down to just two or three of us doing this research in the department. I was scared we were just going to be finished and I’d have to leave.” He wondered: Would he be able to continue to get facilities support? Would he have peers to work with? Would he
have access to emerging scientists to work in his lab and train? Fortunately, a shift was occurring in science from “just tracing, labeling, and counting” to trying to understand physical processes. He and a handful of other scientists, who had once found themselves on the fringes in their respective departments, became part of the formation of a new thriving department. Twenty years later, DW was running a lab doing the research he loved in a department with collegial colleagues. However, the spirit of community, which had marked his early years, was perhaps not gone but had certainly changed. The scientists in the department now pursued different research interests, upcoming scientists were socially and demographically different from DW’s generation, and the entire competitive landscape of science was shifting.

*The Context and the Founding of the Research Department*

Unlike many departments within the organization, the Research Department formed in the post civil rights era in the U.S. By the 1980’s women and minorities had begun to constitute a significant percentage of students in science fields and they were entering the workforce in increasing numbers. Laws against overt discrimination were in place. Women were slowly appearing in leadership positions within scientific organizations.

Along with these social shifts, a decade of remarkable technological changes was imminent, which would provide scientists with unprecedented tools to do their work and increase the speed of research. By the time of the study, one senior male scientist reflected (OM), “So the students are getting trained differently and at a real sort of
technical level and they’re getting a different skill set, and they can think about attacking problems in ways that 10 years ago were simply different. I think it’s impacted how we do work every day. And with the computers too. The computers changed everything.”

Observed a junior male scientist (SI), “But for new science, if you want to compete, you need to be on top of the technology to generate your science as fast as it is needed and with both the quality and the quantity. Now you need to use the computer, data efficiency systems, whatever you want to call it, new things to do the stuff efficiently.”

Within the context of these social, technical, and work changes, the Research Department began as group of five scientists in 198X. The scientists varied in rank from senior to junior scientist. All were white, but not all were of U.S. origin and one senior woman was among their ranks. Functionally, the department was chartered to conduct research, provide teaching and training of new scientists, provide administrative services to the larger organization, and do some internal and external consulting. However, under the leadership of the first chair, the collective focus of department scientists was to build an infrastructure for excellent research and training. It was research and training that would put them on the map as a top U.S. science department. Their cooperative approach to building this infrastructure and the emergence of two female Chairs brought the department to the attention of leaders from the larger organization and eventually to the attention of researchers.

*Leadership and Identities in the Research Department*
A senior female scientist, QZ became the department’s first chair. According to published public media articles, QZ had already established and maintained a reputation as a top scientist, with significant discoveries made in her specialty. Furthermore, her ability to identify and promote collaborations and cooperation among scientists was documented in published profiles. EU, one of the founding male scientists recalled, “And I can remember going to [QZ] and saying, “You have to be the Director of this…because she, in my opinion, had all the qualities of a good leader.” Another founding member elaborated on the characteristics QZ embodied (CW), “There are a number of characteristics that she had that I think make a good Chair. One was enthusiasm, both for her own research, but also for the activities of the Department. …She was at everything, you know, all the research meetings and all the seminars, and she asked questions. She participated. She wanted them to go well, and you could see that. So she was a real force for having a productive Department…She was very much into community. And I think that that’s very -- in my experience, it’s very unusual for a science department. I’m not sure that I actually have ever seen it elsewhere. So she created a group of people who felt like they were on a mission to do something, [and] that they were serious partners in the mission and she was an optimistic, enthusiastic leader. It was an unusual combination.”

Founding department members noted how QZ influenced the emerging culture of the department. One member noted, “She was almost unique in the sense that there was nothing that she thought was beneath her doing. Even though she was the Chairman, you know, if someone had to show slides, or someone had to organize the room, or whatever it was, she was one of the people doing it. And so she, in a sense, made everybody be more communal, because she was.” A second founding member added, “I think that in
the early years, the department was perhaps unique in its sense of community. It had pretty much a single focus, which was to be a very strong department. Almost every member of that department … felt vested in the direction of the department.” A senior male scientist and early department member (HS) reported, “I feel like I learned a lot by example from QZ, when she was here as the Chair. You know her style of running the department and her ability to juggle, an independent research career with the administrative responsibilities of running the department. I watched and learned. I mean, there was never any direct mentorship there. I still take pointers from that experience, and that was already five years ago.” Thus, the first chair embodied values, beliefs, and behaviors, which department scientists emulated.

During QZ’s tenure, two additional senior women joined the department as well as one junior woman and several male scientists with non U.S. cultural backgrounds. However, the shared identities that appeared to be most salient to department members were the professional identities of “good scientist” and “scientific community member.” Indicators of a good scientist, as reported by department members, were that they “publish [sound and useful] research” are “making contributions to their field” and are “enthusiastic about their own and others work”. Being a “good scientist” was a consistently cited as the basis for joining and functioning within the department as well as an ongoing identity to maintain. A male scientist explained, (LP) “Science is - we’re here to learn new things and when you learn new things that have broad relevance, it makes it very important and very exciting. And so that’s what we’re doing.” A female scientist described the good scientist, (YC) – “And so I think people would consider good scientists as the people addressing those major questions in the field and making regular
significant contributions to that field. Then they become identified as, one of the key people in that field” A senior male scientist contributed, (MO) “Well, a good scientist is someone who’s discovered lots of interesting things that are proved correct, and things that are proved significant.” Added a male senior scientist, (OM) “There are very clear discriminators. …Is the caliber of the work sufficiently high such that they’re never wrong? They never make serious mistakes. That means, just doing lots of controlled experiments and being as fastidious in making sure that what you publish is correct, that you didn’t miss anything.” A good scientist identified significant new questions, looked for, employed the best methods available, and did careful, accurate work.

Doing good science did not involve tweaking the work of others, chasing “popular” topics, rushing to be first to publish results at the expense of accuracy, or "scooping" ideas from others. The sentiment felt by department scientists toward the later approach to science is illustrated by a comment from a female senior scientist, NN, who noted, “There are some interesting examples of people who publish stuff and they get it wrong, and then they get it right. So they get two papers out of it instead of one, that kind of thing… They’re sort of jokes.”

Scientific community member emerged as a second important shared identity among early department members. Founding department members cited many cases of scientific collaborations within the department on research projects. Knowledge sharing and idea generation were important. A senior female scientist (GV) recalled the ease of striking up hallway conversations about scientific problems or ideas. Asserted a senior female scientist (YC), “I think [a scientist] has to be an interactive person to make the group better. You know they can’t just sit in there in the lab and be a great scientist and
never talk to other people. That wouldn’t contribute to the group getting better.” Good scientists contributed as a scientific community members when they, “ask you good questions”, “make environments [students and post-docs] do well in”, “stimulate a lot of activities” and “make the group better”, according to several male and female scientists. Another female scientist asserted, “I never used to believe this, but I think it’s very important to have people that interact well with other people. You know, so a lot of scientists are sort of prima donas. They’re people who don’t interact well.”

One male full professor (EU) contrasted the type of scientists in some departments v. those in the Science Department. He asserted that department scientists tend to look at the activities of science beyond a narrow focus on generating research and pursuing grant dollars. Furthermore, he suggested, “…if you look around the department, I think that you’ll see quite clearly, that many of those people have interests outside science …it isn’t just ‘my research’”. Many scientists in the department did not see themselves only as researchers, particularly among the early members. Even at the time of the interviews, most scientists were active in scientific activities beyond research and publishing, like programs to attract minorities to science, development of teaching programs, or student guidance. A senior male scientist observed that scientists in the department tended not to be “unimodal.” “I actually think it’s incredibly important to keep that in balance because I think that the trouble with scientists is that you become so unimodal that you lose, you lose perspective… I think that if you - To be honest, if you end up with a group of completely unimodal people, then the sense of community is almost impossible to build.”
During QZ’s tenure, the scientific community member identity emerged, became salient and integrated with the good scientist identity. Structures of doing work and recruiting new members emerged in support of these identities. Eventually, department members began to select for new members based on these identities.

The Culture of the Research Department

Over time a culture of scientific excellence and cooperation emerged, which most department members highly valued and tried to sustain. Said one department member, a male scientist (CW), “I got the feeling when I got here, from interacting with people, that it was a place where there was a lot of cooperation and collaboration. That wasn’t what I was used to where I’d come from”. The culture that developed is best illustrated by the ladder story reported by a male (MO) and a female scientist (YC) in separate interviews. The male scientist recalled being told the story during his job interview with one of the early members of the department. “So when I interviewed here, the scientist who used to be in the office next to me told me a story of the department having this ladder. And they, it turns out that three or four of the scientists got together and they bought an extension ladder for cleaning their gutters, and every fall they’d drive to their different homes and help each other do their gutters...So it struck me that this was a metaphor, but it was very close to reality…” Over the years, despite changes in leadership and membership, the collegial and cooperative aspects of the early culture persisted. The competitive, grant focused, hyper-competitive approach to science was eschewed in favor of cooperation. Scientists would not present obstacles to each other’s work. Elaborated another senior
male scientist (OM), “Nobody’s trying to thwart any effort. There are no factions that sort of work against each other. I think that’s really wonderful. I think, for the most part, we all think it’s wonderful and try not to rock the boat. It’s not 100%, but it’s pretty good.”

CW, as senior male scientist said, “So I would say the one thing that’s very clear in this department, as opposed to some places where I’ve been, is that people get along with each other and that makes everything a lot easier.”

The culture reflected a desire for an environment of relative peace so that scientists could do their work, with scientific support, and freedom from destructive politics. TH, a senior female scientist observed, “…they come here because it is a less competitive and stressful environment”. A senior male scientist reflected on his reasons for joining the department, “I was going to someplace with nice people, who treat each other with respect; and with a scientifically vital environment, where I myself know I could thrive and this is it. It doesn’t get any better than this.” A junior male scientist observed, “… I’ve been to a lot of places where it’s fairly obvious that there’s a lot of, I guess, political strife within the department. It seems like immediately there are factions of people who don’t speak to other people, you know, within a department. That’s not uncommon….[In contrast] A lot of it came down to the way that they [the department members] were organizing core equipment, and that there seemed to be a very good communication between the people who needed it the most and they were the ones who would be driving it. And that other people weren’t really standing in the way of that, which can happen. So there was no evidence of any kind of favoritism, or certain people needing to have their needs fulfilled. And there were no sorts of obvious prima donas in
the department, who if something went ahead that would be good say for half the department, but they didn’t get what they wanted, they would not support any funding.”

The basis of this cooperative culture appeared to be the good scientist and scientific community member identities established by founding department members and chair. Social structures emerged which embedded aspects of the good scientist and scientific community identities within the culture of the department. EU observed, “We’ve instigated over the years, you know, the social hours, and if you look at attendance there, I think attendance is pretty good. And again, you don’t find, you don’t find cliques of particular people that always huddle in one corner. People mix all the time. People interact all the time.” A research forum was created for sharing and exchange of ideas, which became a popular fixture of the department. Teach teams were created, which included both junior and senior scientist. Close physical proximity of offices and labs afforded opportunities for causal informal interactions.

Apparently the most significant mechanism that embedded and maintained the department culture, was recruiting. QZ was apparently personally very active in attracting and hiring scientists in the early days of the department. Four early department members (those who entered the department during QZ tenure) reported being approached and recruited by QZ. Later AZ, would open the process to more direct participation of scientists, from the recruiting visits to the decision-making discussions around a candidate. Good scientist was the main criteria. Observed a senior scientist, “The caliber of my peers is very high, stunningly high, and I think that— We have become one of the best X departments in the country.” However, at minimum, the recruit could not be a disruptive influence to the collegial culture of the department. At best, the new member
would contribute to the cooperative aspects of the culture. Explained a senior male scientist (OM), “I don’t know how it is across the board, but I think there are several of us who have a firm rule: we will not hire any a-holes. Sometimes you’re good at picking those out, sometimes you aren’t. But once the quotient gets too high… I don’t care how smart they are. I think collegiality is maybe as important as our scientific value we offer. The bar is high. Just to get into the door, to get to an interview, the bar is pretty high. So if you had your choice between somebody who looks like they’re going to play ball, and somebody looks like the Lone Ranger, at the same sort of scientific level, you’d pick the collegial person every time.” Explained a senior female scientist (NN), “And if it’s going to be a person that you hire, who’s a little prima donna, who sits over in [his or her lab] doing their own little thing and doesn’t interact with anybody … it’s not helpful at all to the rest of the department, and particularly with somebody who – … make[s] problems.”

Eventually QZ left the department to pursue a promotional opportunity. With prodding from her peers, AZ assumed the interim chair position. She recalled, “… someone was going to have to be interim chair fairly quickly. And there weren’t a lot of people who - I don’t think anybody really wanted to do it, to be frank. But it was one of these things where everyone was sitting looking around the table saying: ‘Well, who's gonna do this’? And then someone said, ‘AZ, you could do it, you’re a senior person’. And I realized, well I am kind of senior and so maybe I - and so then I thought, well for year or two I could do it.”. As things turned out, AZ moved on to become permanent chair when it became clear that a suitable chair could not be agreed to or attracted from outside. In AZ’s view, the department was in danger of “disintegrating.” Recalled AZ,
“So, I felt that there were a lot of people who were very close to leaving and they were just waiting a little bit to see what would happen.”

By this time, retaining the good scientists in the department was a concern. Department members recognized AZ as an exemplar of good science. She was a recognized leader in her area of science, thus a good role model for high quality science and the type of scientist the department wanted to retain and attract. Explained a senior male scientist (BY), “I’d say the most important thing is there are quite a number of people in this department that I consider very good scientists. So they help set a bar. They help set a standard that helps push me to do better science and to try to be at the cutting edge of what I’m doing. I think AZ is a good example of that. She’s highly respected internationally and by me as a scientist. So having her as my chair and just being very much aware of her science helps gives me something to ---sets a standard, which I think, is just helpful when you have high quality people around to help you strive to do the best.”. As one senior female scientist described AZ (YC), “You know, she has an incredible international reputation for not only being a good scientist, but a nice person and very open-minded and fair and that sort of thing. I think at a scientific level, she’s incredibly highly respected. So that makes it easier, I think, to be a Chair because there’s no issues there.”

Relative to building the department, AZ tended to support the diversity and autonomy of labs. Before her tenure, the scientists tended to concentrate in one particular sub-specialty of science. Various informants reported that this homogeneity, while supporting collaboration, appeared to be causing some internal competitive tensions between scientists. It also meant that the department was limited in courses of study,
techniques, etc. that it could offer students, fellows, and scientists. As indicated in her annual reports, AZ advocated a shift to a recruitment strategy of diversifying the department scientists around research focus and techniques. These new scientists to the department strongly identified with the good scientist identity. However, some were very independent in terms of the science. Asserted one male senior scientist, who was relatively new to the department, “Research, when it’s done well, is much like a free enterprise system, based on the individual investigator.” This independence did not preclude collegiality but did not include a shared vision around scientific objectives as a department. PL explains, “So the only obligation I feel to the department is to take part in teaching, which I do, and to bring in money, to be available to my colleagues to help them, if I can, to give them technical expertise and to, comment on their research when they ask for it or sometimes when they don’t ask for it. But otherwise…”

AZ implemented formal processes for soliciting decision-making input from scientists around areas for which the department was collectively responsible to the institution. AZ actively supported efforts to create joint programs with other departments for teaching. Instead of canvassing individual scientists, which would be time intensive with the growing department, she began having regular department meetings in which she laid out for example, plans for facilities and encouraged discussion on department initiatives. She led the effort to redesign the graduate curriculum with input from all scientists. Socially, she brought in a social hour, department picnic, and retreat. In a departure from QZ’s unilateral approach, she opened the process to all department members and involved the entire department in decision-making about a candidate. NN discussed this process saying, “Well, I think the recruitment process is really fun. I mean
really, because you get to see most of the people who are coming through. Who we’re inviting are people who are doing something that’s sort of front line, and you get to hear about that. And it may not be exactly in your area but sometimes its things, they’re doing things [or] they’re using techniques you can translate to your area… We interviewed quite a number of people, and I think that’s really fun. I mean, it’s a lot of work. It’s a lot of work, because of the dinners and meetings and whatever. But I think it’s a lot of fun, and everybody participates. Everybody in the department participates, so then that’s also fun because you go to dinner with other people in the department. So I actually like that process.”

Not everyone was happy with AZ’s more structured approach to soliciting input. CX observed, “She (QZ) was very informal. We hardly had any faculty meetings. We would have faculty meetings when we were trying to decide on a faculty candidate. That was the main thing. She didn’t really like sitting around and discussing issues for long periods of time, but she would consult everybody when he was making a decision. I think that most people-- I certainly felt that on the one hand, she took my opinion into consideration, and on the other hand, I didn’t have to waste a lot of time sitting around and talking about theoretical issues or something… Some people, I think, thought that we should have regular faculty meetings, but I think that she thought the job could get done in a different way. And given that she did include everybody, I think that that was true. It was also smaller then than it is now, and we had fewer students, so things have changed somewhat.”

Thus, a different style of leadership, more diverse science interests and increasing pressure for grants, shifted the department away from the science community member
identity in the view of some department members. Observed a senior male, “As the department’s matured, I have to say I think that that sense [of scientific community] has largely dissipated. I think that that’s partly because of the maturation of the Department. I think it’s partly because of the diversity of goals within the Department, and I think that in some ways it reflects the leadership.” AZ did not favor the interdependent or social/emotional aspects of the scientific community identity. Though she supported the now cultural norms of polite, respectful interactions, she did not provide or encourage the type of emotional support young faculty had enjoyed with QZ. Noted one senior male scientist, You know you needed to cry about your grant and you went into QZ’s office, she’d hold your hand and go, ‘It’s all going to be okay’. AZ doesn’t do that. AZ just says, “Suck it up.” If she says anything at all, it’s “Suck it up and deal with it. You’re a big boy.” This is not to say the AZ was not supportive of junior faculty. On junior scientist reported that she helped him rewrite a successful grant proposal. She also nominated another scientist for a prestigious award. AZ supported or instituted new structures for scientific exchange and interaction within and outside of the department, and left it to department members to build collaborations among themselves as it fit their needs. Thus, AZ promoted the good scientist identity. Meantime for a few scientists, the scientific community member identity shifted to focus on fulfilling formal responsibilities Vs. identifying and exploiting opportunities for co-development as scientists.

Prevailing Identities in the Research Department
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Despite the pictures of a scientist at work, alone in his or her lab, every scientist in the Research Department reported, at minimum, working with post-docs and students. In addition, many scientists reported interactions with peers, ranging from providing or receiving tips, ideas, and resources, to long-term idea exchanges and knowledge incubating collaborations between labs. Scientists reported how important such interactions were early in their careers as they were launching their labs. Others reported how important such interactions were to helping them keep up with the field and train students.

Participants reported a variety of supportive, agreeable, instructional, and/or work advancing interactions. These constructive interactions appeared to play an important role in how scientists proceeded in attaining and maintaining a good scientist identity. Some also appeared to influence maintenance of the scientific community member identity. A female student observed, “I kind of got the feeling that people here at least spoke to each other as opposed to being locked up in their labs all day and not getting along” The nature of the interactions could be readily identified as four types: collegial, learning, relational and generative. The nature of his interactions in the department evoked this description from one senior male scientist, who had suffered through a very different experience in another department, “I think sometimes people listen to me. I just have a generally positive relationship with virtually everybody in the department, both personal and professional. There has never been a door that has been closed to me. Basically, anything I want, I can get. There’s always a cooperative spirit. No one has ever refused to talk to me or collaborate or allow me to use a piece of equipment…I would say that I perceive most people in the department enjoy having me around and think I know some
A female senior scientist reflecting on her experience of interactions in the department said, “Every place that I’ve been, where people have interacted a lot, it’s been an exciting environment. [an environment] where they interacted not grudgingly, and not one person saying, ‘My stuff’s the best stuff. I’ll help you when my stuff is the best’, That doesn’t work”.

Inclusive and Exclusive Interactions

Congenial Interactions

Congenial interactions appeared to be the most basic type of interaction observed or that participants reported. Congenial interactions consisted of respectful, civil, and congenial behaviors, exchange of positive emotional cues, and sometimes exchange of simple resources. Congenial interactions occurred between scientists in formal and informal settings. They required little time, deep personal interest or knowledge of another person. However, they appeared to establish the ground for more complex relationships and interactions. These interactions could be a simple as acknowledging each other when passing in the hall. Several department members reported that congenial interactions they experienced during pre-employment visits gave them the impression of a positive work climate and provided a basis for further positive interactions once they arrived. …". I also observed interactions between scientists and their interactions with a potential hire. I observed non-verbal cues such as head nodding and even audible “um hums” as the candidate spoke. These appeared to indicate support and interest in the
candidate’s presentation. There was some humor, but not about the scientist or his work, but imagined, illustrative applications of his findings. Before and after meetings, a few scientists lingered and spoke with peers or students. The most frequently reported and observed Congenial interaction was discussion of science or science-related social matters with peers before meetings.

_Norming Interactions_

Norming interactions were the means through which information and knowledge about norms, ways of doing things and/or ideas were shared, mainly via modeling or disclosure in the course of group interactions. Norming interactions in the Research Department were highly dependent on context. Conducive contexts included activities that were a part of the graduate program such as teaching and serving on student committees, and weekly scientific presentations and guest seminars. Scientists’ willingness to share their knowledge and experience in the context of their work could turn a typical task into a learning opportunity for the observant scientist. This was particularly important for junior faculty, since there was no formal ongoing mentoring that occurred in the department.

_Relational Interactions_
Relational interactions are interactions that appeared to help form, maintain, or strengthen professional friendship relationships. These interactions consist of taking interest in others and/or providing emotional resources. Resources exchanged included information about important external relationships, political data, professional gossip, consolation after professional failures or mishaps, specific encouragement, and sharing one's excitement and interest in science. Relational interactions appeared to require taking a deeper interest in others than congenial interactions and signaled one’s interest in including another into a sub-group or indicated interest in being included. A female staff researcher noted, “He [A male full professor] genuinely sounded interested in his research, which is usually the case, but he was also interested in what I had to say. And, he asked me how I felt about the idea of coming to work in the lab. I thought he seemed very interested in me and how I was, not just telling me what the lab is about, and finding out about my resume.” The result of relational interactions can be a sense of belonging, security, and/or satisfaction with people in the work environment. Examples of relational interactions reported or observed included, consoling others about a lab mishap or offering support and advice after loss of a grant. At a meeting, I observed, scientists offer condolences to a colleague about a research setback. As a sub-group of faculty grappled with a difficult administrative situation, a male full professor noted (PL), “It’s been interesting to me that many of the faculty have come up to me and said, ‘I’m really sorry this is a situation and if I can help, let us know’. That’s community.” Other scientists reported celebrations that highlighted the scientific accomplishments of a male and a female peer. The majority of reported relational interactions, for both men and women, consisted of informal, sometimes lengthy conversations about science. In addition, three
female faculty and two male faculty members reported relational interactions with
students and fellows in working through private/professional work-life balance
challenges. However, interestingly, only one such work/life related interaction was
reported between scientists, when a senior male scientist reported that he spoke with a
peer about his decision to take time off to be with his family instead of working on a
pending grant. The foundation of relational interactions in the view of some scientists
was professional respect. A female full professor said, “And it doesn’t mean that you
have to be big buddies and shake hands, and slap each other on the back every time you
see each other, but you have to have the respect for each other…When you get that
[respect], then you listen to what other people say…[you realize] that [the person’s input]
will be helpful because maybe it’s some way you haven’t thought about it at all.”

Generative Interactions

Generative interactions were the most overtly interdependent and complex type of
constructive interaction. Generative interactions consisted of direct sharing of
information, knowledge, experiences, work tools and materials or personal contacts that
benefited the recipient and built capacity for future work within the department. These
interactions appeared to occur in the department as part of ongoing relationships between
dyads, and across labs. Interactions could start with a one-way provision of resources in
response to a request from a peer. However, people tended to respond to receiving a
resource, not only by reciprocating with the giver, but with other department members as
well. Thus, collectively they made more resources available to the group. The basis of
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generative interactions typically appeared be professional or personal friendships and these relationships could extend outside of the department. A senior female secondary department member noted, “If they like you, they will bring you in and support you.”

A condition that supported generative interactions, reported by both male and female scientists, was that internal competition was “not a factor” within the department. This avoidance of internal competition within the department, also apparently made generative interactions safe. Department members trusted that a peer or member of another lab would not use these shared resources to directly compete with or “scoop” each other.

Scientists provided examples of generative interactions. A female senior scientist, who was a junior at the time, reported that a senior male scientist who knew of her work approached her with a question. This causal discussion eventually led to the female professor securing a funded stream of research for her lab. The male scientist helped with knowledge sharing and a graduate student trained in that area, despite the fact that the research had little to do with his own. In another example, a female senior scientist asked for technical and material assistance from a male senior scientist. She then provided him with helpful data from her use of the resources he provided her. In another example, a small group of scientists teamed together to create in-house capacity for producing a needed resource. In another case, three faculty members cooperatively secured a shared equipment grant necessary to replace an important piece of equipment. Although individually they did not have use for the equipment, it was the type of resource an attractive department to students and fellows should have. Other types of generative interactions involved steering funding opportunities to other labs in which the work was a
better fit, and teaming to help peers, even those in other departments, obtain research funding.

A male junior scientist (KQ) illustrated how important generative interactions could be to a scientist’s work saying, “Here in the department, everybody is working on completely different projects and topics. I think where we try to help each other is with the techniques. So if I see somebody is doing, let’s say [name of a technique] and I can’t do this. I go to him, and I try to learn it there. There are a lot of techniques in the department, which are available, (and) that you could use and gather. That’s what a department is for.”

One female senior scientist referred to these cases of sharing resources as “looking out for each other”. A male senior professor talked about how much the department had given him, and how he believed, he had been successful in “giving back.” He summed up the effects of this orientation on the department as follows: “I think the better the department is, the more cases there are of faculty working together on things that benefit the department but not necessarily an individual faculty member exclusively.”

There were no reports of any harassment or direct exclusion based on any demographic characteristic such as sex, race, ethnicity, or age from any participant. However, as might be expected, newcomers to science, like fellows and junior scientists, reported more challenges to navigating the dynamics around the prevailing department identities. In addition, a handful of established scientists also expressed tensions. Of these scientists, all but one shut down the recorder interview or requested an offsite interview. Most of these scientists were senior scientists, thus they had secure employment in the
organization. Most had entered the department as junior members either after or late in QZ’s tenure.

Among the fellows and junior scientists, tensions occurred when department peers did not support junior scientists in some way or a junior scientist did not do the things required to move towards the prevailing identities, for example, get funding. In the case of funding, this presented a clear path out of the door and participants provided many examples of scientists acting to address such situations. The perceived identity and behavior mentioned most frequently as moving scientists away from the prevailing identity was being a “lone-wolf” or “isolating oneself in one’s lab.” This was a particular danger for junior scientists. The pressure was on to establish their labs and secure funding. They saw their best chance at establishing their careers to be in focusing on their research. As one junior scientist asserted, “I need to worry about my papers and my grant. So a lot of that [larger organizational matters] I try to ignore.” However, within the Research Department, there was an apparent expectation among most senior scientists that junior scientists would approach other scientists and interact. In commenting about the recruiting process, a senior female scientist noted that she wants to know, “Can they interact”? Most department scientists agreed on the need to interact, but reported very different perceptions about how the department as a whole handled social support and interactions with junior faculty. One male senior scientist, who entered the department during the transition between QZ and AZ reported receiving little guidance from department peers on what was required to gain promotion. He observed what he perceived to be the isolation of a junior scientist, who eventually left the department. “Well, even though ultimately a scientist rises or falls based on his or her own creativity
and ability, I don’t think it helps the individual or the department for anyone to feel isolated. And I know in our system people can feel very isolated. And when that happens, when people are not being successful if someone is not being successful, they don’t feel there is anyone they can turn to if there is not a culture of acceptance of the need to mentor. …. A culture of acceptance of the fact that people might need to bounce ideas off other people to find the right direction. So, that’s why it’s important. I think some people can succeed in isolation, but I don’t think everyone can and I don’t think that should be an ideal. I think we ought to and I have seen young people, junior scientists, not succeed. I can think of one young scientist who was not being successful. And when I spoke to him, it was clear that he felt totally isolated. And he was almost in a me and them situation. What’s the point of…? I just think that doesn’t help anyone. And he turns out to be an extremely creative bright person who just had a different style, but who welcomed the input when it was offered. So, I think we need to make it easier for people to feel that they can ask for help.” In contrast to this position, another senior scientist known to have actively mentored a few junior scientists in the department asserted, “Very different. I mean here, one the expectation is that you’ll do well; and two if you’re not, then someone’s going to try to help you. And that’s not to say that people are automatically going to be promoted, because that’s not true, but the rest is true. When they hire people, they hire them because they think they’ll make permanent colleagues.”

The reality among junior scientists appeared to be that they had to learn how to initiate interactions within the department and develop an independent research stream. They could gain professional support from colleagues if they were having funding problems or if they made the first move. Very early in his career, DW, who was
introduced in the opening vignette, received internal grant support from his chair when he was unable to secure funding on his own. One junior scientist reported that AZ had helped to save his lab when his grant fell through. However, another junior scientist observed, “Everyone is so busy! You know, it’s not like they don’t want to help you. They’ve just got 50 bazillion things to do. And you’re not knocking on their door pestering them about something? So they can ignore you… And they have to deal with that [people pestering them]. It’s not like they didn’t want to help me.” This scientist had to learn to initiate contact with senior peers. “…there are people now that I have kind of worked this out with that I feel that I can go to and ask for guidance. Yeah, and they know I’m getting better… now, I mean I – a lot of these relationships I’ve kind of figured out”.

Given the support many senior scientists reported as being so helpful to the development of their careers in the department, what was puzzling is why senior scientists did not make the time to make uninitiated, non-emergency efforts to reach out to junior scientists professionally. Extreme busyness, exacerbated by the pressure to secure grants, provided one explanation. However, another possible reason related to a subtle shift in the prevailing identity of good scientist, as the more independent aspects of the good scientist identity became more salient under AZ. Offering help, in the minds of some scientists, seemed like a vote of no-confidence in the junior scientist’s abilities. It could even be shaming. This was the rationale of some department members, which a male and female scientist reported in interviews. The male scientist elaborated, “So we just had a department meeting about someone who is relatively new in the department who we’re concerned is not going to have the portfolio that we think will be necessary to
be successful when they come up for review by the management promotion committee. So, we’re discussing what is to be done. So one suggestion was to have a more senior scientist be assigned to mentor that person. Then someone said well if you do it for one person then you have to do it for everyone, otherwise that person will feel singled out. So there really is no system for mentoring people.”

Professionally things like failing to gain funding for ones work, not publishing; conflicts with students and fellows or not interacting with peers could move a scientist away from the prevailing identities. However, aspects of personal identities, which a scientist believed could not be integrated into the prevailing identities, could also move him or her away from a desired prevailing identity. A female scientist described one such situation in an unrecorded interview. She became pregnant with her first child before tenure. She noted that no colleague appeared to notice. She was afraid to tell even the female chair that she was expecting. Over five years later, a female fellow who had worked in several different departments noted a similar experience in the Research Department. She mused, “You know, that’s like a really subtle thing. No one ever actually came out and said – … I don’t remember whether anyone actually said like ‘what are you doing having these babies?’ – but it sort of felt like people were thinking that. There were a lot of times I’d be walking around, and people would say, like, “Wow, you’re pregnant again? Seems like you’re always pregnant!” or “I don’t think I’ve seen you ‘not pregnant’ in the last 5 years!” There were some comments, random comments like that. It’s unusual, especially to have 3 kids! I don’t know anyone else that’s trying to build an independent career and having 3 kids. So it’s unusual.” At one point, a well-meaning senior scientist advised her not mention her pregnancy at social functions with
funders. Eventually, both women focused on developing and funding their science. Both advanced in scientist positions, the fellow to junior scientist, the junior scientist to senior. But each determined that the pressure was to put a science face forward, and minimize any aspect of their identities not already integrated into one of the prevailing identities. Emphasizing this strategy, at a talk AZ was quoted as stressing “the importance of marketing scientific expertise rather than femaleness.”

Autonomy relative to one’s research was an important in moving towards a good scientist identity. This power to employ ones own agency toward scientific pursuits of one’s own choosing emerges as a key indicator of a good scientist identity, as opposed to a lab technician, lab manager, or fellow. True scientists exercised power within their own labs through students and fellows, to explore phenomena and contribute to the field. Thus, a scientist who spent too much time in service of another scientist’s research in lieu of his or her own, could find him or her self adrift both socially and materially. A junior scientist, from outside of the U.S. recounted how he realized he could not spend time working on others ideas saying, “This was a little bit critical for me, at the beginning…[I have mastered a few new techniques in my lab]... In the beginning, there were four or five people coming to me, who wanted to get help, and we helped them. And then they wanted to get help in Y and other product techniques and so on and so on. Eventually I had to realize that I could not do this because I don’t get my own work done. And that’s the drawback, so I have to be really careful of that, helping or not. But at the time, I didn’t notice anything. I realized this after probably one year. Now in my second year, I had to tell people, ‘I can only show you how it works, but then you have to make it work by yourself.’ And that’s what I’m doing at the moment. So I’m kind of careful with it.
Somebody says, “You want to collaborate?” I normally say, ‘No.’ Because what collaboration means most of the time is that they want me to do the work and then they’ll put me on a paper, which doesn’t tell me anything. Here it comes down to that you have to have your own work … just coming out of my lab and out of my head rather than from somebody else. Yeah, I had to learn this. That’s just how it is… You see, I think that in the Department, of course, if I help this person and this person and this person, I could do this and then eventually I have to decide whether I get promoted or not. They’d probably say, ‘Oh, you helped me. Blah-blah-blah.’ But then, on the other hand, they’ll probably argue, “Yeah, you helped the people too much, so you didn’t get your own work done.”

A female fellow, who at the time was working in another department, learned a similar lesson. She recalled how she believed the chair of another department to be directing her to help her husband, a department scientist, secure a grant. However, at her annual review she was told that her funding would be cut off, since she had produced no independent research. The experience was frustrating, but lead to her decision that she needed to have her own sources of funding and pursue her own research interests. She declared, “I was like ‘I am going to get a job at Starbucks selling coffee – I am NOT working in someone else’s lab anymore… I was at the point where like, it was just going to be all or none, I just wasn’t going to do this anymore, if I wasn’t going to have my own support, my own researchers…”

A final inclusion-exclusion dynamic lay in how scientists viewed the time required to do science. In general, in the Research Department, scientists viewed the time demands of science on the nature of science itself. A female scientist described her fellowship years as “monastic” and expressed her surprise that anyone would pay her to
have so much fun. This willingness to devote many hours to science was viewed by scientists of the baby boomer and older generations as the mark of true love of science.

Two senior scientists, male and female, commented on younger scientists’ apparent treatment of a science career as a “job.” Within the department, it was now typical for fellows to start families. I observed that all but students and one or two junior scientists had cleared the labs by 5 pm on three occasions I walked through the department in the evening. Several male scientists, reported expectations that junior scientists and fellows would fill some of the time demands, particularly in the evenings. Others viewed science as the priority and the decision to assume other identities to be a “personal choice” to be managed by the individual. A senior female scientist, who did not have children reported, “When I was at D organization, some women decided that they wanted to start a women’s group, … So I went to the first meeting and this woman who’s a Ph.D. (like I was) got up and she said she wanted to know how she was going to be compete with - she called them “the young Turks” in her department. She was in a quite well known department that had a lot of national prestige and a lot of good people, and she was good. She said, “How am I going to compete when I have to compete with these young Turks, who have a wife at home doing everything and I want to take my son to the baseball game, you know, and watch his little league?” And I said, ‘You aren’t. You aren’t. Face it, you are not going to compete...You aren’t. Be realistic.” The senior female scientist went on to assert, “So they have to be really realistic. And we’re in a field-- And I guess people should think about this even before they go to graduate school. We’re in a field that’s really competitive, so we’re competing for grants. We have to be front-line. We can’t say, “I’m going to do this” and meanwhile someone else has done it in half the time
you did it and moved on and published on it already, and you’re just plodding along because you’ve only got half the time to spend on it. You know? And I guess I thought about this.”

On the other hand, a much younger female scientist asserted, “So I’ve always been able to do it, and I was able to have children, and can spend a lot of time with my kids. For me it’s been not an incredibly lucrative job, but I’ve had a lot of flexibility during my childbearing time.” This scientist had had very different experiences, and she saw a good scientist identity and her identity as female and parent as coexisting and even mutually supportive. She recalled, “…my graduate advisor was female – I mean, brilliant - without kids, but female. And that helped me, just seeing her do it. And she wasn’t – she was a woman. She bought everybody flowers for their birthday, she loved to cook, and her mom would come in and they’d cook us these big fancy dinners, and she really took a mothering – if someone didn’t show up, she’d call them at home, she’d be all worried. She was kind of mothering ---And you know, I saw you can run a department - the model doesn’t have to be male. You can do good science work and be female.” Furthermore, she saw the barriers to inclusion in science to be beyond that of simply spending time in the lab, but instead how effectively one interacted when one did have time. She shared, “ I think about this a lot, it tends to be – especially if you’ve got kids! – it tends to be harder to spend your summers travelling around to international meetings, hanging out, you know, informally, kind of making a name for yourself, if you’ve got all these responsibilities at home. I mean, women have less free time to devote to networking than men do, by-in-large. I think women tend to present themselves less assertively than men do. You know, in kind of casual conversation...that doesn’t always help us either.”
See Table 1  Identities, Culture, and Inclusion Factors in the Research Department for a summary of Site one findings.

Power Relations in the Research Department

Within this organization, the chair’s position could allow its holder to exercise significant decision-making influence. Observed one senior female scientist (NN), “For example, I know …there are some Chairs - the Chair does everything, basically makes all the decisions, so everything fits around that. Your input’s not important. You either complain… or you go do your thing or whatever, and things break into pieces.”.

“I’ve been places with bad Chairs,” explained one junior male scientist, “…it’s …just simply having a bigger extension to your own lab, which is the way a lot of Chairs might run it. You know, ‘My lab’s the most important. The rest of the department is here to pump me with grant dollars and to basically serve as a chiefdom for my lab and to be kind of a servant.’”

Overall, despite differences in style, QZ and AZ were consistent in including department members in decision-making processes and treating the chair’s role as service to the department. Among department members, there was appreciation expressed for the effects in terms of power relations in the department. Again noted CX, “Well, in both cases, the relationships between scientists and, in fact, between scientists and students are extremely smooth in the department. So there isn’t any politics, and nobody’s being forced to do things. People are genuinely interested in teaching or are certainly interested
in the job search. And so it’s a sort of a team effort, which makes it rewarding. I think that there isn’t very much of a hierarchy in the department, so again, at that level, at the junior faculty and the senior faculty. And, to some extent, the students feel like they’re part of the process, and so people feel empowered. People’s opinions are asked and feedback gathered.”

Nevertheless, apparently QZ would exercise the authority of her position. QZ could exercise authority in matters of adherence to the associated norms. Recalled a senior male scientist (OM), “Now the previous Chair, with QZ, if stuff happened that she wasn’t happy with, or she thought you should be doing XYZ, she’d come sit in your office and tell you directly. “I didn’t see you at the meeting today. What’s happening with your grant? You’ve got to get those papers published.” Observed a senior female scientist (NN), “She was pretty unilateral, but she interacted and talked to everybody [before making decisions]. QZ could also apparently be very persuasive. Recalled a senior male scientist, “So if she wanted something, there was knock on my door, not a ring on my desk. That turns out to be very effective…it's a very strong validation of a personal connection, much more so than a telephone. And, you know, combined with a very persuasive style. It’s very hard to say “no” to a request of someone who’s sitting there.”

QZ’s power appeared to stem from confidence among the scientists that she would identify and reconcile the mix individual interests. Observed a senior female scientist (NN), “My feeling was that when QZ was there, she sort of took care of everybody. I was only here for a short time so I can’t really tell you that. But we were discussing this when I was on the Search Committee for the new Chair. We talked a lot
with the people in the department and my general feeling was that they had been taken
care of.”

On the other hand, AZ appeared to exercise power, via authority by her
prototypicality as a good scientist, in part likely contributing to her success in attracting
and retaining good scientists. However, AZ was hands off relative to the scientific work
of others. “It is my job to give them my advice, and then they are adults who can make
their own decisions. And then they live with the consequences. That’s sort of how I run
things.,” she stated. This was in strong contrast to QZ’s approach to building a scientific
community member identity and her exercise of authority around that identity. With her
reputation and status, AZ could have employed coercive power to advance her interests.
But as one male junior scientist noted, “That is not AZ’s style.” Instead, as one senior
female scientist saw it, AZ wanted to spread responsibility for decision-making across the
department. NN explained, “And I think that AZ wanted a department where people,
where there was more discussion and everybody had more input. I mean she still has to
make the final decision. You always have to have a leader who will do that. You know,
you can’t rule by consensus, I don’t think. I think you have to listen to everybody, let
everybody have their say, but ultimately the department, you know, you’re the Chair and
you have to make the - Even if it goes against the wishes of the department, I think you
have to do that. But you have to listen to everybody. I think that she wants everybody to
have an input. That’s my impression.”

Between scientists, power emerged, acquiesced to, or shared around certain
identities. Senior scientists, particularly the remaining founding and early members
reported interactions in which they were able to exercise power through peers in order to
secure material or knowledge resources. This was the most frequent exercise of power between peers noted. These scientists appeared to desire to maintain the mutual exercise of power, which advanced everyone’s science and maintained scientific autonomy. At the same time, autonomy had become a more pervasive value as the department matured and grew. As noted earlier by junior and emerging scientists, scientists needed to be strategic about how they lent their agency to others or they could not maintain their own work and identity as scientists. However, some of the more recent scientists viewed the exercise of any structural, face two, power as a threat to their identities. A senior male scientist who is prototypical of this position explained, “So I’ve been in a couple of places where things worked really, really well (and this is one of them, I think) as a department... they both worked because people don’t try-- People try and identify good people to bring in and then give them their head. Let them do what they want to do.” Doing what they wanted to do encompassed both courses of scientific research and management of one’s own lab. By maintaining ones own funding and operations, one could avoid acquiescing to larger organizational agents, the department leadership, or pressure from peers. A junior scientist noted the sense of confidence and independence a funded lab provided the scientist: “Uh, I was extremely insecure when I first got here, but I did extraordinarily at my first grant, and so that was very confidence-boosting for me. And so now, although I am uber-junior, I’m not constantly feeling like an impostor. I feel like I got the money, I did the thing that you brought me here to do, and I did it. OK. So I have money for 5 years. So I feel junior, but I’m not nearly as insecure as I was. It’s an issue of proving yourself. For me, at least.”. Scientists used a track record of funding to counter the
disempowering effects of deviations from the prevailing identities and related cultural expectations.

Later in the department’s history, several scientists, both male and female, expressed concerns about how aspects of their identities appeared to either make them vulnerable to the exercise of power by peers, or stymied their own efforts to influence others. For example, founding members asserted that training of students was essential to being a good scientist. However, newer members tended to view teaching as an obligation of formal department affiliation, but not as a shared aspect of either the good scientist or scientific community member identities. Thus, one senior female scientist and a male scientist both reported that they believed that being viewed as a good teacher, counted against them being viewed as good scientists by some senior peers. On the one hand, not being viewed as a good scientist threatened their ability to remain that identity. One now senior scientist, explained,”… my heavy commitment to education and teaching, took away time from research and so I think some saw it as a negative some saw it as positive. So I think it depended on who was looking at it. Its an interesting phenomenon, even though I’ve had a very successful research funding track record and career, when someone is heavily involved in education, one tends to get a reputation as being more of a teacher and less of a scientist. … Even though I always had at least two research grants. Always brought in most of my salary on research grants. Still there was this perception: Well he’s more a teacher. And that was a negative for me.” To counter this perception, he focused on securing research grants. He asserted, “It’s no mystery that really counts are research grants. Some one would have to be pretty blind to the message not to hear it, see it smell it.”
While securing funding could secure one’s formal position as a scientist, it still did not mean that a person could exercise influence in the position. Again, those perceived as deviating from the prevailing identities were not expected to exercise power. As the department matured and financial pressures mounted, teaching became less and less a part of the prevailing identity of good scientist. However, parent or any similar identity had never been a part of the prevailing identities of the department. Most scientists did not take on or publically acknowledge parenting responsibilities until they had firmly established their reputations as scientists. Even then, a few scientists believed that the perception of holding a marginalized identity affected their ability to exercise power in a formal position. For example, one senior female scientist observed that she was on a powerful committee within the field, yet no one from the department sought her help in navigating that committee, yet others outside the department did. She openly wondered if this was because her peers saw her as teacher or a parent but not as a good scientist.

As the focus of the leader changed, the diversity of science interests grew, and scientists felt the demands for more grants, changes also appeared around the aspects of prevailing identities of good scientist and scientific community member, and thus, who fit these identities. These changes also apparently promoted a shift in how scientists exercised power between each other. Thus, two sub-groups appeared to emerge in the department. One emerging sub-group of scientist desired autonomy and viewed autonomy as the best defense against the kind of systemic exercise of power by a Chair or another subgroup within the department. However, sub-group of scientists advocated for more interdependent relationships marked by mutual or two-way power relations. Such
relationships would enable good science and advancement for participants. Explained one senior male scientist, “And so we’re trying to work on ways, through the infrastructure of the department, to expand the circle. To have people more interconnected with other labs, so we’re trying to find ways to have the labs that aren’t involved in this central cluster of scientists be more involved in having them on students committees, having them on exams. Try and reduce the ability of people to be really isolated.” Explained a female scientist who also viewed cross lab relationships as important, “Yeah. It’s going to be hard for any lab to survive for a long period of time all by itself, without interacting with anybody. You know, because no lab can do every technique. It just doesn’t work anymore. I mean the gigantic labs can buy people to put into each sort of facet … But most labs can’t do that. They’re going to have to find their interactions among their colleagues.” A scientist summed up the implications of these different views of relationships, maintaining identities and power within the department, “And I think that’s the spectrum, … the gulf or the wide variation. Whether people really see that their long-term efficiency and happiness relates to how well they run their own lab mostly or it relates to interdependence between their own and other labs… So the tension in the department is between these two points of view. So on the one hand, there are a group of people who want to have less involvement and people telling them how to train their students and less input from other people in terms of shared resources, just be left alone. And the other side is somewhere where you’re trying to build cooperation, collaboration, and that you see is more important in a sense then having survival of very independent isolated labs…But I think to some degree, people are going to do what they want to do
because the types of people that go into this have to be good at running their own show. “

See Table 2  Identities and Power in the Research Department.
Chapter 6  Case Report Two: The CTR Department

Introduction

This case report presents the findings from research Site two, the Consulting, Teaching, and Research (CTR) Department. This department was located in an organization with over 20,000 employees globally. The particular division focused on applied science, teaching, and research. Participants at this site enjoyed autonomy around the goals, processes, and timing of their individual work, but not resources like the number or mix of support staff. Peers and management recognized this department for its strong culture of cooperation, professional excellence, and active support for scientists as both professionals and as contributors to the larger community through family and other roles.

Opening Vignette

Decades after women began to enter science in significant numbers, M11, a white female scientist, and mother of two young children, reflected on the different career choices she had made in contrast to the women who entered science before her. “… I don't know how M5 [a senior woman scientist] did it. She and her husband are both full-time scientists, and they are just -- I don't think she sleeps! I just don't think she sleeps! It is non-stop! But she is unbelievably respected in the world of science, she has worked her
way up to that, and that is something that she has completely earned with exceptional
dedication and hard work over the years. And she's published and everything in the
world! And we support her. And she's tremendously supportive of me, but that's not my
choice! That's not what I want.”

What M11 wanted was to be able to pursue her love of applied science as a
scientist as well as maintain her identity as active parent to her children. In the CTR
Department, she found she was able to reconcile these two identities. The proactive
practice changes implemented by the current chair made this reconciliation possible.
However, these changes also appeared to be possible due to a culture primed to value and
support an apparently cross-cutting identity of active parent in the workplace.

The Context and Founding of the CTR Department

The CTR Department was founded in 197x. Its focus was applied science, in the
form of consulting, and teaching, though it would later expand into research. The
department grew slowly during its first decade. In 197x MH joined the department. MH
would become one of four successive Chairs who shaped both the shared identities and
culture within the department. A period of faster growth of the CTR department in the
1980s corresponded with the entry of significant numbers of women, minorities, and
immigrants in science and technological fields. Thus, several early members of the
department were women or from countries outside both the U.S and European countries.
Despite this added diversity of identities, participants articulated a culture that several attributed to the leaders of the department.

*Leadership and Shared Identities in the CTR Department*

A senior male scientist observed, (M12) – “I've been here for 18-20 years, and because of the founding influences of MH, who was the Chairman who hired me, and then ML who followed him, M5, the acting Chairman after ML left, and M18, we're like family here.”

MH presided over the first period of growth in the number of scientists in the department. MH apparently modeled and recruited scientists very much in line with his identity. Participants described him as an excellent scientist, who valued hard work, and meeting client needs in anyway possible. Recalled a senior male scientist, “the very first chair I never knew, but the guy after him who was here for many years was MH, and he's just a -- he's a saintly guy, and a hard, hard-working scientist” At the same time, he was known for being very involved in his own family and treating his colleagues as family. (M4). Recalled a female scientist, “MH …gosh, he was a guy who could bring the best out of anybody! Very inspiring! I would say that he is a very religious man, he's almost priest-like in his study of science, and in the way he teaches. …So he had that scholarly part about him. But he also -- he's the father of five! And he treated everybody in the department like a member of the family! And just that kind of combination of inspiring people to do their best, being familiar like you would be in a family, joking and messing
around, and he was really quite an inspirational figure for me to go to in science, and then to stay here as well.” (M19)

Key elements of the prevailing shared identities of department members emerged during MH’s tenure. One was excellent consulting scientist. The excellent consultant was a skilled, client centered, problem solver. Hard-work was also frequently cited as an admirable trait in peers. For example, the skills and long hours of M3, which were referenced in the opening vignette, were recalled by several male and female participants who regarded her as a role model. Furthermore, participants reported long hours in pursuit of science.

However, MH and his successors also fostered the belief that life was more than science. He fostered a sense of caring about colleagues, beyond valuing their technical contributions. Thus, the other aspect of the prevailing identity that emerged in the department was that of family member, or as one female department member clarified “functional family” member. All but the newest department members directly discussed this identity. The newest members discussed their perceptions of the department culture but did not discuss who they were in terms of either prevailing department identity. Like the junior scientists in the Research department, they were more concerned with discerning how to launch and maintain their careers.

The functional family identity meant some clear expectations for behavior around the treatment of others. A male scientist observed (M13), “It's also an environment that made me realize that people do different things, and the fact that they do different things in different areas, that doesn't mean that they're less than me! If I said, "do that" and it
wasn't done, I should not be presenting it as "I SAID DO THAT!" [pounds on chair for emphasis] And I should reason with people and understand where they're coming from.”

A period of faster growth in the department came after MH when ML became chair. M3, a senior female scientist reflected on how the department grew from a handful of scientists to eighteen. “M19 [a female scientist] and I -- M19 had finished her fellowship, and I was interested in moving. So we became a department of 3, this was 198X. And now I know, if you look at the roster, it's pretty big, it's grown exponentially since then!

ML was described as “A wonderful person, just a very fine, caring and decent human being.” (M19) ML modeled excellent teaching and training of the junior scientists who joined the department. Thus, ML elaborated the prevailing identity around developing others. Reported one female scientist (M11) who came through the department as a fellow, “the department [was] very enthusiastic about having people, and really dedicated to training people…going through the fellowship, I was just amazed at the effort they put into it,” Another female scientist (M15) reported how important this support had been in helping her see herself as a scientist as she proceeded through her fellowship, “I got to work with scientists who were so amazing to me (M7 and ML)! M7, (a male scientist) was so bright, intelligent, and hard-working, everything that I had always wanted to be! I mean, so that was a big influence … then he [M7] wrote this amazing letter personally to me, saying ‘God, you were one of the best…’ And that, of course, elevates you…And I think M7 really influenced me…You think wow, they’re the nicest people. They work hardest. And they’re the smartest…”
The Chair at the time of the study was M18. He had assumed the chair’s role because the outside search to replace ML was “going poorly.” His objective was to maintain the culture of the department and address the external challenges the department faced. While ML had maintained processes and practices supporting the same professional identity for everyone, M5 and M18 implemented process and practice changes intended to maintain the prevailing shared professional identity while making adjustments to respond to the environment.

Under M5, the department began implementing reduced-time positions for scientists. Unlike similar positions in other science departments, at a certain minimum threshold of hours worked, these scientists had the rank and privileges of full-time scientists but at reduced pay and benefits. Though mostly younger women of varying ethnicity took these positions, a few men did also. Still, the mix was unique to the department. This move made the identity of active parent salient to department members. The active parent identity shared with the prevailing identity the value of building a strong family and support for the development of others. The active parent identity involved spending substantial face time with children, particularly during the years of school age and younger. However, the core values of caring and fostering the development of others still aligned with the shared department values.

Behavior on the part of reduced-time scientists appeared to facilitate support of their identity. Reduced-time scientists appeared to be particularly cognizant of not allowing their work to fall to others, even on days they were scheduled out of the office. For example, in her interview M11 explained how she fielded client calls during her off
day during the week. M9, a female reduced-schedule scientist explained how she offered to step in for a colleague when he was accidently scheduled for consulting meetings on his day off. M7 took the most difficult, time-consuming clients from his full-time colleagues.

_The Culture of the CTR Department_

Several scientists noted what one female scientist described as the “culture model of the big family” (M19). ML was credited overtly insisting on norms of personal and professional support. Explaining the norms that encouraged scientists to freely consult on cases, and even substitute for one another in handling client work, a senior male scientist (M12) reported, “First of all ML insisted on help, M5 has followed that and M18 [has followed].” M7 elaborated, “They pitch in. People just pitch in, they don't ask for much in return. But the people here will obviously do things in return for them… no one keeps a tally. But to me, that took years of instilling that into the group, and years of careful recruiting…[and] I would say from anywhere from informal conversations to formal ones. Like say at weekly staff meetings, issues like this are brought up if it's important. Brought up at retreats. But it's also discussed everywhere, like 'this is what you do, this is what we do as a group.' It's sort of the culture of the group.”

ML made other moves towards enculturation of the excellent consulting scientist and functional family identities. ML maintained a system of equal distribution of the consulting work, work that tended to be grueling and absorb time from research and
teaching. M3, a senior female scientist, noted that “… one of the strengths of the
department for many years was that we all did the same kinds of work, we did the same
thing. So nobody was resentful of anybody else, there was no one who was looked at as
not pulling their weight.”

Also embedding the culture were the recruiting practices of the leader.
Participants reported that MH and ML after him recruited for people who would thrive in
and support the emerging department culture. M2 a senior male scientist recalled “The
chair who was here before M18 was a guy named ML who was here for a decade or
something. And he made it his mission essentially to recruit people and create that
atmosphere in the department. And recruit people to contribute to that. And to make that
almost an expectation. And there have been many, many new people since then. But it's
something that persists and it's something that I think everybody appreciates enormously!
“ M4, another male senior scientist supported the comments of M2, “ The people who
started this department, going way back to MH…MH was very wise about the people he
chose, and the people who followed him, and we've tried to continue to do the same.”
Mused one male senior scientist (M6), “ It really grows out of the personalities of the
people who started out in here. -- The very first chair I never knew, but the guy after him
who was here for many years was MH, and he's just a -- he's a saintly guy, and a hard,
hard-working scientist who made alliances throughout the institution, recruited other
similarly-minded people. M5 (a male scientist) observed " M19 (female scientist), you
know M19's just a wonderful mentor, scientist, teacher. And as these people came in,
they tended to attract more people like them. That's all, it's just like-minded people attract
-- likes attracting likes, I think.”
Two changes occurred that precipitated the shift a parent identity from low salience to high salience and integration within the department. The first was the increased demand for the department’s consulting services. To address this demand, the department needed more scientists and needed to grow quickly. Second, related to demand, there was an increase in the number of dual career marriages/partnerships. Also, more scientists, both women and men needed and wanted to maintain some level of involved parenting and a career. The offer of a reduced-time status helped the department retain highly skilled and experienced scientists as well as attract new scientists. Recalls a scientist who joined the department because of the availability of a reduced time position, “And he [M5] absolutely laid it out, and said ‘we need somebody on the client consulting who can take the pressure off of the other scientists and we really really really need someone on the consulting. And I said ‘Fine’ and signed on… (M11)”.

In the CTR department, the functional family identity was closely tied to the parent identity. As a result, department members willingly extended a culture of support to the reduced-time scientist. A full-time, male senior scientist with no children of his own, explained, “My wife and I decided not to. But we have some very wonderful children [he knew some of his colleagues’ children] in this department! And they're great kids! …And I think we all agree to, especially for our part-time people in this department, to rally for them. And that's not every department! Oh, yeah. There are people who have left the [other departments] because they were [reduced-schedule] moms and their colleagues did not rally to the flag when there were childcare issues or illness. And that just wouldn't be tolerated in this department… M18 has announced an
example of -- he's a great dad, by the way. His children are good kids, and he spends as much time as he can with them, because it's important.”

M18 continued to build the structural aspects of the family and professional culture. He implemented more flexible work practices around the consulting work. This had a significant impact on scientists' ability to manage multiple interests and responsibilities. For example, a female, reduced-schedule scientist explained, “And again, it has a lot to do with the changes that M18 has put into place to help control scheduling. I've been here six years almost. And the first several years were very consulting heavy. He has changed things so that I've been able to compartmentalize my time better. I can change my work to focus more on my areas of research interests… I've developed a lot of teaching curricula and I've got a number of small studies that are starting to enroll and go forward. I've had more time because of the way my consulting life has been structured differently to be able to pursue a little bit more research. Like today! It was a day that I would have never had before, … normally I didn't have a day where I didn't have otherwise have significant consulting responsibilities. And that's helped a lot. And also then the way that I've structured the rest of my time, I'm able to focus but still have time for my kids.”

M18 also began to push the development of scientific and functional specialties. For example, one scientist had slowly evolved to lead the department’s training and teaching programs (M7). Others began to focus on building the research infrastructure (M3). Everyone was encouraged to develop either a specialty or assume administrative leadership positions outside of the department (M19, M5, M6). This energized several
scientists who had been bordering on going stale. M6, a senior male scientist explained, “I was very almost straight consulting for a long, long time. But I now do a fair amount of administrative and committee work, I'm doing things with the X Society of America, and on advisory boards for public health, state and local, and I'm on the science division committee here, … and I very much enjoy that. .. I became president of the X Society of (U.S. State) then kind of moved into more national pieces... Those are things that I really enjoy and keep me from getting stale …which I was doing five years ago. I was getting stale.”

However, a contributor to the acceptance, even embracing of the structural changes of M18 was that the changes helped scientists begin to diversify from the excellent consulting scientist identity and expand into other areas, while maintaining the functional family identity. Asserted one female scientist, “The same solution doesn't need to work for everybody. And we've been able to sort of tailor our schedules to meet the individual demands of our lives. Which again is great! My husband is a research scientist who has been recruited heavily elsewhere, and so I have recently looked at many other programs. And there is just nothing to compare! It's going to make it very, very difficult to leave because of that.” (M2)

Overall, participants described a close-knit culture in which work demands were clear, but work practices and structures were flexible to meet the needs of scientists pursuing various scientific and personal interests. “I felt very supported. Always felt that this is a work family, this department. … Yeah. That this is my work family, it's not just my job here.” said one male scientist. One female scientist summarized, “You will find
this is the consistent theme among everybody. And it was clear immediately. Again, looking at a lot of departments at that time, I looked at 10 nationally-known science departments, and it's different. It's just very different. Where instead of people really operating very individually and having a structure that you fit into and there being that everybody fits into the same sort of structure, and there being relatively limited interaction or cooperation between people, other than potentially economic collaborations and so on. Here is again, it is very personal -- this department is like a family and it's very obvious.” (M2)

But this culture was not for everyone. M4, a male scientist observed, "And we've had people, there's no question, we've had people come through in searches, chairman searches, and have looked at us and go, 'are you kidding? Me get involved with this? It's crazy, you people are too crazy!...We've lost a couple of people along the way because that wasn't their approach to life! Not that they were bad people, but they didn't feel that need or desire to be that much of a close-knit, almost a family, and they soon felt their own level of discomfort and moved on to other things. They weren't told to leave, they just -- the workload was more than they cared to do, the environment with the amount of work, and one of them it was a lack of research time. I think we made a little bit of mistake in judging his character, in that he was truly more devoted to research than he was client consulting, and he wanted and needed more time than we could give him for that! And he sought that out and found it somewhere else, and more power to him! He knew what he needed and he went looking for it!”
Department members’ described interactions within the department as “collegial.” However, a closer look at these reported interactions suggests that collegiality in the CTR department encompassed multiple types of constructive, identity, and culturally supportive, interactions.

**Congenial Interactions**

Congenial interactions consist of the day-to-day behaviors conveying interest and polite respect for others, but not relational commitment. They can consist of exchange of simple resources that require little effort on the part of the participants (Jordan & Bilimoria, 2007). A male, junior scientist in the department observed, “I did my fellowship here. So when I was here as a fellow it's just the working relationship with everyone. Everyone is very approachable, very friendly. And that's not something that you find in many places. There are very few places where you actually find that. Almost every place you will find some people who are a little odd and difficult to get along with. But it was just that in this department, there wasn't a single person like that.” (M8)

Participants also noted the role that respect played in Congenial interactions. My own treatment when visiting the department was noticeably congenial. Scientists walking in the hall were helpful in locating other scientists. One scientist volunteered a tour of the location of offices, the coffee room, and restrooms. The researcher noted brief but
friendly exchanges between scientists who encountered each other in the coffee room and hallways. Thus, in the CTR the norm was to extend congenial interactions to all, as opposed to select high status peers or to people with direct working relationships.

*Norming Interactions*

Norming interactions occurred around transmission of group norms and expectations required for further successful inclusion within a group or organization. They also encompassed exchange of knowledge about skills and helpful approaches to the work. The most frequently recalled experiences of learning interactions were from scientists who had been fellows in the department. They reported being highly influenced by the examples set by senior scientists, as indicated in several of the earlier quotes. Summing up these experiences, one male scientist observed, “I learn a lot from my peers, I learn a lot from my students, I learn a lot from my technicians, if I keep my eyes and ears open all the time…I think that’s a great benefit and privilege of being in a place like this…” Some of the things scientists learned were how to handle the myriad of personalities in other departments they might work with, things to consider in resolving client cases, and different approaches to interacting with clients. A senior female scientist discussed her plans to introduce one of the newest female scientists in the department to scientists in the larger organization who work in the new scientist’s area of interest.

Not all norming interactions were pleasant. One scientist recounted how she, in her earlier days in the department, inadvertently ran afoul of the value of hard-work and
the norm of working persistently through out the day. M19 recalled, " I've had one of my peers, who I adore, a hard-driving guy, but I'd had a bad morning and I was actually eating lunch at my desk and reading the paper. He came in and saw me reading the paper and just [snorts]. You woulda thought I'd...! He was so angry, because he was working hard, and I wasn't. And that was kind of a pivotal moment so to speak -- that's the ethic in the department."

Relational Interactions

Relational interactions were a prominent feature of inclusion dynamics within the department. Scientists, particularly those whose tenure was long enough for them to have known MH and ML, appeared to have a human but also pragmatic interest in the well-being of their peers, professionally and personally. Reported a male senior scientist (M13), I do not feel that anyone is preferring their own benefits over mine, meaning that they don't walk on me to accomplish something -- I never had that feeling. We disagree, and that's healthy.” M18 spoke at length about how he tried to make time to talk to all the scientists in the growing department and find out ways he could help if he could. Despite having taken a much different approach to career and family than her younger professional peers in the department, a senior female scientist discussed how she tried to welcome new people to the department, particularly those juggling significant family roles. “… I try to spend time with each younger person that joins the department. And I haven't really been assigned as an official mentor to any of these people, but I try to
spend a lot of time with them, I also try to really open the door, particularly for the younger mothers, to talk about family issues. Because I was actually -- I think I was the first woman in the department that had kids. … And then it was a number of years more before we had others.” But some of my colleagues have done much more organized things, like M15 had a women's get-together at her house with all the women scientists and fellows, and that was wonderful, being able to chat in an informal setting.”

Some scientists were particularly attuned to the need for people to do things other than science. Explained, M19, “But we're pretty good, again, in the MH culture model of the big family, of cajoling. I've called partners' wives, and said, "Hey, we're going to go out to dinner, and you need to call and tell them [their spouse] that you're going to go, and we're all going, and this is it! Just drop it!" Because it's going to be here tomorrow, you know!"

Generative Interactions

Participants reported many interactions around the norm of support, which were important to creating time for individuals when they needed it to address family or personal demands. These interactions could have possibility been identified as further relational interactions. They did provide emotional support in terms of validation from peers of an identity held as important to them all. However, this form of generative interactions appeared to be critical to helping scientist maintain their careers in the face of
multiple identity demands. These interactions generated the time resources that kept scientists in the department and in the field.

Reported M15 – “So yeah, it's a great department. I love my department! No, really, the people -- I mean, they're always there for you, for anything. It's great to know that, because my husband's in science, and I know that that's -- I see some big discrepancies in the department on that realm. So it's good, it's a good department!”

Asserted M4, a male senior scientist, “… People help each other. They work together. They care about each other. We try to do what we can to make things easier for each other. If you need help, all you have to do is ask. People will try to pitch in as best they can.”

Generative interactions were particularly important to supporting the work/life priorities of scientists. Explained a female scientist, “There is a priority placed on kids and needing to be home when you need to be home. If even one of my kids got sick, or whatever, I had the Halloween party to go to at school, and I said to any of my colleagues, ‘Gosh, I really need [to go]’. They'd say "Go, leave, you're outtalk here. Give me your pager. I'm not even going to let you do another thing." (M2). A reduced time, female scientist recalled how she pitched in to help a full-time male scientists with his consulting load (M11), “It’s like ‘Hey, my wife is going to deliver, can you cover me?’, Yeah! Hand it over! Come on, you’re not going to answering pages while she is delivering for god sakes!” What was unusual was that scientists could and did direct this time to support an identity, which appeared to be divergent to the superordinate identity of consulting scientist, with apparent full social support from peers. It appeared that
assuming the load at various times for various colleagues was seen as supporting maintaining them as a colleague. There was a sense that they were interdependent and had kept every member of the department on board. Added M19, "We try to look after each other in that way. Because when one person crashes, and we're all enmeshed, and if one person crashes, then we all crash, whether that's actually or just in terms of the culture. We can't have a lame person! And by that token, when people have had health concerns, and things like that, I think everybody's pitched in! But on the other hand, if burnout is the issue, I think we all try to be pretty sensitive to that. And unload, and do the things we can to address it."

*Pressures on the Prevailing Identities*

The department’s culture appeared to exclude certain identities. As a male scientist pointed out earlier, some potential recruits and even a few who joined the department, found that the culture of the department was not for them. The time spent on activities such as teaching and consulting instead of research was a turn-off to some scientist’s whose identities were closely tied to research. The interdependent aspects of culture could be a turn off to other scientists. M5 noted that scientists tend to value autonomy, even in a close-knit department like the CTR department. The norms of helping other with their work might be too entangling for some scientists. Last, M18 the current chair asserted, "Prima Donas" need not apply. However, two factors threatened the accepted shared identities within the department.
Though the CTR department appeared to be very successful in integrating the identity of active parent with the professional identities of excellent consultant and functional work family member, a number of tensions persisted. Regardless of work schedule, scientists with young and/or school age children faced the daily challenge of maintaining their lives and careers. Sick children, sick sitters, school events, mad rushes to pick up children from daycare or school were part of daily life. Most difficult to manage were the unexpected events, such as prolonged illness of a child or sitter. The larger organization did not sponsor onsite childcare or other services that might facilitate management of work and personal lives.

A more pervasive tension cited by several scientists was the inefficiencies in work systems and the devaluing of their work by the larger organization. Inefficiencies in work processes, technology, practices, and supporting activities reduced scientists’ productivity and effectiveness throughout the workday and created spill over into home time. Most scientists relied on junior scientists or skilled research staff to take care of many implementation issues. However, requirements from the larger organization, in the view of one male scientist, interfered with how he could manage his staff. This was an organizational condition that he perceived to interfere with his ability to spend time with his family. “It's like I'm trying to run Wal-Mart, and it's like nobody shows up in the Electronics Dept. today. Because they have to go to this seminar. But I don't have anybody to step in and take their place. Oh, OK, so I'm the store manager and I'm going to be standing at the cash register in the Electronics Dept. I can do that, but when I'm doing that I can't be the Manager. And so my managerial job will suffer because I'm doing the daily task of another employee. And it's not about whether that's 'beneath me' or
anything -- it's not about who's more important! -- it's just I have -- being honest about what role does a scientist play in this bigger organization and what does effectiveness and efficiency look like? (M10)” A female scientist, with two young children elaborated on the short supply of support staff and the effect on her scientific work, “People will call at any moment and suddenly need you to make 10 phone calls. I get calls to get peoples' resources back on line, to try to get through a prior authorization for a chemical, that's a 20-minute-wait on hold with the Vendor, to somebody who's having a crisis or a this or that or whatever. There are unexpected things that happen all the time. But similarly, there's also one of you. So that's a huge piece of it. But there's preparing right now on my to-do list, there's also writing articles, preparing talks - Here's my list - writing a grant. Preparing some teaching sessions for the fellows in an hour and a half. - A variety of other things like that.”.

A related factor acting against maintenance of the prevailing identities was how the larger organization viewed and valued the contributions of the department. In some scientists’ minds, the excellent consultant identity had led to the department taking on more of other department’s work with little in return in terms of tangible resources to maintain their science and approach to the work. “I think as a dept we're very well-thought-of and respected in the institution but I think that we get a lot more 'attaboys' than dollars and resources.” asserted M6. M19 suggested, “Part of that is a MH heritage. MH was a consummate quarterback of consultations, …And so people have come to expect that of this department.” Noted M6, “as a group we're a very accommodating bunch. Can we say that we won't see a consult? Not really…Another factor was that the department members viewed their financial contribution to the organization in terms of
their consulting work as opposed to research. Noted, M6 again, … the bottom line is that the firm is a very free-wheeling environment in terms of consultation. …-- especially in a group like ours… Our way of making money is consultation.” Thus, the department faced increasing workload with little match in funding. This made hiring of support staff difficult and time for identity maintenance beyond that of consultant a scare resource.

*The Integration of a Cross-cutting Identity in the CTR Department*

The increasing workload, the need to diversify the work, a shift in the identities of entering scientists shifted the leadership to try to attract more scientists with more diverse sub identities, both professional and social. Under ML, teacher emerged as sub identities to the prevailing scientific identity. Also, active parent emerged as the department added reduced-schedule scientists. The reduced-schedule scientist would seem to be an abhorrent to the hard-working scientist aspect of the superordinate identity. The practical need for more qualified scientists in a growing department likely helped to reduce resistance. Their contributions to reducing the load on peers and supporting development of areas like teaching and training also appeared to provide value to department members. However, what appeared to make day-to-day implementation of these arrangements work appeared to stem from MH’s embedded values around family and care for others reflected in the functional family identity. This identity formed before the first active parent contracted for a reduced-schedule. (See Table 3 Identities, Culture, and Inclusion Factors in the CTR Department)
In the CTR department power relations manifested in three areas. Relative to the larger organization, scientists in the CTR perceived that they exercised less power over resources such as space and acquisition of support staff than scientists from other departments whom brought in large sums of money into the larger organization via grants or consulting. As a result, department scientists operated in older cramped facilities and shared support staff.

A second area of power relations concerned support staff. The staff members tended to be African Americans and filled various clerical and scientific support roles. Staff was shared among the scientists, and the formal reporting relationships were to a staff administrator who reported to the chair. Thus, individual scientists apparently had little formal authority over staff. Scientists differed in the ability to enlist the agency of support staff. One female and one senior male scientist, both white or U.S. origins, noted good relationships and support from staff. On the other hand, a female junior scientist (Asian origins) and a senior male scientist (white, U.S.) reported problems ranging from work returned unfinished to errors in scheduling of appointments. One difference between these sets of cases was that the former reported taking personal interest in staff. Reported M11, a senior female scientist, “So our assistants are working hard not just to be assistants but hopefully move forward and become research associates. And that's great, but it's a heck of a lot of work! So we've all got lives outside of our lives here. And
I think recognizing that, it helps you to work better when you're here, because if somebody is having a little down day, then I'm going to help them up, and by the same token, when I'm not feeling my best, they're going to help me out.” A senior male scientist noted that he made it a point to know and acknowledge everyone, including the janitor (M5). Scientists noting less support tended to discuss their relations with staff in terms of accomplishing tasks. They did not report particular efforts to develop interpersonal relationships with staff members or an interest in staff concerns.

The third area of power relations was among the scientists themselves. The chair exercised limited formal authority over a scientists work. Though, as M18 demonstrated with changes in client workload scheduling, he could facilitate or impede the work of scientists. Chairs in the CTR department appeared to concern themselves with acquiring the resources the department needed to do science and retain scientists. These efforts paid off in term of retention. At the time of the study, several scientists whose spouses had been heavily recruited to join other organizations, reported that they stayed with the organization due to the leadership of the chair.

Several scientists appeared to be particularly influential within the department. From a norms standpoint, one senior female scientist and one senior male scientist set a high standard for hard work. Several scientists in separate interviews mentioned the hours they worked and their accomplishments. Also frequently mentioned was a male scientist known for his knowledge of a particular scientific area. Several younger scientists cited him as the reason they had become scientists. However, the direct exercise of power appeared to center on the active parent identity or maintenance of the consulting scientist.
identity by avoiding burn-out. On a day-to-day basis, scientists were able to call upon each other to carry out work when a childcare, personal health or family need arose. In the name of maintaining a valued identity with in the department, a scientist could turn down even the chair. For example, one of these reduced-schedule scientists rebuffed a request from a chair to refocus her work in a way that she viewed would have imperiled her time with her children.

Scientists also appeared to lend their agency to members taking on new projects that could benefit the department. For example, though M5, a senior female scientist, was highly respected she was not sure that her peers would be supportive when she began to assume the work of building the department’s research infrastructure. However, later she believed that peers continued to support her because they saw that her work had opened opportunities for them.

M11, a reduced-time scientist, was able to draw support from her peers to pursue a community service project, which addressed a passion of hers and provided good publicity for the department and institution. “It's time away from the [lab] here,…, but it's also something that I think the people, my colleagues, 100% support what we're doing. …And invariably, when I announce that we're doing something like that, the response is "How can I help?" To a person, throughout the department. …And I've gotten nothing but 100% support for it!” She viewed the support she received from peers in a wider context saying, “To a person, throughout the department. So I think being able to not only [just do research, teach or work with clients], but to be able to kind of spread your wings and
do things that you're passionate about as well is very important. And I've gotten nothing but 100% support for it!” (M11).

However, choosing to maintain the active parent identity did appear to relate to lower status within the larger organization. Noted M11 again, “Anytime you do something like that [reduced-schedule] you do it at a cost, in the sense that I signed on as a [junior scientist] which is kind of a job you usually you get …right out of fellowship, and here I was much older than that. But it gave me what I needed to balance my job and my family at the time. So to be able to work with this group was well worth it. To be able to reach the balance that I needed in my life was well worth it.” (See Table 4 Identities and Power in the CTR Department)
Chapter 7  Discussion – Inclusion in the Study Departments

In this chapter, I will compare and contrast data from the two the departments and explore whether and how connections between the concepts emerged from the case data. In the process, I will address the three research questions of the study, which are reproduced here:

- What are the relationships between identity, inclusion-exclusion dynamics, and an organization’s culture in creating inclusion?

- What are the implications of inclusion strategies employed among individuals and groups within organizations?

- How might organizational members’ access and responses to power relate to their salient individual and/or group level identities in a work organization?

However, before addressing these questions, I will discuss contextual factors that appeared to play a role in inclusion within the study departments.

Role of Contextual Conditions and Primers for Inclusion

The Influences of Context

An aspect of inclusion that was omitted from the conceptual framework was the context of the study organizations. I will first discuss the external contextual conditions
that appeared to influence social processes within the study organizations before I address
the research questions.

Though the focus of this study was on the internal social dynamics within the
departments, certain contextual factors appeared to influence the content and course of
these dynamics. The professional context was addressed in chapter three. Here I discuss
societal changes and other professional organizations as additional influencing contexts.

**Larger Societal Conditions.** As suggested by the chair of the Research
Department during a research contracting meeting, the external social context did appear
to provide conditions favorable for greater representation of women in each department.
During the growth periods of both departments, women began to enter and complete
science degrees in record numbers. They constituted the largest visibly different social
category within the organizations studied.

Identity shifts were also underway among the white, educated, middle-class men
who dominated the study organizations and the larger organizational and professional
contexts. The model of the “supportive spouse” who managed the active parenting
identity outside of the sphere of the workplace was less prevalent among younger male
scientists. An increasing number of younger men assumed the active parent role in some
degree. Scientists cited two cases of male students who opted for the primary parent role
and became supportive spouses in the service of their wives’ careers. These trends did not
necessarily change the gendered nature of professional identity at the working level of
organizations, but it did appear to shift the location of the perceived problems of the
active parent identity from women as a category to working parent as a category potentially including men.

**The Larger Environmental Context.** As noted in prior studies (Dent & Whitehead, 2002; Derber, et al., 1990), scientists in the department noted the constricting of their professions by managerial controls and pressures. Several Research Department participants perceived a shift within the larger environment from concern about knowledge creation and training to the procurement of grant funding. Scientists on the application end of the spectrum voiced similar concerns around the valuing of client work by the larger organization. Also of concern was increasing administrative demands and controls around their work, with little administrative support.

However, the CTR did take advantage of changes in larger organizational policies that allowed reduced-schedule work. Such policies became popular in many organizations in the 1990s in an effort to promote work/life balance. The difference between the CTR and many other departments was that the CTR deployed the policies in ways that supported the prevailing identities, as I will discuss in more depth later.

**The Context of Other Departments.** Awareness of other departments appeared to play a role in maintenance of the shared identities within the study departments. Consistent with Hogg’s (2006) explanation of social categorization processes and creation of an in-group identity, scientists in both departments noted differences between their department and other departments. They reported features of their own department in a positive light and characterized differing departments in a negative light. These
comparisons sometime took the form of retelling of stories of bad Chairs, group conflicts in their former departments, or the observation of “dysfunctional families” from an interview visit to another department. These stories also illustrate unacceptable behavior and/or boundaries of interaction and the exercise of power of department leaders and participants in the participant’s current department.

Identity, Inclusion-Exclusion and an Organization’s Culture

Mor Barak’s (2000) model of inclusion indicated that inclusion was an affective and perceptual outcome of the identities (personal norms and values) brought into an organization and the organization’s culture (policies, processes and procedures). The data from these cases supports a role for identity and culture in relation to inclusion processes. However, Mor Barak (1998) assumes that individuals bring fixed personal and social identities to the organization, which remain relatively fixed even after interaction within the organizational context. Scholars have pointed out that peoples’ identities are influenced by the context of other identities (Abrams, de Moura, et al., 2005). The data from these cases suggest that individual and group level identities are integrated at some point in organizations’ histories and become the prevailing identities. Newcomers have to adapt to or take advantage of opportunities to shift these prevailing identities. In addition, the data suggests a more dynamic relationship between identity, culture, and inclusion-exclusion.
Establishing the Prevailing Identity – The Role of Early Leaders

Early in the history of the two departments, there was no internal culture, but there were larger organizational cultures. However, due to the autonomous nature of their professional work, early leaders and members had a great deal of leeway in establishing the values and day-to-day norms of their organizational cultures. An important result of this autonomy was that members of the Research Department selected their first formal leader. In the CTR, MH was selected by leaders of the larger organization who shared his profession. He had the freedom to recruit and select department members in his own image. As a result, the early leaders of the department reflected the prototypical group member. Abrams and colleagues (2005) explain that the prototypical group member is not the average member, but more of an ideal or aspired-to identity that helps groups to clarify the in-group boundaries, or the “pro-norm” deviant. That prototypical individual will likely emerge as the organizational leader (Abrams, de Moura, et al., 2005). In the Research Department, members had the advantage of prior interactions with QZ when they were peers in different departments. In addition, what appeared to support QZ’s emergence as leader was the perceived need for the fledging department to pull together, yet remain open to cross-disciplinary collaborations. QZ’s skill in recognizing and actively encouraging such generative interactions is one of the key reasons for her support within the department and her subsequent promotion out of the department.

Consistent with the literature on both identity and culture (Abrams, de Moura, et al., 2005; Schein, 1990), the early leaders appeared to play a significant role in what aspects of identities were integrated into the prevailing identities and how these
arrangements were embedded in culture. QZ was female and while maintaining certain masculine aspects of the scientist identity, such as valuing autonomy and promoting her science to others, she brought in aspects associated with a female identity role (Barrett, 2002; West & Zimmerman, 2003). A male scientist described her as “nurturing” in her interactions with junior scientists, and he noted that she took an active role in the development of junior faculty. However, her good scientist credentials were undisputed. She was a recognized researcher in her specialty with a national reputation. She fostered interdependence as well as independence in science. MH of the CTR department strove for excellence in his career. However, he also strongly identified with his religion and brought the idea of caring for the whole person into his work. He was recalled as acknowledging how work could affect the personal lives and well-being of scientists and proving emotional support and encouragement. MH apparently did not make changes in the structure or demands of the work that might have better accommodated the active parent identity. In fact, a participant indicated that MH left the role of chair due to the demands on his time and physical/mental resources. However, it appears that he did promote a culture receptive to later changes.

Gender in the Prevailing Identities

A unique outcome of inclusion dynamics within the departments was the forms of gender integration into the prevailing identities. As discussed, the Chairs appeared to play
a significant role in providing ingredients and supports for this integration. Other processes were also involved, which I will discuss later. In the two departments, women constituted the largest social identity group that had been historically excluded from science in the U.S. (Sheffield, 2004). In this section, I will discuss gender in relation to the prevailing identities in the two departments.

In both departments, a more gender inclusive (masculine and feminine) conception of scientist appeared to influence the construction of the prevailing identities and support the inclusion of women, both in terms of access to a scientific positions and in ongoing inclusion dynamics. This integration of difference into the prevailing identity was important because it reduced women’s need to perform what Bruni and Gheradi (2002) termed “gender switching.” They describe gender switching as the delicate balancing act, which women in male gendered work cultures have to strike in day-to-day interactions in order to assume a professional identity. When the professional identity is defined in highly masculine terms, Bruni and Gheradi (2002) suggest that women must seek a balance in every interaction between maintaining a professional identity in accordance with those masculine terms and yet avoid disqualification from the professional identity on basis a female identity (Bruni & Gherardi, 2002; Valian, 1999). This type of dynamic comes into play when one social identity has been categorized in opposition to characteristics of another (Hogg, 2006; Tajfel, Henri, 1981). For example, “hegemonic masculinity” or extreme masculinity in terms of aggression, heterosexuality, strength, risk-taking and rationality is constructed in a dichotomy with ‘emphasized femininity’ characterized by “sociability over technical competence”, fragility, compliance and acceptance of motherhood and childcare” (Barrett, 2002, p. 159). In the
study departments, insofar as the prevailing professional identities were not defined in opposition to a particular social or personal identity, and/or the prevailing identity(ies) embraced aspects of members’ personal or social identities, the need for these “switching” performances were reduced. Women in the Research Department were still clear that certain more masculine behaviors such as self promotion were key to their careers, particularly in context such as conferences and when presenting their science. However, in the study departments, a more gender integrated prevailing professional identity appeared to reduce the effort both women and men had to make to belong, interact and integrate themselves into the department.

Across both departments, a conception of scientist more aligned with a “pure science” approach emerged, which appeared to favor a more gender inclusive professional identity. Holton (1999) found different perceptions of good science between male and female scientists. He noted that male scientists tended to take a more “careerist” approach and characterized good science as getting research published fastest and generating publications. A successful science career required aggression, combativeness, and self-promotion (Holton, 1999). Women, on the other hand described what was termed “pure science,” that is, a focus on significance of the results, care and accuracy in the results, and comprehensiveness. “Women were less concerned with the political aspects of science, such as influence or power” (Holton, 1999. p. 83) and a successful career related more to being able to pursue and disseminate pure scientific knowledge. This approach to a scientific professional identity was particularly prevalent in the Research Department and shared by both women and men. It was reflected in what became the cultural behaviors and norms around avoiding internal competition and
support (or at least non-impediment) of peers’ science endeavors. It was also reflected in the CTR department in terms of the emphasis on training of fellows and outreach to junior scientists in the form of informal mentoring.

The CTR department appeared to take gender integration a step further in their construction of the shared functional family identity. The belief in caring for peers as both a professional and member of a family or community outside of work underpinned the functional family identity. The functional family identity was an identity that both full-time and reduced-schedule scientist shared. But more interesting was the flexibility around enacting this identity. As indicated in the opening vignette of Chapter 6, not even women took the same approach toward the functional family identity. A senior woman remained full time, shared active parent duties with her spouse, and shifted the timing of her autonomous work. A less senior woman opted for a reduced-schedule position. Each of them singled out each other for praise in interviews. The senior woman was cited by colleagues for her excellent scientific skills and hard work. The younger scientist was cited for her organization of external outreach efforts. Men who joined the department also tended to value their roles as parents, though most men opted for full-time work. The functional family identity allowed them to give voice to the need for family time, which the larger organizational context generally ignored. They supported the structural changes that reduced-schedule scientist role necessitated as these created time for professional growth and development. Thus, the functional family identity appeared to serve as a bridging identity between the sub-group category identities of full-time and reduced-schedule scientists. In so far as the prevailing identity was shared and salient, in-group/out-group categorizations between the two groups were reduced.
The demands of the organization and the professional context play roles in what identities become salient and a part of the prevailing identities. The cases suggest that, particularly early in an organization’s formation, many individual level identities can be salient. Some of these identities are personal (gender, age) and others social (parent, professional). The identities that form to create unique in-group boundaries (the negotiated prevailing identities) are influenced by contextual demands of the situation. The larger organization provides such a context, as do any other challenges or constraints presented by the environment outside of the organization (Denison, 1990; Schein, 1990).

Proposition 1: Given the set of contextual conditions an emerging organizational unit faces, the salient aspects of individually held personal and professional identities will influence the formation and maintenance of the prevailing shared identities

The Role of Culture

In terms of the emergence of the prevailing identities within the department, the external contexts as discussed earlier appeared to play a dominant role in the formation and early development of the departments. The features participants referred to as culture were established over time. The role that culture appeared to play at this point was consistent with prior literature (Schein, 1990). Leaders enacted structures and processes around formal inclusive interactions, which tended to be replicated over time. For
example, QZ introduced department-wide research meetings, which continued under AZ. M19 retained (and built on) the introduction of reduced-schedule work by his predecessors. Sometimes leaders enacted new processes like the regular department meetings introduced by AZ.

Other changes appeared to impact the maintenance or shifting of the prevailing identities and culture. Some scientists in the Research Department attributed the decline of the scientific community identity to AZ’s strategy of diversifying the specialties within the department and her avoidance of cross lab policies around areas such as mentoring. These same moves by AZ were viewed by other scientists as strengthening the good scientist identity, reducing tensions around similar research streams, and creating more interdepartmental collaborations. Regardless, the science community member identity appears to have decoupled from the good scientist identity. It was the science community member identity that QZ best embodied. The science community identity appeared to foster outreach and development of new and junior faculty. Such outreach benefited the women who joined the department during AZ’s tenure. At the time of the study, the scientific community member identity appeared to have shifted more to promoting professional friendships through informal socializing than the generative interactions with senior faculty that helped launch YC’s lab (See generative interactions in Chapter 5). Women were not excluded from these interactions; in fact, men were sure to invite them. However, for women and men trying to maintain a good scientist identity relative to work and an active parent identity, such interactions did not directly assist in maintaining either of these identities.
On the other hand, M18’s structural moves around client scheduling appeared to boost both the excellent consulting scientist identity and expand the functional family identity. The difference between outcomes in the two departments appears to link to which prevailing identities the Chairs’ moves were perceived to affirm. In particular, M18’s moves appeared to maintain the linkage between the individual professional competence-based prototype of excellent consulting scientist and the collective prototype of the ideal colleague located in the functional family member identity. As the functional family member identity was linked to that of active parent, maintaining and enhancing the salience of the functional family identity appeared to support inclusion of male and female scientists’ active parent identities. This reduced the need for women to employ gender switching, or an assimilation strategy, in order to maintain an in-group membership position closer to prototypicality (Abrams, de Moura, et al., 2005; Schein, 1990).

The Role of Inclusive-Exclusive Interactions

The emergence and then embedding of the prevailing identities into culture appeared to be related to inclusion-exclusion dynamics within the departments. Mor Barak’s (2000) model of organizational inclusion suggests that identity and culture are single directional inputs to members’ perceptions of inclusion-exclusion. In this study, inclusion-exclusion is explored in terms of the interaction experiences of participants. This approach yielded more insights about the relationship between inclusion-exclusion, identity, and culture.
The particular inclusion-exclusion dynamics studied in these departments converged towards interactions, which could facilitate individual (or sub-identity group – like reduced-schedule scientist) movement towards prototypicality within the superordinate and salient in-group identity. Furthermore, identities could be shaped, shifted, or solidified through inclusive-exclusive interactions. And such interactions could have a positive or negative valence. Culture influenced inclusive-exclusive interactions by providing intra-departmental norms around how decisions are made, who is involved, and/or mechanisms for conveying in formation (formal meetings vs. emails or meetings in the hall). However, given the independence scientists exercised in the day-to-day execution of their work, perceptions of one’s own and other identities appeared to relate more to the examples of inclusive-exclusive interactions participants shared.

Early in the history of the Research Department, it was through ongoing inclusive and exclusive interactions that the unique shared conception of the good scientist identity appeared to take shape and influence the formation of culture. The early leaders and members of the department modeled interaction behaviors that were both consistent with their own professional and, to varying degrees, personal identities. As the departments grew, members interacted and addressed the challenges of funding, workload, and eking out physical space. The aspects of identities that worked in addressing these challenges were supported with the norms, practices, work structures and other aspects that constituted the culture of a department (Schein, 1990). Consistent with the literature, inclusive-exclusive interactions in both departments did appear to serve to socialize new members into both the prevailing shared identities and the culture that maintained these identities (Levine, et al., 2005). Also, inclusive-exclusive interactions provided the data
individuals needed to assess themselves and others relative to the prevailing identities. What was interesting about many reported interactions in both departments was that they tended to consist of either giving or receiving resources, be it time, information, materials, or social support. In both departments, constructive interactions served to support the effectiveness of scientists and retain them in the department by creating an atmosphere that buffered members from stresses of competition and larger organizational demands. One senior scientist who had received offers for more prestigious positions explained why he remained stating the “stress to success” ratio was about right.

No department scientists reported exclusionary interactions of an overt or intentional harassing, degrading, or hostile nature. Exclusive interactions appeared to serve or be employed (intentionally or unintentionally) to signal a violation of norms. Thus, exclusive interactions could also represent a clear threat to the individual’s position relative to a key prevailing identity. In the one example of this nature (M12’s disgust at M19 taking a break), his directness in indicating a norm violation appeared to be received constructively by M19. However, M19 also reported relational and generative interactions with M12 and other colleagues. Those interactions also likely tempered how she interpreted M12’s behavior towards her.

Still, exclusive or inclusive interactions were not always constructive. An example of non-constructive exclusive interactions was the comments about her pregnancies reported by TJ, the female post doc. The comments may have been intended to warn her about the department norm of full devotion to science. She did not perceive her pregnancies as being relevant to her emerging status as a scientist. Only in hindsight, did she begin to suspect that she had violated some norm.
Furthermore, TJ was of the generation of scientists who believed that they could be an effective active parent and scientist. Women of the Baby Boomer and older Veteran’s generations had established their places in science by adhering to the example set by Marie Curie. Marie Curie walked the precarious line between the masculine norms and marginalized female roles in science by projecting her very real devotion to science publically and withholding public presentations of herself as a mother (Sheffield, 2004). Marie Curie advised her daughters, “it isn’t necessary to lead such an antinatural existence as mine, I have given a great deal of time to science because I wanted to, because I loved research. . . . What I want for women and young girls is a simple family life and some work that will interest them.” Curie’s wish for women appears to be the desire of some within emerging generation of female and male scientists. However, in TJ’s case, she eventually perceived the exclusion of an identity that was important to her. She left the department after securing an independent line of research and her own funding. TJ’s comments throughout her interview indicated that she had never been seen as a scientist by scientists within the department. Perriton (2006) points out research indicating that assessments of who is an insider or outsider influences interaction with and behavior towards others. Thus, inclusive interactions were not available to TJ and exclusive interactions with in-group members signaled TJ’s violation of important norms. An example of intended inclusive interactions that a target can experience as non-constructive involved relational interactions. Scientists maintaining active parent identities found relational interactions particularly difficult, because they did not perceive that these interactions supported either their professional or active parent identities, which were important to them. Furthermore, the nature and timing of the interactions (beer after
work hours) was reportedly unappealing to some male and female participants. The conflict of the timing with family responsibilities and the idea that for religious or other reasons people would not drink beer, did not cross the minds of initiators of these interactions. Anecdotal stories from conversations with professionals outside of the study departments suggest that the nature of these informal discussions can tend to center on organizational politics, gripes about the administration and gossip. My informants expressed frustration that such conversations did not advance them professionally and they stopped attending such functions as soon as they achieved tenure. I noticed a similar approach (and subject matter) to “getting to know each other” pursued by white male students in a group dynamics course I taught. The format allowed me to inquire about this behavior. The men explained that such conversations were intended to be inclusive of other group members. However, inattention to the diversity of the group pointed to lack of understanding (or perhaps social identity complexity, which I will discuss later) on the part of such well meaning peers and actually isolated some participants within the group.

In extreme cases of norm violation, in-group members could signal rejection of an incoming member via isolation. Isolation is an extreme form of exclusion and, at minimum signaled rejection or disengagement from a prevailing identity (Williams, K. D.). For example, the “lone wolf” scientist of the Research Department was seen as isolating himself due to his behavior, yet he also perceived that he was being isolated by his peers. However, the original source of this identity disconnect appeared to be around the junior scientist’s style of independent action in a department whose members at the time closely held a scientific community identity. This scientist did not apply for tenure, thus assuring his departure from the department. In this particular case, he apparently left
science as well. On the other hand, the scientist who left the CTR department, remained in science but obtained a position more aligned with his interests. It was not clear whether he had experienced isolation, but whatever his experience, it did not move him away from a scientist identity. Thus, isolation is a social tool used consciously or unconsciously between in-group members as they test themselves and others against the prototypical standard. The outcomes appear to depend on the identity aspects most salient in the prototypical model and the mutual capacity (and willingness) to integrate differences. Though this particular example did not involve a visibly different social identity group, it does illustrate the bluntness of the instrument of isolation. It does not question the nature of the norm violation or difference. If this is the main mechanism of handling norm violations within the organization, inclusion of new identities is likely to be problematic if possible.

The interactive aspects of the scientific community member identity were also embedded in the cultures of the respective departments. In the Research Department, 6 cross-lab cooperative efforts were reported among the 12 primary scientists of the department as well as 1 department-wide effort to redesign the student training program. Senior scientists pointed out these interactions as evidence of the high level of cooperation within the department they enjoyed and expected. However, these activities did not appear to be linked to any formal structure but more to shared behavioral norms. The ability to request and expect such supports was appeared to be function of shared identities. The behaviors themselves were tied to the larger understood meanings and functions of the department. Thus, these behaviors can be viewed as residing in culture.
Thus, day-to-day inclusive-exclusive interactions provided the threads, with which scientists not only wove careers and established their identities as good scientists and scientific community members in the Research Department or excellent consulting scientists and functional family members in the CTR Department. A scientist, particularly an emerging or junior scientists, regardless of social-demographic identity, could find himself or herself excluded from the prevailing identities. However, to the degree that the prevailing identities did not reflect important aspects of a scientist’s personal identities, she or he could experience exclusion dynamics. The prevailing identities did shift over time in each department. How an identity aspect was to be included (or not) in the prevailing professional identities depended on the integration strategies employed by both department membership aspirants and department incumbents.

Strategies of Integration and Their Implications

Strategies of integration were employed by both the organization and potential or current in-group members who held new identities that were new to the organization (parent, caregiver, administrator) or new variations on old identities (teacher, administrator, active parent). Dovidio and colleagues (2005) refer to these as “cognitive representations” of the outcomes of conditions of contact. Oddly, Dovidio and colleagues do not mention direct contact in their model of intergroup contact. However, as I constructed the conceptual model it appeared that Dovidio’s cognitive representations meshed nicely with Cox’s(1993) theorized organizational outcomes of integration as well as Thomas and Ely’s (2001) Diversity Paradigms. Furthermore, Cox’s multicultural
organization and Thomas and Ely’s learning and integration appeared to mesh with Dovidio’s “pluralistic integration” (Dovidio, et al., 2005, p. 260). However, the case findings helped me to understand that these scholars were talking about a similar phenomenon but they were addressing different levels of behavior around inclusion. Dovidio and colleagues were addressing cognitive individual and sub-group assessments that guided in-group interactions (Dovidio, et al., 2005). Whereas Cox (1993) and Thomas and Ely (1996) were referring to types of organizational cultures. Thus, the former treats inclusion as a social process and the later treats inclusion as an outcome.

The study data suggests that newcomers (or holders of new identity category(ies)) engaged in interactions within the organization based on certain expectations, or what Dovidio and colleagues (Dovidio, et al., 2005) refer to as cognitive representations about how individuals prefer to mesh their own identities with that of the in-group they were joining. They suggest that under recategorization, when an individual holds a category identity that is of low salience relative to a superordinate identity they will select an adaption strategy of assimilation whereas highly salient subordinate identities will suggest a strategy of either separation from or pluralistic integration with the superordinate identity. This behavior appears to relate to self-monitoring processes, which Snyder (1980) explains is also concerned with “the processes by which individuals actively plan, enact, and guide their behavioral choices in social situations. Caldwell and O’Reilly (1982, p. 124) note that “high self-monitors, out of concern for the appropriateness of their behavior, modify their behavior to fit the situation, whereas low self-monitors attend less to social cues and rely more on internal beliefs as guides for appropriate behavior”.
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Participants were very clear about their desire to be scientists and had already received considerable training in this regard. Members appeared to expect and even welcome assimilation with regard to the prevailing good scientist identity. Specific examples of self-monitoring with respect to a prevailing professional identity can be seen in the comments of BY who indicated that he was very aware of the standard of good science set by AZ and he tried to emulate it. The no a-holes, no prima dona polices of informal and formal leaders of the two departments indicated identities to avoid in order to achieve in-group membership. A female scientist’s awareness that she had broken the implicit norm of not having children before tenure and her efforts to assert her identity as a scientist provides another example of possible high self-monitoring. However, newcomers did bring new identities (generational) and new takes on old identities (active parent). As senior scientists in both departments noted, these younger scientists did not appear to be aware of behavioral norms around working hours or the timing of starting families. It was unclear from the data whether such widespread behavior was the result of an identity-based strategy as suggested by Dovidio (2005). However, these apparent examples of low self-monitoring occurred relative to social identities that were not integrated into the prevailing professional identities (cross-cutting identities). Thus, these examples suggest that there is an additional factor involved in self-monitoring behavior related to how the required adjustments in behavior support or conflict with important held social identities (See Table 5).

In contrast, the acceptance and integration of the active parent identity in the CTR department created a different set of norms that were consistent with that identity. In other words, the active parent identity appeared to be a nested identity within the CTR
department. Self-monitoring behavior in that department supported integration into the professional and personal identities. An example of such self-monitoring behavior was how reduced-schedule scientists tried to ensure that their workload did not fall to full-time scientists. The scientist adopted this behavior to support both a highly salient personal identity and the prevailing professional identity. Thus, self-monitoring behavior appears to be not only related to an individual’s ability to navigate social situations, but it is also a function of how the social dynamics of identity within an organization mesh with the individual’s identities. Based on a sample of 268 undergraduates, Miller & Thayer (1988) found that participants’ social sources of identity were significantly related to their self-monitoring scores. Findings from a professional context support Miller & Thayer’s results. Thus, there may be some relationship between self-monitoring behavior and the perceived superordinate in-group identities as follows:

Proposition 2: The congruence between an individual’s highly salient social identity(ies) and the target in-group identity will influence the extent to which the individual engages in self-monitoring behavior.

Proposition 2a: High congruence between a highly salient social identity and the in-group identity(ies) may relate to more self-monitoring behavior relative to the in-group identity
Proposition 2b: Low congruence between a highly salient social identity and the in-group identity(ies) may relate to less self-monitoring behavior relative to the in-group identity and eventual departure from the in-group.

Across the departments, a combination of integration strategies appeared to be employed within the organization. Separation appeared likely to occur around superordinate and subordinate identities that cannot be reconciled and are of low salience to group members (See Table 5). These identities varied by department, but likely consisted of memberships in other organizations outside of the department. Overall separation did not appear to be a pre-dominant integration strategy. Norms of a cooperative culture appeared to support constructive interactions, which maintained the high salience of the prevailing identities.

Proposition 3: Assimilation will be a preferred integration strategy when the organization’s culture makes prevailing identity(ies) highly salient.

Assimilation was likely to occur around a larger salient superordinate identity. The superordinate identity could reflect the identity of a dominant social category identity. Alternatively, the superordinate identity could emerge as the result of some prior negotiation. Examples at the formative stage of the department include formal structural recognition of the departments and the resulting new category of Research Department member or CTR Department member. As mentioned earlier, assimilation appeared to be
the preferred strategy relative to the professional aspects of the prevailing identities. Surprisingly, only two participants in the Research Department reported that they considered aspects of their own identity (personality, personal values, style of working) as they considered department membership. Most looked at geography and research fit. Scientists in the CTR also considered geography but were also attracted to the functional family identity and “family friendly” culture of the department. Thus, assimilation appeared to be the preferred strategy of integration (See Table 5). However, different departments presented better assimilation opportunities for personal identities than others.

An individual (or sub group) is likely to attempt pluralistic integration when the dual identities individuals bring to the organization are both highly salient. Dovidio (2005) and Gaertner (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) conceptualized these dual identities in superordinate and subordinate relationship to each other. This strategy is particularly important under conditions in which two highly salient identities can come into contact and can conflict (Fiol, Pratt, & O’Connor, 2009). Such conditions appeared to be most likely to occur at the formation stage of the Research Department and with the incorporation of the reduced-schedule scientists (who made an active parent identity highly salient) in the CTR department.

In the Research Department, the integration of the differing specialties of scientists coming from different departments appeared to be facilitated by QZ’s promotion of the scientific community member identity and the shared goal of a strong department (See Table 5). The outcomes of her efforts are consistent with Fiol, Pratt, and O’Connor’s (2009) Intractable Identity Conflict Model.
In the CTR department there appeared to be two factors that contributed to organizational support of pluralistic integration. First was that the integration of difference related to maintenance of important aspects of the prevailing identity. Second, incumbent members perceived the link between the active parent identity and the functional family identity within the department. Furthermore, some members anticipated their own need to shift from a focus on maintaining their professional identities to assuming other social identities as they aged or became caregivers to their own aging parents. The CTR department provided the clearest evidence of these factors. The functional family identity in the CTR department appeared to prime department members for acceptance of reduced-schedule scientists. An older scientist with no children of his own supported the active parent identity in that he anticipated that he could need to attend to his own or family health concerns in the future. The active parent identity was driving changes in work practices and policies that would enable him to make needed identity shifts in the future (Table 5). Thus, in the case of the CTR department, the enabler of the integration of dual identities appeared to relate to what Roccas and Brewer (2000) refer to as “social identity complexity” or the capacity to hold dual identities. Fiol, Pratt, and O’Connor (2009) explain that this capacity depends on the extent of overlap perceived between sub-group identities one holds. Furthermore, the more these sub-identities are likely to be in conflict with each other, the more capacity for identity complexity is required. For example, the multiple functional identities of non-unimodal scientists within the Research Department require less social identity complexity to integrate than the excellent consulting scientist and parent identities within the CTR. The functional identities of teacher or administrator that made Research Department scientists
less unimodal were also in less conflict with the prevailing good scientist identity. Regardless, in day-to-day professional work settings, social identity complexity that supports the pluralistic integration of highly salient identities may have a direct bearing on maintaining harmonious intergroup relations.

Proposition 4: In so far as organizational members have a capacity for social identity complexity that results in pluralistic integration of highly salient sub-group identities, harmonious intergroup relations will be maintained within the organization.

Ironically, as cultural structures and norms emerge around the aspects of the pluralistic identity, new members will be recruited for and expected to assimilate to the integrated “We” that develops. Thus, pluralistic integration can morph into assimilation, until some new highly salient identity emerges that must be integrated. For example, in the CTR department, excellent consulting scientist and parent identities became the “We” identity of functional family member. The individual more interested in research and less attracted by the functional family identity left the organization.

Proposition 5: Pluralistic integration is unlikely to be a constant integration strategy of either individuals or organizations. Instead, the integrated dual identity (the integrated “We”) will become the new target of assimilation for organizational members and new members to the organization.
Overall, the study findings support the aspects of the Intractable Identity Conflict (IIC) Resolution Model. Fiol, Pratt and O’Connor (2009, p. 40) suggest that “promoting simultaneous intergroup differentiation and unity” supports formation and strength of dual identities or what Dovidio and colleagues refer to as pluralistic integration (Dovidio, et al., 2005). Particularly in the CTR department, two typically difficult to reconcile, cross-cutting identities of excellent consulting scientist and active parent were highly salient to department members and integrated into the “We” of the functional family identity. Thus, the conflict around the two identities was reduced between department members.

Integration Strategies and Power

Turner (2005) and Simon and Oakes (2006) theorize that identity is the basis of power in organizations. Given the shared prevailing identities, which could also reflect important aspects of social category identities, power relations did appear to emerge in ways consistent with the theories of Turner (2005) and Simon and Oakes (2006). However, how an individual or subgroup was included or integrated into a department appeared to determine who could exercise power through others and on what basis. The match of inclusion strategies between the individual/sub-group and the department appeared to be a significant factor in the course of inclusion. These strategies appeared in inclusion-exclusion dynamics at the individual level and the organization’s strategy appeared to be perpetuated in its culture. The match (or mismatch) between inclusion
strategies between the individual and the organization also appeared to play a role in how power relations became manifest.

A mismatch of strategies could produce a default separation strategy on one or both sides (See Table 5). For example, in this study included a mismatch between the expected inclusion strategy of pluralistic integration by a scientist holding a salient parent identity and a sub-group strategy of assimilation to certain social norms associated with the scientist identity. The outcome was adoption of a separation strategy on the part of the participant relative to the rejected identity, and thus, a shift away from the superordinate identity of scientific community member. These dynamics perhaps illustrate how a superordinate identity can decline as other identity aspects emerge. Thus, while mismatches might lead to unintended consequences, separation itself appears to represent a stage in the reconstitution of organizational identities.

On the other hand, a match in integration strategy in some cases could indicate facilitated pluralistic integration of identities such as active parent and scientific family member in the CTR department (See Table 5). Alternatively, it could indicate assimilation in the case of a scientist from outside of the U.S. who reported a desire to assimilate to department cultural norms, which had not been his own. Thus, a match does not mean that individual differences pluralistically integrated within the organization. The way to determine assimilation vs. pluralistic integration is to identify the shared prevailing identities within a department and compare these values, beliefs, behaviors, and expected norms to other salient individual or sub-group identities of organizational members or aspirants.
Complicating matters, strategy mismatches can occur relative to one shared identity and not another. For example, many scientists with children indicated they were included as scientists. Their records of advancement and the professional support they reported receiving from colleagues verified this. However, they reported little support for the parent identity. Those who desired that support, expressed dissatisfaction with peers or even the leadership in that regard. Others who viewed being a parent as a personal choice, had no expectation of integration and blamed tensions more generally on the nature of science, not the lack of recognition of their different identity by peers or shared work practices or norms.

*Separation and Power*

The first strategy is referred to as a two-group categorization, separatism, or “we/they,” in which subgroup identity is of high salience and the superordinate identity is of low salience (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 249). Theoretically, individuals/subgroups and the organization could match around the strategy of separation. Perhaps due to the high salience of superordinate identities of participants and the cooperative cultures of the departments, this dynamic was not readily apparent at the individual/organizational interface in either department. However, among the sub-groups that formed within the Research Department, some sign of the emergence of a sub-group of independent scientists did appear to be emerging, as the previously superordinate scientific community identity fragmented into its component aspects. Recall that for the emerging subgroup of independents, research scientist was the more salient identity, not the higher
order identity of scientific community member. They performed other roles in fulfillment of obligations imposed by the larger system, reflecting a possible example of acquiesce to coercive face two power. Thus, separation occurred in the study departments when there was a mismatch between an individual’s or a subgroup’s strategy of integration and the organization’s strategy, which could not be resolved within the available shared identities.

I also observed a few individual cases in which separation appeared to become the integration strategy. In these cases, some other identity of the individual becomes highly salient. However, finding no identity to assimilate to within the organization or no extension of pluralistic integration, the individual remained attached to an identity group outside of the organization. Insofar as the outside group provided support to a professional identity like good scientist, the individual could still maintain organizational membership. The outside identity groups or networks can inoculate them from the exercise of Face one power over resources as the key supports for their salient identities lie elsewhere. Nevertheless, Face two power of organizations systems can be brought to bear to get individuals to act according to the dominant group’s wishes. As one male, who was not assimilating to the norms of socializing in one department, was told, “It would be politically good to come out of your lab.” Realizing that his department peers exercised Face two, structural power in determining his contract, he changed his strategy and began to build interactions with peers around a prevailing identity.

*Pluralistic Integration and Power*
Dovidio et al. (2005) referred to pluralistic integration as “two subgroups in one group” or “Us+them = We” (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 249), “same team” (Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 251). In this form, salience of a superordinate identity and sub-group identity is high. A match in strategy of pluralistic integration could apparently result in exercise of power both ways, or “power with” (Clegg, et al., 2006) or Follett’s (1918) “coactive power” between individuals or sub-groups with differing identities who had come to negotiate a shared identity which side-stepped a single privileged identity and reflected aspects of multiple identities.

The power relations that emerged from a match in strategy around pluralistic integration were most evident in Site two. In the CTR Department, scientists holding the either of the prevailing shared identities and could enlist the agency of peers as “support”. Examples of this support typically involved assuming client work or teaching load, the two work tasks that were most inflexible in terms of time. Peers’ support allowed scientists to pursue their scientific identities in terms of research, or science related service or could allow them to maintain an active parent identity. Most examples of bilateral power occurred peer-to-peer among scientists who might have differed in rank, but shared the status of scientist. This was evident in the Research Department, particularly in generative interactions. Generative interactions promoted a reduction in any scientist’s ability to exercise face one power by cornering resources and instead scientists engaged around shared interests. This exercise of bilateral power between peers played out over time. The exercise of such power was not necessarily reciprocal between the individuals evolved in the initial exchange. It could extend to other members perceived as sharing the same identity.
The next form of social integration, is referred to as “one group” or assimilation, in which a superordinate identity is highly salient and sub-identity salience is low or discarded completely (Dovidio, Gaertner, Hodson, Houlette, & Johnson, 2005). A match in strategy around assimilation could apparently lead to either unilateral and/or bilateral power relations between the individual who had attained greater prototypicality relative to the salient identity and an aspirant.

Unilateral power relations were observed in these settings, when an individual, for whom the superordinate identity was highly salient, wished to secure a closer position to the desired superordinate identity. In such cases, participants deferred to the skill or knowledge of a peer and supported them for a position of formal authority. For example, AZ approach to a science career was “promote science, not female.” Thus, she maintained an intensive full-time science career and managed her parent identity such that it was not salient to her peers. However, like several men in the department, her moves between employers and positions were influenced by family needs. Still, AZ strongly asserted her identity as a good scientist as noted by a peer in Chapter 5. Her approach related to some tensions as expressed by a female participant who commented: “you would not know the department had a female chair.” However, insofar as the pure science based good scientist prototype was active within the department, AZ personified that prototype and had ascended to leadership.
Proposition 6: A match in integration strategy between individuals and their work group/organization will facilitate inclusion via the exercise of and response to power by the individual.

Proposition 6a: A mismatch in integration strategy between individuals and their work organization will promote adoption of a separation strategy by the individual.

**Acquiescing to and Countering Resource and Systems-based Power**

Consistent with Turner (2005) and Simons and Oakes (2006) the basis of who exercised power within the departments could be traced to the establishment of prevailing superordinate identities. Before work practices, policies, and processes emerge, certain shared identities emerge. However, resource-based power did appear to come into play in day-to-day interactions. From the perspective of newcomers, having agency, in terms of resources clearly afforded a scientist power. In the Research Department, grant funding brought independence from the larger organization, staff to conduct research and secured a position in the organization via tenure. Senior scientists in both departments recognized how access to human, material, and social resources was needed in order to maintain professional autonomy and avoid becoming completed subject to administrative power. To counter resource and systems based power, the scientific community and functional family identities within the two departments appeared to discourage deployment of
coercive power due to control of resources within the department. Senior department members, either from prior experience or desire to maintain the current department cultures, were careful about who they allowed to ascend to leadership. This apparently contributed to the difficulties both departments had in finding Chairs externally.

Power and identity operated hand in hand in both departments. Being viewed as a peer scientist was a condition for soliciting the agency of others. Scientists willingly lent their agency to other scientists based on shared interests and identity. This is how a junior scientist could legitimately ask for a senior scientist’s time. I noted that time appeared to be one of the most valued resources a senior scientist could provide to a junior peer. Having agency, in terms of resources, could also afford a scientist power. However, the cultures of cooperation and sharing of resources within the two departments served to place a limit on the development of coercive power due to control of resources. While a scientist could maintain whatever size lab or consulting load they were able to secure outside resources for, the internal distribution of resources from the larger organization was accomplished with transparency and with the overall interests of the department in mind.

Scientists resisted internal structures, except for those relating to decision-making about resources, such as recruiting and procurement of major resources. Thus, scientists avoided exercise and acquiesce to coercive, face one and face two power and mutually exercised persuasive and identity based power (Face three and four) between one another.

The exercise of power could not occur without a scientist assuming the position of A and soliciting resources from others. It was the asking and acquiesce that not only confirmed the power of A but also A’s membership.
Proposition 7: An individual who is less prototypical of the prevailing identity is more likely to need to acquiesce to resource and/or systems based power in order to maintain group/organizational membership.

Proposition 7b: Individuals will have little recourse to resource (Face one) and systems (Face two) power, when their highly salient identities are in conflict with the prevailing identities.

Proposition 7c: Formation of a prevailing identity(ies) that reflect a valuing of cooperative norms can counter internal deployment of resource-based power.

Dovidio and colleagues (2005) also suggest that “Pre contact experience” with a social category can prime intergroup relations. What may have facilitated greater inclusion of women, particularly white women, was more positive pre-contact experiences with this social identity group. In the larger professional context, women were represented and some had secured notable achievement, which corresponded with the growth periods of these departments. Some men where married to women scientists who were also actively pursuing a career in science. Furthermore, the earliest women hired in both departments were both exemplars of pro-norm behaviors such as hard work or collaboration, behaviors viewed as central to maintaining a professional and the eventual intra-departmental prevailing identities. These departments were able to hire
more women over a shorter time frame than organizations with slower growth. More women were hired into the departments, thus ameliorating the token status of the early women department members (Follett, 1918; Kanter, 1978). Thus, when women were considered for department membership they could be regarded more as individuals than representatives of an out-group social category. On the other hand, U.S. minorities, particularly African-American, were absent in scientific professional roles in the Research Department and in the larger organization. This fact had not escaped the notice of some scientists within the department. Perhaps, race became salient to some participants, as I am identifiably African American. Upon seeing me at his door, one scientist demanded to know why blacks were not entering science. Unsolicited, another scientist was explicit about her work with black students and black females during her interview. Comments from other participants suggest the rather limited experience that many U.S. white scientists had with other racial/ethnic groups. A member of an ethnic minority identity group spoke about how he perceived that his own behavior contrasted with white peers and had evoked some tensions. He had observed that U.S. whites preferred more physical distance, no physical contact, and maintained more closed social groups outside of work. Another informant noted that black students had a reputation within the Research Department of “breaking things”. Furthermore, they had experienced little contact with such groups under conditions of equal status as every African American I observed within both contexts were in non-science support roles. Thus, relative to African Americans, some of the conditions for inclusion appeared to be missing.
Rethinking Inclusion: A Revised Theory of Inclusion in Work Organizations

In theories of inclusion in the management literature, inclusion is conceptualized as the outcome of top down initiatives typically associated with diversity management (Cox, 1993; Miller & Katz, 2002, Roberson, 2006). In this study, inclusion is rethought in terms of the day-to-day social processes. In addition, the conceptualization of inclusion is expanded to reflect the important role of the integration strategies based on recategorization, as well as power, as factors in locating an individual relative to a prevailing in-group identity.

The revised model of inclusion still follows core elements of Mor Barak’s (2000) model. Mor Barak (2000) points out the dynamic nature of inclusion through the phenomenon of inclusion-exclusion. Her model introduces identity as an indicator of diversity. She also shows the role of culture in creating inclusion-exclusion dynamics. Furthermore, she asserts that inclusion-exclusion is “the result of the interplay between the individual’s personal characteristics that affect their values and norms (the personal dimension) and the organization’s environment in the form of polices and procedures (the organizational dimension). The congruence or fit, between what the individual beings to the work environment and the organizational culture in the workplace dictates how welcomed and valued they feel in the system (Mor Barak, 2000, p. 58).”

Figure 3 provides a recap of Mor Barak’s (2000) model as it relates to inclusion-exclusion.
The revised model (See Figure 4) focuses on the day-to-day level of social relations that are shaped by the identities early members bring to the newly formed organizational group. Mor Barak’s (2000) model assumes an ongoing functioning organization. However, by looking back at the formation stage of the organization, the revised model highlights the importance of inclusion dynamics in shaping and later reinforcing culture.

In the revised model, context, as discussed earlier in this chapter, and culture are two separate factors influencing inclusion dynamics. Following the approach of scholars

such as Cox (1993), Mor Barak (2000) viewed culture as only the practices, policies and rewards imposed by an organization, or specifically, management. However, in the revised model, culture reflects the norms of the prevailing in-group identities. Culture is evident in the stories circulated among members and passed on to newcomers. Consistent with Mor Barak (2000), once established, culture also feedbacks into inclusion dynamics as it reflects policies (ex. reduced-schedule work), sanctioned activities (ex. research sharing) and the arrangement of physical space. Thus, culture can support or impede interaction, support the organization’s integration strategy and provide the structural basis for the exercise of face two power.

In the revised model, a single social category identity at a single level, as selected by the researcher, is replaced by the salient identities of organizational participants. Individual level personal identities, such as gender, age/generation were not the predominant salient identities for most participants. However, social identities such as parent, active parent (both of which reflect gender identities), or community member were identified as salient based on the reports of participants and appear to be the basis of interactions reported by participants. Still individual social identities, which were not integrated into the prevailing identities, tended to be subordinate to the prevailing identities within the departments. The prevailing identities in both departments were social identities that were closely tied to members’ professions.
The revised model parses Mor Barak’s (2000) conception of inclusion-exclusion into three aspects. The relationships between these aspects derived from this study are illustrated in Figure 5. First, the interactive aspect of inclusion-exclusion is highlighted by inclusive-exclusive interactions in. In the revised model, what Mor Barak (2000) referred to as “fit” can be achieved through three integration strategies, separation, assimilation and pluralistic integration.
At the core of Figure 5 are integration strategies. How and whether an individual or sub-group identity is included in the prevailing identities is a function of integration strategies in combination with inclusive-exclusive interactions and power relations. Individuals and organizations can employ different integration strategies based on feedback obtained through inclusive-exclusive interactions. Individuals can enter organizational units with expectations about how they will adapt to a new organizational unit. Achieving integration into an organizational unit inherently requires assumption of a
new organizational based identity (i.e. scientist in a given department). However, U.S. professionals tend to hold their professional identity as superordinate to the larger organizational identity and even personal or other social identities (Dent & Whitehead, 2002). Thus, new members generally appear to seek to assimilate to the professional aspects of the in-group identity. Depending on the strength and salience of their other social identities, some new members may not be willing to assimilate to in-group identities, particularly when the prevailing identity is in conflict with an important social identity. Furthermore, if the target in-group does not offer socialization processes via inclusive-exclusive interactions (See Figure 5) that are consistent with the new member’s strategy, the new member may adopt a different strategy. Given a highly salient personal or social identity, the individual may change to a separation strategy. This approach allows them to preserve their own superordinate identity, but at a cost of further distance from prototypicality within the in-group (See Table 5 Power Implications of Match (or Mismatch) of Integration Strategy).

The revised model also suggests another aspect of Mor Barak’s (2000) idea of fit. Ultimately, fit is reflected in the forms of power that an individual can exercise or respond to. The implications of high or low salience of in-group super and subordinated identities for individuals is reflected in what forms of power an individual can effectively initiate as well as the forms of power they respond or acquiesce to (See Forms of Power in Figure 2). An eventual match in integration strategy, as influenced by inclusive-exclusive interactions points to corresponding forms of power. When the organization’s strategy persists as assimilation and the individual’s approach is in alignment, the individual will be perceived to be closer to prototypicality and will exercise power (in
terms of ability to enlist other’s agency) to the degree that they are perceived to be prototypical. This case is illustrated in the study department by AZ and her personification of good scientist identity. Her prototypicality relative to the good scientist identity supported her in becoming Chair. This dynamic was also illustrated by M11’s ability to get her colleagues’ support of her community outreach efforts as she was viewed as being prototypical of functional family identity.

When the organization and the individual engage in pluralistic integration, power will be initiated or exercised both ways via persuasion or face three power (See Table 5). QZ provided the best illustration of case as she promoted the integration of good scientist and scientific community member. She accomplished this by promoting linkages between scientists and an emphasis on what Fiol, Pratt and O’Connor (2009) referred to as integrative goals and structures.

If the organization offers separation or the individual’s strategy is or becomes separation, both sides will expect that exercise of power is via control of resources and/or structural position or rules (See Table 5). The separation strategy observed in the study department appeared to occur in cases of particular individuals. For example, the male scientist in the Research Department who found little support from peers around his parent identity first responded with a separation strategy. He withdrew from peers and focused on the professional social identity of good scientist. However, a senior peer exerted structural, face two power in the form of a warning that it would be politically better for the junior scientist to get out of his lab and interact. The junior scientist responded to this power move due to his desire to maintain his salient superordinate
scientist identity, not the salience of scientific community member, or a preferred adherence to the norms of interaction.

This last example illustrates the complexity of the interactions between identity, power and integration strategy. One strategy does not fit all as identities shift at the individual level. An individual secures inclusion via a mix of strategies. Different identities become salient due to interactions and feedback about the effectiveness of a deployed integration strategy relative to the salient identity. The degree of inclusion of an individual or sub-group within an organization is a function of all three strategies, which can change over the course of an individual’s career and the organization’s history. The opportunities for shifting the in-group identity occur at the level of day-to-day interactions. But day-to-day interactions become bounded by the salient prevailing identities and the culture within the organization (See Figure 4).

The final component of the revised model is an expanded definition of organizational inclusion. This definition is focused on the intra-organizational level of system where day-to-day experiences of organizational members shape their own and others’ perceptions of inclusion. Thus, inclusion of diversity in a work organization is the outcome of inclusion dynamics, which determine an individual’s or sub-group’s:

• access to task and social information and psychosocial support
• perceived movement towards or away from full-membership or prototypicality within salient in-group identities
• ability to enlist the agency of others and their degree of willingness to lend their agency to others through multiple forms of power
This definition is consistent with the Pelled, Ledford and Mohrman (1999) and Mor Barak’s indicators of inclusion, which include access to work related information. The revised definition adds access to psychosocial support, which was particularly important to inclusion and the subsequent retention of scientists in the CTR department. The matter of job security, included in Pelled, Ledford and Mohrman’s (1999) definition is addressed more specifically as the interactions that secure an individual’s or subgroup’s identity position relative to the in-group’s conception of the full or prototypical in-group member. This is a similar notion to Schein’s “insider” status. However, in this definition, links position to a salient identity and the associated interactions. All interactions are not equal, as revealed in the case reports. Collegial interactions are the more surface-level interactions that may provide entry to more inclusive interactions. Generative interactions are particularly important as they signal positions closer to full membership. In these cooperative contexts, generative interactions tended to create resources that perceived in-group members employed to advance their positions relative to a prototypical identity. But, the nature of generative interactions will depend on the context and the salient in-group identities.

Decision-making influence is an indicator of inclusion in both Pelled, Ledford and Mohrman’s (1999) and Mor Barak’s (2000) conceptions of organizational inclusion. Again, with the linkage to identity in mind, in the revised definition, at its core, decision-making influence is about the exercise of power through others in order to accomplish one’s objectives. Of interest here is where individuals direct their energies and towards whose agenda. Decision-making influence captures one’s ability to make decision-
making recommendations, as in face three power around shared interests. It could also pertain to the possibility of directing human agency in organizations due to one’s access to resources, position within the organizational structure or social status. But, an additional dimension of decision-making influence could be the ability to exercise authority through one’s legitimacy as a prototypical representative of a salient shared identity. Lack of such legitimacy may be a factor in barriers to advancement of certain social identity groups in work organizations, particularly when a representative of an apparent out-group in someway violates prescriptive norms (Abrams, de Moura, Hutchison, & Viki, 2005).

Also neglected in other conceptions of organizational inclusion is that individuals also respond to other’s exercise of power depending on how they have been included in organizations. Those whose own salient identities are not integrated into the prevailing or shared salient identity(ies), and are thus pursuing a separation strategy will likely not be responsive to face three, interest based, or face four, identity-based power (See Table 5) due to the lack of a highly salient superordinate identity, either via pluralistic integration or assimilation. From a management perspective, the costs of exercising face one and two power can be higher in terms of surveillance (to insure that the objective is accomplished) (Turner, 2005). Dependence on the exercise of face one or two power through others can signal a one or two-way identity disconnect. Thus, the direction and nature of power relations also provides an additional gage of organizational inclusion.

*Closing Observations - General Conditions for Inclusion*
To close this chapter I will discuss several conditions that appeared to influence the course of organizational inclusion dynamics within the departments. The first three conditions are similar to the conditions for reduction of intergroup bias as suggested by Pettigrew (1998). These conditions also apply to the Common Group Identity Model (Dovidio, et al., 2005). The forth condition relates to Turner’s (2006) theory of power. The last condition is specific to the study departments.

The first condition that appeared to influence inclusion dynamics was the reported cooperative nature of relations between department members (Pettigrew, T. F., 1998). Though the norms of professionalism dictated autonomy, members recognized opportunities for addressing their own needs or goals though interdependence with peers.

A second condition is related to the loosening of external norms, particularly around the social roles available to women in the larger society. Pettigrew (1998) suggests that supportive norms both outside and inside of the contact situation provide one of the key conditions for reduction of intergroup bias. The periods of department growth corresponded to the increased entry of women in scientific professions and the professional world more generally. Thus, there were increasing opportunities for contact between men and women in professional training or work contexts.

A third condition consisted of the generally egalitarian norms within the departments. Egalitarian norms suggest more equal power relations, which Dovidio and colleagues (2005) cite as a condition for successful intergroup contact.

A forth condition was that power relations between peers within the department appeared to fall within what Turner (2005) called consensual power relations. Individuals were highly motivated to do the work of science. They also monitored the balance of
power between the leaders and members by avoiding “prima donas” or others would use status to corner resources and fail to offer their agency to others in the department. No one was being forced into department membership, though many felt various professional pressures discussed earlier.

Last, oddly, an additional possible inclusion priming condition was the lack of formal diversity interventions such as hiring targets for minorities and women. Abrams (2005) has asserted that forced contact between different identity groups can actually activate biases, as each group attempts to maintain the distinctiveness of their social identities by reinforcing intergroup norm differences. Such forced contact can result in increased resistance to inclusion. Lack of externally imposed personal and social identities into the departments appeared to reduce the salience of those categories and make the potential identity contributions of new entrants more salient than social categorizations as gender or age. However, I must also point out, that the imposition of difference had occurred years before the creation of these departments. Laws and social moments that pressured educational institutions to bring women through their doors also played a role. Higher-level inclusion priming through the professional training experience provided men and women with the opportunity for pre-contact experience. Thus, the lack of formal diversity interventions in the study departments appeared to be facilitated by larger societal interventions.
Organizational inclusion is related to access to information, decision-making and securing a recognized position within an in-group, as shown by prior research (Mor Barak, ; Pelled, et al.). They are helpful in looking at individual effectiveness in organizations. However, stopping at these indicators limits our thinking to outcomes and not the day-to-day interactions that produce. Furthermore, these indicators do not adequately address the issue of who is included in power relations. Power relates to who is included in defining the interaction context, influencing the formation and change in culture, and defining the boundaries of identity that determine who is admitted and stays in a profession. Thus, to understand inclusion of difference in work organizations one must not only look at culture but the prevailing identities. A good place to begin is to look at the leaders that a group selects formally or informally. What identities do these individuals personify? This is an important consideration because the prevailing in-group identities appear to influence the course of inclusive-exclusive interactions, the success of integration strategies and the types of power in-group members respond to and exert within the organization. This influence occurs both before and after an in-group culture has emerged. The prevailing identities also interact with individuals’ personal identities to shape individual and collective adaptations to the organizational environment and to the presence of out-groups. However, the match or mismatch between the integration strategies employed by the organization and those of the individual appear to influence the form of power the individual can exercise and will respond to within the organization.
A conceptual finding of interest is the possible relationship between the salience and hierarchy of an individual’s identities and their self-monitoring behavior. In the literature, self-monitoring is conceptualized as an individual ability or psychological characteristic (Snyder & Cantor). Individuals are described as high or low self-monitors has if such behavior is a function of personal dispositions or traits. However, I suggest a social aspect to self-monitoring behavior in that highly salient identities may influence whether individuals will engage in such monitoring. This assertion may seem to run counter to research concerning strategies women use to establish themselves in male dominated work environments. Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that women leaders assumed masculine behaviors in masculine contexts and more feminine behaviors in feminine contexts. Several scholars have described how women play down their gender (Barrett, 2002; Bruni & Gherardi, 2002) and/or race (Bell & Nkomo, 2001) and play to a dominant identity in order to advance their professional identities. Thus, women are viewed as denying some aspect of themselves and having to do more work (self-monitoring) than men to be seen as professionals within an organization. This view assumes that the masculine identity is highly differentiated from the woman’s identity. A closer look at the descriptive data from qualitative studies suggests that the identity that is salient target identity to the women participants is the professional identity (Barrett, 2002; Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Bruni & Gherardi, 2002). In so far as the prevailing identity is confounded with social identities such as a particular gender or dominant racial characteristics, women may behave according to such characteristics as part of the bargain in assuming the professional identity. However, I suggest that it is important at this point to separate the individual level identity from the possibly imposed social
Barrett (Barrett, 2002) suggests that “femininities” in our society are more diverse and have a greater range for enactment than hegemonic masculinity. Thus, some women may display masculine characteristics with as much ease or more than those socially recognized as feminine. The problem that relates to attracting and retaining individuals arises when an individual wants to hold an excluded or marginalized identity relative to a superordinate professional organizationally based identity. I suggest that for people who hold highly salient cross-cutting and/or marginalized identity, insofar as that identity is incongruent with the prevailing in-group identity, they will not subordinate their salient personal or social identity. They will reduce or give-up self-monitoring relative to the prevailing identity and seek some way of integrating their marginalized identity. Such individuals can be drawn into a resource consuming fight to establish their place within the in-group or depart from the in-group. These individuals will be viewed by the organization as “not a fit”. But, the very individuals that might help an organization expand the range of values, norms, behaviors that constitute the prevailing identities, and subsequently shift the culture, leave the organization or simply never join.

My study also provides empirical support for Fiol, Pratt, and O’Connor’s (2009) Intractable Identity Conflict Model. However, the conditions of my study were far more favorable than contexts for which these scholars hope that their model might apply such as management labor disputes (Fiol, Pratt and O’Connor, 2009).

Last, I proposed a model of organizational inclusion. It reflects the multiple identities that provide inputs to inclusion dynamics. It explicitly addresses contextual factors by separating context from culture and identifying multiple layers of context that influence inclusion dynamics over the life of an organization. Unlike Mor Barak’s model,
culture is shown to include the social structures, shared norms, stories, and formalized activities internal to the organizational unit, which embed and maintain prevailing identities.

_PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS_

This study informs approaches to organizational diagnosis in preparation for the design of organizational development interventions in diverse work groups or organizations. As I indicated in the introduction, part of my interest in the concept of inclusion lay in my observations and experience during twenty-years of cooperate life. Based on these experiences, I offer several ideas of practical importance to diagnosing and design of inclusion interventions in organizations. These ideas relate to three areas, attraction and retention, leadership development, and organizational diagnosis.

Attracting and retaining women and social identity groups such as African Americans, Hispanics, and Native American into knowledge intensive professions, like scientist, continue to be a challenge despite significant gains. What appears to have occurred is that organizations are attracting and retaining those whose identities most align with the identity requirements of dominant in-groups. Meantime, individuals who would bring significantly different perspectives to the work never join the organization in the first place. In the case of active parents, many organizations create policies and programs around family leave or childcare. However, since these efforts do not reflect changes in the prevailing identities and thus the culture of such organizations, these initiatives come across as special accommodations benefiting a particular identity group.
Accommodation does not change the nature of the prevailing identity and the associated power relations. Nor does accommodation change the potential cross-cutting nature of an identity such as active parent or as another example, Muslim in a Christian context. Thus, full inclusion is not possible. Instead, I suggest the more difficult course of revisiting the prevailing identity. This may be accomplished by through convening of focus groups or interviews of a purposeful sample of organizational members in which the question of what are the prevailing social identities maintained by the organization is addressed. An additional question would be: How well do those identities reflect the values, beliefs, behaviors, and norms of the potential new workforce? Such an intervention is actually best done before any visible or invisible difference is added to the work group. This is because the more narrowly conceived the prevailing identity is, the more difficult it will be to attract people from a broader pool, much less retain them.

The degree of social identity complexity of many study participants appeared to play a role in supporting inclusion dynamics. However, attracting new members and hoping for increased social identity complexity of organizational members is not enough. The organizational identity prototypes (leaders or informal leaders, respected group members) must model such complexity in order for people to bring these identities in to the workplace. Modeling social identity complexity can be difficult if the context does not present opportunities to display, explore, or develop a wider range of identities within the prevailing identities. So for example, in Dick’s case, which I mentioned in the introduction, a coach to observe him at meetings and offer alternative behaviors would likely have been helpful (executive coaches were offered within some divisions at Ford for several years). Thus, Dick could have some support in trying to bring other aspects of
his identity in to his work. Such coaching should not only focus behavior change via techniques or skill development, but also help leaders explore their assumptions about the prototypical identity. Managers and leaders need to explore how well that identity reflects themselves, the people who they work for them, as well as peers.

Perhaps more importantly, managers need to consider whether the prevailing identity(ies) needs some retooling given the bigger picture demands on the organization. This retooling can begin by simply making the effort to get to know new organizational members, particularly ones who bring a clear social category difference to the organization. Collegial interactions are a good start, but, assuming that some sort of professional identity is a key component of the prevailing identity, welcoming them into generative, resource producing and sharing interactions is perhaps more important. Formal mentoring programs can play a role in promoting generative interactions. However, I suggest that the need for a formal mentoring program actually points to an assumed collective disinterest in newer organizational members. Also, the new member must have some leeway to solicit the agency of others in order to establish an inclusive position in a group. Incumbent group members can support inclusive interactions by simply taking the time and interest to converse with new members about professional goals, work processes or any area of mutual interest. Again, finding areas of mutual interest begins with interactions and incumbent group members can initiate such contact.

In the departments studied for this research, Chairs significantly influence the definition, maintenance and shifts the prevailing identity. In these settings, their peers selected the leaders, and thus they were more likely to reflect the prototypical identity than managers in other settings were. Still, the importance of formal leader selection
cannot be dismissed, in terms of priming an organization for inclusion of diversity. In addition, the success of these leaders was also premised some degree of overlap with the identities of in-group members. This suggests that introducing a change in formal leadership in order to change the culture of a group may be less effective than introducing a leader who supports key prescriptive norms, but can also introduce differences that seem relevant to the problems the group faces. Furthermore, with respect to implementation of organizational change efforts, the need to identify the prototypical group members, which may or not include the formal leader of the group, and cultivate their support of inclusion efforts is likely essential to a successful inclusion effort. The late Kathy Danimiller, of Danimiller, Tyson, and Associates, intuitively perceived the need to tap these prototypical representatives of organizational in-groups by identifying and incorporating them into the intervention design team.

The relationship between identities, integration strategy and power, suggests that organizational leaders and managers may have to consider how they promote a prototypical identity. Do they assume a more coercive approach and thus produce conflictual power relations around the prevailing identity (Simon and Oakes, 2006)? This is perhaps a more difficult question to answer because some management practices encouraged in the literature, particularly those involving “carrots and sticks” can arguably fall within the exercise of face one and face two power. To determine if such power is conflictual or consensual in Simon and Oakes’ (2006) terms, one must look at what aspects of identity are supported by in-group norms, beliefs and behaviors and who benefits.
Finally, this study points out a key contextual factor essential to inclusion within professional work organizations. Societal level initiatives that promote equal contact between different social category groups appear to be an important primer for workplace inclusion. Thus, the need to promote social inclusion in the form of constantly improving access to education, safe housing, and healthcare persists despite the apparent gains of non-dominant social identity groups. These efforts provide the basis for inclusion in work organizations by equipping individuals to engage with each other as equals.

Limitations

The model of organizational inclusion from this study reflects the level of intra-organizational or day-to-day interactions within an organizational group. An organizational group in this study is a collection of individuals who regularly interact and are interdependent to some degree. Thus, inter-group (ex. between departments or functional groups) organizational relations were not explored in this study. The data collection was bounded by department membership. Department membership in Site two was defined as being a scientist. Thus, the opportunities to look at the social dynamics between participants and those outside of the department were also limited.

Each department was not only situated within a larger organization but within a status hierarchy. What perhaps I noticed because of my own racial category is that there were many African Americans working with participants. However, they were not department members, instead filling lower to low-status support staff roles. The same observation can be made of white women, except more of them also held scientist roles.
Derber Schwartz & Margrass (1990) suggest that the status arrangements that professionals perpetuate create a perpetual underclass within society. In so far as this underclass is populated by women and minorities within a society, the gender, race and ethnicity free claims of a professional identity are questionable.

At the same time, workers in these lower status roles are essential to maintenance of a professional career. Sheffield (2004) points out that the appeal of allowing more women into scientific labs was that they could do the detailed work of preparing samples and data crunching, thereby leaving the male scientist free to do more abstract work. In a recent article Roth (2007) points out examples of how merely providing female scientists with lab technicians during the critical transition from post-doc to tenure track scientist can help in retaining female scientists.

Other limitations of the study relate to the choice of research approach. First, for qualitative researchers trained in inductive approaches to research, they may have concerns about the level of detailed development of the conceptual framework. Such concern may arise particularly for researchers who are familiar with exploratory case study (Stake, 2000) and classic grounded theory derived approaches to social science research (Glaser, 1998). However, Suddaby (2006) argues that that a literature review, conceptual framework or background and the development of the research questions does little to harm the perspective of a researcher in any tradition. Suddaby (2006) notes that the main danger of extant literature is not that extant literature “will contaminate a researcher’s perspective, but rather that it will force the researcher into testing hypothesis, either overtly or unconsciously, rather than directly observing” (Suddaby, 2006, p. 635). He believes that the researcher is fully capable of looking at the extant literature in order
to strategize where the study fits, then suspend that knowledge and enter the field with “fresh eyes”. Suddaby (2006) also suggests that the researcher avoid drawing from one substantive area and instead draw from several areas that relate to the phenomenon under study.

My own experience with the conceptual framework approach is that it is difficult to avoid testing out preformed propositions within the data when using secondary data. I believe that this effect was mitigated by the fact that the topic and the conceptual model was informed by the data I collected in an earlier inductive study. However, I wondered if there was an alternative explanation for the relationships I saw in the data. This line of thinking surfaced the position of integration strategies as pre and post inclusion-exclusion cognitive phenomenon. It also assisted me in identifying conditions of inclusion. Still the conditions of inclusion alone would not likely produce the kinds of interactions that support inclusion over time as found in the study departments.

One of the advantages of using secondary data collected from prior data collection efforts is that it allows the researcher to maximize the use of data, which is very expensive to obtain (Glaser, 1994). Getting assess to high level professions is difficult and their time spent in interviews is an expense to the organization or cuts into their sparse personal time. It can be particularly difficult to obtain such data for social integration and diversity research because of the sensitive nature of some social relations relative to the larger society (Cox, 2004; Kochan, et al., 2003). However, secondary data has drawbacks similar to those of using survey data from existing databases. The first drawback is that additional data, to answer any new research questions that emerge, is not possible to obtain from the field. In this study, this drawback was partially off set by my
use of the interview protocol in the least structured way possible. Thus, I encouraged participants to talk about areas of interest to them beyond the protocol. Such off-the-script conversations yielded the most information about exclusion in otherwise cooperative, collegial work settings. I also employed secondary data sources beyond the data I collected.

Also, consistent with inductive approaches to research (whether qualitative or quantitative) I allowed the research questions to evolve with the study (Creswell, 1998; Maxwell, 2005). In this approach, the research questions provide starting point for analysis, but are refined as the data is analyzed, revealing more interesting or productive insights about the general phenomena of study (Maxwell, 2005).

**Future Research**

This study points to several opportunities for future research. One option would be to build on this study with contrasting cases in different organizational and social contexts. It would be interesting to look at organizations in which the professional identity might be subordinated to a larger organizational identity or a social category or some other personal identity. Also, the departments in this study maintained cooperative cultures. Some contexts maintain very competitive cultures due to the nature of the work and the personalities that tend to be attracted to certain settings. It would be interesting to explore how social category and sub-group identities intersect within a highly competitive work organization.
The possible link between self-monitoring and integration strategy provides an opportunity for further research. Further exploration this connection lead to a better understanding of the cognitive and social dynamics that contribute to attrition within work organizations.

The propositions concerning strategy matches and mismatches could be developed into testable hypothesis for deductive research. Such a research project would still require some qualitative research to establish what the prevailing identities are in an organization. If strategy matches and mismatches occur in organizations, the next step would be to see how they correlate to power relations. However, in such a study it would be important to not only look at structural or control of resources, but power through cultivation of shared interests and prototypically to a prevailing salient identity.

Development of an instrument that reflects probable prevailing professional or occupational identities, as well as detailed aspects of identities such as gender, would support future theory testing research. Gender (in terms of male and female sex), race, and age provide visible markers of possible difference. However, based on these study sites, the social role based aspects of identity appear to be key inputs into inclusion dynamics in work organizations. These subtle dynamics cannot be addressed with the policy and practice based interventions currently employed in organizations. Research that supports development of instruments that take a finer-grained approach to identifying salient differences would help in developing better interventions.

Closing Vignette and Thoughts
During my tenure in the automotive industry, management issued regular calls for change. Two such changes I remember were intended to produce a “quality driven” culture during the 1980s and “shareholder value added” culture in the 1990s. After each call, there were numerous changes to the organizational charts, realignment of divisions and new training programs. My office was relocated five times in about 10 years, not including my moves due to trainee rotations and a promotion to management. When “nothing changed”, I heard upper managers refer to middle managers as “the layer of clay” between upper management and fresh high potential managers at the lower ranks. In other words, the blame for the lack of change was pushed down the ranks.

Upper management approached diversity management initiatives in a similar fashion. Management set a goal of being regarded as the employer of choice. Consultants trained upper managers who trained the managers below them to train other managers to train subordinates in diversity. This rollout approach was intended to create ownership of diversity throughout the management ranks. In such a training session, an African American manager/trainer declared, as I recall, “We don’t care about your attitude, but you better change your behavior.” During the session, as my white peers were presented with evidence of overt and subtle discrimination against African-Americans and women, they began to recount times they received what they viewed as similar treatment and nobody did anything about it. Some people left the training angry, some acted indifferent. I recall feeling an increasing uneasiness. It seemed to me that manager refused to hear what participants were saying and many had shut down to his message. I asked the manager a question about something he said and the reaction of some participants. I don’t recall the question. But, I recall that he snapped, “So what are you going to do about it?”
I shut-up and I went back to work. After completing this study, I now have some language for understanding what I saw happening and what happened to me in the course of my professional career as an engineer.

I realize now that diversity initiatives were about compliance. Compliance was the overall approach to change within the company – force, cajole, or incentivize compliance. Employees were to change behavior, keep their attitudes and “personal beliefs” to themselves. While this made for a relatively profanity free workplace, it also forced conflicts underground until a design crisis forced coercive action by “the big guns” in management to achieve a resolution. Unfortunately, such an approach did not address the divisions around organizational identities. Conflicts around masculine vs. feminine approaches to the work, work/life balance, and relations within an increasingly racially and ethnically diverse workforce were not addressed either.

The compliance approach to change, explains the powerlessness that managers and sweepers alike expressed in the companies I worked for. Face three power around interests was employed at the level individual shared interests (ex. gaining promotions). The definition and requirements of the prevailing superordinate identities were left unchanged. Face four power around the superordinate identity of an employee, whose role was compliance, always loomed. By assimilating to a particular identity, individual’s exercise of power is bounded by that identity. In the process, other potential strengths are left out (like Dick’s grace and courage in a difficult situation).

Thus, the question becomes: “What entrenched identities impede needed change in work organizations? To begin to shift those entrenched identities, individuals may need to take at least small risks in integrating aspects of their identities into their work to
increase their options for exercising power or recognizing and deciding to respond to power (Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000).

However, the bigger challenge comes in attempting to reframe what identity means among managers and leaders of organizations. What managers and leaders at my prior organizations did not seem to recognize was that “the problem” was not a culture that they could manipulate with training, repeated messages, rewards and punishments. The challenge is to align and in some cases redefine the identities within the organization. To achieve the stated goals require a shift in how people see themselves and others. These changes also require management and leaders to model the needed identity shifts in terms of behavior, values, and norms. Subsequently, people could begin to change in their thinking about what should and could be done, who could lead the work as well as who could do the work. In this way, developing diversity interventions that confront the construction of identity and the nature of power relations could not only lead to more equitable power relations in organizations, but also inform obstacles to change in functional and operational areas of organizations. In this way, both the objectives of work force effectiveness and equity can be accomplished through inclusion.
Appendix One: Site One Research Department Interview Guide

(Review Informed Consent, answer any remaining questions, sign forms to formalize agreement to participate)

This interview consists of three short stories of up to 10 minutes in length and two open-ended questions.

1. Looking back over the past 6 months to one year within the department, think of a time you felt most engaged in your work within the department, by “engaged” I mean you felt sync with, committed to, or constructively busy. Tell me a story about one of your experiences at that time.

OK, thank you. For the next story

2.) Please tell me about how you came to join this department

(Newcomer - less than 3 months- interview starts here)

Prompts:

What appealed to you about this department before you joined?
How has your actual experience matched those observations or impressions?
For faculty here since department founding: How is the department the same now as it was when you joined? How is it different?
For the last story...

3.) Please tell me about a time that members of this department helped you develop as a scientist.

Probe:
What role did the chair play?

For all stories clarification questions are:

- What were the circumstances?
- What was your role?
- Who was involved?
- What happened?
- What was the outcome?
- Aftermath, if any?

Closing prompts:

Thinking about these stories and your overall experience in the department what do you value most about:

- Your relationships with people in the department?
- Processes or ways of doing things in the department?
- Structures that support you in advancing your work and career?

In what ways do you feel you are valued or recognized?
- For your work in this department?
- As a person in this department?

(Open Ended Questions)

4.) When have you had to make the choice between your career and other personal demands or important aspects of your life?

Probes

- *What can you tell me about the situation?*
- *How was it resolved? (// phrasing: What was the outcome?)*
- *What did you learn about your priorities through this experience?*
- *What did you learn about the department through this experience?*

5.) To close, I am going to give you some incomplete sentences. I ask you to complete the sentences based on your knowledge of and experience in the department:
A successful scientist is: _______________.

does: _______________.

has: _______________.

Probes:

(What? How? or When? for each)

Or

To sum up, describe a successful (or ideal) scientist

Prompts:

What are concrete things this person does to be successful?

What kinds of skills and abilities does this person have?

What kinds of contributions does this person make?

What kinds or resources or support does this person need?

What is it like for you and others to be around (work with) this person?
Appendix Two: Site Two CTR Department Interview Guide

1. Briefly, what attracted you to pursue a career in medicine?
   a. Prompt: If needed – what did you want to gain, do, become, or contribute?
   b. Probe: What goals do you have for your work or career?

2. Thinking back over the last 6 months to a year that you have been in this department, 
   Think about a time you felt you were at your personal best or you were doing your 
   best work. Can you describe that situation in as much detail as possible (or tell the 
   story)?
   a. Prompt: Think about a situation in which you felt fully engaged in your work, 
      alive and pleased or happy with your work, your work with others, or the 
      people around you, or how an important situation was worked out or a 
      desired outcome was achieved.
   b. Probes: How did you get involved? What happened? Who was involved? 
      What was the goal and outcomes?
   c. Probe: What workplace factors made this possible? (Examples: How work is 
      done, timing, rules, amount of work, available resources, administration, 
      formal or informal leader and peer support and acceptance, rewards, 
      recognition or personal influence)
   d. Probe: How did this experience, or similar experiences, contribute to your 
      remaining in the department?
[Note: If above story is short (5 minutes), ask for a second story]

[Note: Question 3 may be a good point to remind participant that the recorder can be shut off]

3. What would you need to experience yourself at your best/ do your best work more often?
   a. Probe: What workplace factors need to change? (Examples: How work is done, timing, rules, amount of work, administration, resources, policy, level of peer support and acceptance, rewards, recognition or personal influence)
      What personal factors or circumstances?
   b. Probe: How might you wish you could arrange your work or work conditions differently? What are the obstacles? What resources, authority, or influence might you or others need?
   c. Probe: Have there been times when you considered leaving because of your work experiences? What kept you here?
   d. Follow-up: How do you help others in the departments do or be their best, contribute or manage difficult situations.

4. Think about times when you feel you are at your best with family, or while doing a favorite personal activity outside of work, or perhaps when you are serving your community. Describe yourself in general in these situations, or pick a situation that stands out for you.
a. Probe: What do you enjoy most about those times? What is going on that helps increase your positive feelings during those times (or time)?

b. What (if anything) do you bring from those experiences into your work? What do you wish you could bring?

c. Probe: How does your paid work affect your life outside of work? How does your life outside work affect your paid work?

5. In light of what you have talked about, is there anything you would like to add? Is there any topic that seems to be missing or unaddressed?
Table 1  Identities, Culture, and Inclusion Factors in the Research Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual personal/social Identities</th>
<th>Social Demographic Categories: Gender, Ethnicity, Age/generation</th>
<th>Social Identity: Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture</strong></td>
<td>cooperative, seeking collaborations, creation of research forums, informal recruiting, informal input in decision-making, converging of research interests</td>
<td>Cooperative, formalized recruiting and decision-making processes, formal input in decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Strategy of Integration¹</td>
<td>Pluralistic Integration (Us+Them= We)</td>
<td>Assimilation (We)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Power Dynamics and forms (A to B)</td>
<td>Persuasive Qz’s Ascent to leadership based on ability to build collaborations/“persuasive style”</td>
<td>Authority AZ ascent to leadership based on Good Scientist embodiment and seniority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2  Identities and Power in the Research Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salient Shared Identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Salience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Power Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A to B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive (Face three)</td>
<td>QZ’s ascent to leadership based on ability to build collaborations/ “persuasive style”</td>
<td>Authority (Face four)</td>
<td>AZ ascent to leadership based on good scientist embodiment and seniority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive (Face one or Face two)</td>
<td>Chair runs department as “Chiefdom”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3  Identities, Culture, and Inclusion Factors in the CTR Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual personal/social Identities</th>
<th>Social Demographic Categories: Gender, Ethnicity, Age/generation</th>
<th>Societal: Parent</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Superordinate: Department member – Low salience</th>
<th>Subordinate: Competitive Scientist, “Prima Dona”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subordinate Identity: Parent – High Salience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Cooperative, Flexible work content and scheduling,</td>
<td>Cooperation, Recruiting in image of leader, standards for hard-work, Scientists do “same thing” “If one crashes, we all crash”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion/ Exclusion Dynamics</td>
<td>“Pitching in” to support parenting responsibilities, avoid burnout</td>
<td>Learning from peer, developing others Caught not “working hard”</td>
<td>Scientist do own thing, no interaction with other scientists, no support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational contributions not valued by larger organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy of Integration(^1)</td>
<td>Pluralistic Integration (Us+Them= We)</td>
<td>Assimilation (We)</td>
<td>Separation (We/They)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Power Dynamics and forms (A to B)</td>
<td>Persuasive Support for M11 projects</td>
<td>Authority M18 ascension to leadership based on prototypicality to excellent consulting scientist and maintenance of cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted: Coercive culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4 Identities and Power in the CTR Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Identities/Aspects</th>
<th>Social Demographic Categories: Gender, Ethnicity, Age/generation</th>
<th>Department Power Dynamics and forms (A to B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal: Active Parent</td>
<td>Persuasive (Face three) Support for M11’s projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salient Shared Identities</td>
<td>Superordinate identity: “Functional Family” – High Salience</td>
<td>Authority (Face four) M18 ascension to leadership based on prototypicality to excellent consulting scientist and maintenance of cooperative culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subordinate Identity: Parent – High Salience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superordinate identity: Excellent Consulting Scientist</td>
<td>Predicted: Coercive (Face one or Face two)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low subordinate identity: Parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rejected Superordinate: Department member – Low salience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subordinate: Competitive Scientist, “Prima Dona” – High salience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5  Power Implications of Match (or Mismatch) of Integration Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separation</strong></td>
<td>Power through individuals via coercion or face one or two power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. “Chiefdom” Chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Traditional Scientists”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Mismatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal from I-E interactions or possible exit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual power via persuasion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual power via persuasion or can exercise authority around integrated “We”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. QZ of the Research Department; Parents in the CTR Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Individual Acquiesces to Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual can exercise authority to the extent that they are prototypical of the assimilated “We”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. AZ of the Research Department, M18 of the CTR Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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