CHAPTER 1

Introduction

"Hardly any minority ethnics in the top of 'Netherlands Inc.'" (Volkskrant, 2014, translated by the author)

In the Netherlands, minority ethnics' career prospects are less favorable compared to those of dominant ethnics (Ghorashi & Ponzoni, 2014), particularly in terms of reaching higher organizational levels (Essed, 2002; Volkskrant, 2014). This low representation of minority ethnics in Dutch organizations can only partly be explained by differences in education or other forms of human capital (Heath, Rothon, & Kilpi, 2008; SCP, 2012). This phenomenon of low minority ethnic representation at higher organizational levels in the Netherlands may be an indication "of normative preferences for clones of imagined perfections of the same type and profile: masculine, white, and European" (Essed, 2002, p. 2). If this was true, what does the persisting image of the ideal norm worker as being dominant ethnic, white, fit, heterosexual, young, and man (Benschop, 2007) mean for the career experiences and outcomes of ethnic diverse professionals in Dutch organizations?

The general discourse concerning ethnic diversity and potential inequalities in the Netherlands mostly concerns minority ethnics who came to the Netherlands from former Dutch colonies or as guest labor migrants (Groeneveld & Verbeek, 2012), and their descendants. Lately, the public debate also pays increasing attention to refugees coming to the Netherlands (SCP, 2011). In 2013, 11,7 % (1,97 million) of the total population of 16,8 million inhabitants of the Netherlands were considered so-called non-western minority ethnics (CBS-Statline, 2014b), who themselves or whose parent(s) migrated from one of the following countries: Turkey, all African countries, Latin America, and Asia, excluding Japan and Indonesia (CBS, 2012). As the proportion of minority ethnics relative to dominant ethnics is steadily increasing (CBS-Statline,

2014a), Dutch society is continuously becoming more diverse in terms of ethnicity (van Oudenhoven & Ward, 2013). Growing up and participating in higher education in the Netherlands, nowadays more and more minority ethnics are equally qualified and possess equally high levels of education and relevant skills as dominant ethnics (Heath et al., 2008; SCP, 2012). In addition, in comparison to the dominant ethnic group, particular groups of refugees have relatively higher numbers of highly educated members, on the one hand, while on the other hand, these groups have relatively higher unemployment rates among their members (SCP, 2011). Thus, especially highly educated minority ethnic professionals may face a unique position on the labor market and in organizations (Kenny & Briner, 2007): Minority ethnic professionals may be privileged due to their high level of education compared to less educated others, while they may be marginalized in relation to their minority ethnic background compared to dominant ethnics. The Dutch government tried to realize proportional equal representation of minority ethnics and dominant ethnics in organizations through the promotion of particular legislation and policies (see for a review Bleijenbergh, Van Engen, Terlouw, & Schalk, 2014). However, the effects of these attempts appeared to be marginal (Groeneveld & Verbeek, 2012).

Systematic inequality in careers between dominant ethnics and minority ethnics is not a unique phenomenon in the Netherlands only. While the workforce in many industrialized nations rapidly becomes more diverse in terms of gender, age, and ethnicity, many organizations in these nations do not show similar proportions of these diverse groups among their employees (Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2008). In addition, there are systematic inequalities in favor of dominant ethnic compared to minority ethnic managers and professionals in relation to indicators of objective career success, such as hiring decisions, promotions, salary development, and performance evaluations in individual career achievements (Avery, 2011; Bielby, 2012; Carton

& Rosette, 2011; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; James, 2000; Maume, 2012; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005; Parks-Yancy, 2006; Parks-Yancy, DiTomaso, & Post, 2006; Rivera, 2012). In western European countries such as Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands cumulative disadvantages have been observed on every step of the way towards making a career for minority ethnic professionals: "Second-generation Turks in Belgium or Germany, for example, are disadvantaged in their educational attainment; after controlling for educational level, they are additionally disadvantaged in obtaining jobs; and even those who obtain jobs are disadvantaged in access to higher-level professional and managerial positions" (Heath et al., 2008, p. 220). Similarly to what has been observed in the Netherlands, in other countries efforts to tackle systematic inequalities through the promotion of laws, policies, and practices of diversity management have been either only marginally effective or violated and rejected in organizations (Groeneveld & Verbeek, 2012; Prasad, Pringle, & Konrad, 2006).

　　　While systematic inequality between dominant ethnic and minority ethnic professionals in terms of objective career success is frequently observed (Avery, 2011; Carton & Rosette, 2011; Parks-Yancy, 2006), underlying patterns and processes creating and maintaining disadvantage often stayed unexplored (Prasad, D'Abate, & Prasad, 2007; Prasad & Prasad, 2002). Yet, some processes and practices (re)producing systematic inequalities between diverse social groups have been described previously, such as "inequality regimes"(Acker, 2006), the idea of the "norm worker" (e.g. Acker, 1990; Benschop, 1999, 2007; Essed, 2002; Janssens & Zanoni, 2014), and the belief in meritocracy in relation to organizational careers (Castilla, 2008; Castilla & Benard, 2010). However, questions such as "how do diversity and diversity management affect outcomes such as (…) advancement opportunities and promotability" largely stay unanswered (Guillaume, Dawson, Woods, Sacramento, & West, 2013, p. 133). As answers

to such questions are crucial for developing adequate strategies to ensure equal opportunities for the increasingly diverse workforce (Guillaume et al., 2013), the main research question of this thesis is:

How do underlying processes and practices (re)produce observed systematic career inequalities between members of different ethnic groups in the particular context of professional organizations in the Netherlands?

Thus, the exploration of underlying processes (re)producing systematic career inequalities between different ethnic groups pursued in this thesis is explicitly situated in the specific context of professional careers in Dutch organizations.

1.1. Adopting a Power Lens

It has been suggested that inequality between different social groups stems from unequal power relations among these groups (Foldy, 2002; Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) explain how differences in access to and utilization of power lead to systematic inequality in careers. In addition, the development of career and the development of power are considered to be closely interrelated, as "each phase of a career presents opportunities for the accumulation or attenuation of resources for power" (Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989, p. 52). Building forth on the elaborations of Lukes (1974) and Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullivan (1998), Foldy (2002) continues and extends the discussion of different approaches to power, which all lead to different rationales for the emergence of systematic inequalities among different social groups in society or organizations. In the particular context of this thesis, I chose to consider the mainstream view of power (e.g. Dahl, 1957; Hardy & Clegg, 1996) and the discursive view of power (e.g. Foucault, 1977; Hardy & Clegg, 1996). In the mainstream view, power is understood according to the principle of meritocracy, reflected in tangible and hierarchical outcomes, such

as indicators of objective career success (Dahl, 1957; Foldy, 2002; Hardy & Clegg, 1996). The discursive or Foucauldian view is characterized by a more subtle understanding of power, in which power exists and is enacted through discourses, and thereby becomes something that we all possess (Foldy, 2002; Foucault, 1977; Hardy & Clegg, 1996). According to this view, rather than being possessed by dominant actors only, power exists through "a web of relationships, or structures of dominance, normalizing the actions of dominant and subordinate groups alike" (Ghorashi & Sabelis, 2013, p. 81). It is particularly these normalizing aspects of power characterized by "the prominence of hegemonic norms constituting gender, racial, cultural hierarchies of difference", which (re)establish and maintain systematic inequalities between different social groups (Ghorashi, Forthcoming, p. 7). Taken together, the mainstream and the discursive view of power provide a framework allowing for considering both tangible and tacit aspects of power. In order to further explore the underlying processes and practices leading to systematic inequalities in professional careers between different social groups, it is necessary to consider both obvious and less obvious aspects of power.

Especially the discursive view of power suggests that power is constructed, enacted and transferred on what Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) describe as the individual, the interpersonal, and the organizational level. Thus, suggesting a multi-level, interdependent perspective on power, the discursive view of power implies a similar understanding of the emergence and maintenance of inequality, in which (interdependent) individual, interaction, as well as organizational aspects may be of relevance.

Before adopting a power lens to further discuss the need and the opportunities to better understand the underlying processes leading to systematic career inequalities between dominant ethnics and minority ethnics, I will introduce the concepts of careers and diversity in

organizations. In addition, I will situate the concept of diversity in the particular context of the Netherlands, as both the understanding as well as the consequences of diversity in society and organizations depend on both the geographic and the cultural context (Prasad et al., 2006).

1.2.   Career

Career has been defined as an "unfolding sequence of a person's work experiences over time" (Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005, p. 178). Even though recent career research suggests a trend away from hierarchical careers towards multi-directional career paths (Baruch, 2004), particularly managerial and professional careers are still structured by means of hierarchical or upward mobility systems (Arnold & Cohen, 2013; Sonnenfeld & Peiperl, 1988; Vinkenburg & Weber, 2012). In such systems, mobility has to be understood as moving "up the hierarchy" from one position to the next (Arnold & Cohen, 2013; Forrier, Sels, & Stynen, 2009). The so-called "up-or-out" career logic in knowledge-intense environments is based on specific objective performance measures within a particular time span (Kumra & Vinnicombe, 2008).

Career success is generally understood as the "accomplishment of desirable work-related outcomes at any point in a person's work experience over time" (Arthur et al., 2005, p. 179). Furthermore, career success is distinguished into objective and subjective career success (Heslin, 2005). Objective career success refers to observable career achievements, such as salary, number of promotion, or job level (Arthur et al., 2005; Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz Jr., 1995; Ng et al., 2005), while subjective career success refers to the individual experience of career achievements, such as career engagement, career commitment, and career satisfaction (Arthur et al., 2005; Ng et al., 2005). Objective career success and subjective career success appear to be only moderately correlated (Ng et al., 2005), but are conceptualized to influence each other over time (Abele & Spurk, 2009).

Extending the definition of career given by Arthur et al. (2005), an individual's career can also be understood as something that is not only restricted to the individual self, but which is also constructed through interaction with others and the broader environment: As such, a career is "constituted by the actor herself, in interaction with others, as she moves through time and space" (Cohen, Duberley, & Mallon, 2004, p. 409). This understanding of career reflects the individual experience of the self, the encounter with third parties, and with a particular environment and context (Cohen & Mallon, 2001; Killeen, 1996). Thus, individual experiences of professional and (inter-) personal development, or the awareness and understanding of informal organizational rules may play a crucial role in an individual's career (Cox & Nkomo, 1991). Accordingly, self-knowledge and individual sensemaking seem to play a role in career construction (Cohen & Mallon, 2001; Killeen, 1996), which goes beyond the achievement of traditional objective markers of career success such as performance measures or salary increases only. This understanding of career lies at the core of what I consider career experiences throughout this thesis.

Careers commonly unfold according to particular career scripts providing "prescribe[d] patterns of legitimate thought and operate[ing] as modalities between individual action and social structures" (Duberley, Cohen, & Mallon, 2006, p. 1135), offering resources, interpretative schemes, and norms (Barley, 1989) relevant within a particular organizational context. As such, careers are intertwined with particular cultural and social practices (Walton & Mallon, 2004). By means of legitimized organizational norms and values in line with common dominant ethnic beliefs, habits, and practices (Siebers, 2010), societal debates and power relations are transferred to organizations (Prasad, Pringle, & Konrad, 2006). The conceptualization of the gendered organization (Acker, 1990; 1992) explains how "gender is present in the processes, practices,

images, ideologies, and distributions of power in the various sectors of social life" (Acker, 1992).

Similarly, power relations between ethnic groups in society (Verkuyten, Hagendoorn, & Masson,

1996) are mirrored in many organizations. That is, the norms of the dominant group are

reproduced through formal and informal organizational policies and practices (Cox, 1994;

Kirton, 2003). However, not only dominant norms, but also particular power relations are

transferred by similar means, as power exists through the " routinization, formalization, and

legislation of everyday practices" (Ghorashi & Sabelis, 2013, p. 81). Organizational resources

and interpretative schemes that affect individual careers and career experiences are thus pervaded

by normalized power relations, dominant beliefs, and expectations.

1.3.   Diversity

"At its core, the concept of diversity is all about matters of *difference* and *inclusion*"

(Prasad et al., 2006, p. 2, original emphasis). Looking beyond this general description of the

concept, various approaches to the understanding of diversity exist (Guillaume et al., 2013;

Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Prasad et al., 2006). One common approach to diversity (Guillaume,

Brodbeck, & Riketta, 2011; Guillaume et al., 2013; Harrison & Klein, 2007) includes any

potential attribute of difference, such as personality traits or individual behavioral style, next to

the traditional demographic attributes, such as gender, age, and ethnicity (Guillaume et al., 2013;

Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Prasad et al., 2006). The common critique to this approach is

twofold: First, framing diversity as individual differences distracts from systematic inequalities

between certain social groups (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). Second, this approach considers all

possible attributes as equally important in determining difference or inclusion, and thus neglects

the possibility that attributes may vary in the extent to which they affect particular outcomes

(Prasad et al., 2006).

Another approach to diversity particularly focusses on social groups that are systematically marginalized in society or organizations (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Prasad et al., 2006). This approach takes existing power relations between particular social groups into consideration (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). These often historic or institutionalized power relations between social groups lead to systematic inequalities between members of these groups (Linnehan & Konrad, 1999; Prasad et al., 2006). This understanding of the importance of power may conflict with the belief in meritocracy held by many organizations (Prasad et al., 2007), that often lies at the core of hierarchical career logics. I position this thesis in line with this latter approach to diversity, as it offers the opportunity to explore the underlying processes leading to systematic inequalities, rather than only describing the existence of these inequalities (Guillaume et al., 2013).

The definition of diversity I apply throughout this thesis reflects the relational approach to diversity (Guillaume et al., 2011; Guillaume et al., 2013; Riordan, 2000). Rather than merely focusing on the distribution of differences among members of a certain unit (Harrison & Klein, 2007), diversity defined according to the relational approach concerns "the *extent* to which an individual's demographic, or idiosyncratic attributes are shared by others in the unit" (Guillaume et al., 2011, p. 2, emphasis added by the author). The choice to embrace this approach throughout this thesis stems from the following: Depending on the individual's *relative* (dis)similarity with others in a given unit in terms of a particular attribute, diversity may affect individuals' work-related outcomes, attitudes, behavior, and processes differently (Guillaume et al., 2011). Instead of expecting particular outcomes based on absolute similarities and differences along the lines of predefined social categories, the definition of diversity according to the relational approach

provides room for individual perceptions of *relative* (dis)similarity in terms of specific attributes in relation to the others *in the same unit*.

      1.3.1.   From dissimilarity to inequality. The crux of (dis)similarities between individuals based on one (or more) commonly shared attributes lies neither in the mere (self-) categorization of an individual as belonging to a particular social group, nor in the numerical over- or underrepresentation of that particular group in society or within an organization. In order to eventually lead to systematic inequalities between individuals, (dis)similarities need to be nested in social or institutional structures (DiTomaso, Post, & Parks-Yancy, 2007). As I have described previously in this introduction, these social and institutional structures are pervaded by dominant norms and legitimized dominant beliefs and expectations. These norms and beliefs reflect and reinforce existing power relations between particular social groups, by which mere (dis)similarities may lead to systematic (in)equalities within these groups. Only when (self-) categorization leads to systematic advantages of one social group compared to another with respect to certain opportunities or outcomes, such as promotion (Kirchmeyer, 1995), the generally neutral concepts of similarity or dissimilarity are denoted in terms of equality or inequality.

      While the concept of diversity may encompass a vast variety of relevant attributes both demographically and psychologically (Harrison & Klein, 2007), the focus within this thesis lies on ethnicity and to a lesser extent on gender. Both in career literature as well as in daily organizational life in western Europe, these two attributes are (among the most) prominent when considering systematic inequality in careers (Acker, 2006).

      1.3.2.   Ethnicity. Ethnicity "refers to aspects of relationships between groups which consider themselves, and are regarded by others, as being culturally distinctive" (Eriksen, 2002,

p. 4). Kenny and Briner apply the concept of ethnicity to "denote group differences based on shared ancestry, traditions and categorizations by those within and external to the group" (2007, p. 439). Throughout this thesis, I combine this understanding of ethnicity with the relational approach to diversity. Therefore, I define ethnic diversity as the relative (dis)similarity between individuals within one unit due to assigned or acclaimed group membership based on assumed similarities in culture, ancestry, traditions, and categorizations.

Both, ethnicity and gender, are considered diffuse status characteristics (Ridgeway, 2001; Roberson, Galvin, & Charles, 2007), "from which one infers general assumptions about individuals" (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch Jr., 1972, p. 242). The distribution of power based on the general assumptions of diffuse status characteristics results in a status hierarchy, in which members of the dominant ethnic group are ascribed higher status than ethnic minority members, since for instance "people widely hold assumptions that it is more worthy or valuable to be male than female or white than black" (Ridgeway, 1991, p. 368). Performance expectations and evaluations are affected by so-called status characteristics, which thereby influence the distribution of forms of power and prestige (Berger et al., 1972).

According to Verkuyten et al. (1996), the "ethnic hierarchy" is a social representation of a status hierarchy on the basis of ethnicity. While the criteria for assigning social status may differ between different ethnic groups, there is often consensus between the different groups in society on the ranking of various ethnic groups reflecting the ethnic hierarchy (Van de Vijver, 2009; Verkuyten et al., 1996), with White people typically holding the highest status position. The societal ethnic hierarchy is mirrored in power and status differences in most organizations, through the establishment of unquestioned (organizational) norms and values based on habits, practices, and beliefs shared and maintained by the dominant group (Siebers, 2010). In societies

with relatively large numbers of recent immigrants, such as the Netherlands, minority ethnics are often constructed as "absolute others" (i.e. not belonging to the nation and yet living inside it), informed by history (Ghorashi, 2010). This construction of ethnic other reflects perceptions of cultural differences as well as lower socio-economic status and power of ethnic minorities, which lead to disadvantage on the labor market and increases the possibility of exclusion of minority ethnic members in organizations based on stigmatization (Engbersen & Gabriels, 1995; Ghorashi, 2006; Siebers, Verweel, & De Ruijter, 2002). In terms of the relational approach to diversity (Guillaume et al., 2011; Riordan, 2000), minority ethnic members are likely to be perceived as most dissimilar by members of the dominant group, in comparison to those who are dissimilar in terms of gender and/or age, but similar in terms of ethnicity (Guillaume et al., 2011).

 1.3.3. Gender. Gender is understood as an evolving concept, finding itself in a continuous process of (re)definition (Acker, 1992). Once having been used as a substitute term for biological sex and women (Acker, 1992; Scott, 1986), gender is now understood as "a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes, and gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power" (Scott, 1986, p. 1067). Organizations have been described as gendered, when these are pervaded by notions of gender through the (re)production or concealing of the male standard or prototype in their structures, their processes, their symbols, and in their interactions (internally or externally) (Acker, 1990; Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998). Acker (1992) describes gender itself as a process rather than an attribute. At the same time, however, "the assignment of persons to gender categories is a central aspect of the process" (Acker, 1992, p. 567). Following this understanding of gender and combining it with the relational approach to diversity, throughout this thesis gender diversity is

defined as the relative (dis)similarity between individuals within one unit due to assigned or acclaimed group membership based on perceived differences between men and women.

Ethnicity and gender as well as their consequences, such as ethnic and gender hierarchies in organizations, are constructed through social relations (Eriksen, 2002; Guillaume et al., 2011; Scott, 1986; Verkuyten et al., 1996). This understanding of ethnicity and gender as an outcome of social relations shows how power does not only pervade institutional patterns and structures, but also how power is ingrained in shared and individual constructions and (self-) perceptions of individual ethnic or gender identity. This line of thought is reflected in Foldy's (2002) statement that power can be considered the core of identity.

1.3.4. Operationalization of diversity throughout this thesis. As I stated before, I embrace the relational approach to diversity, which specifically focuses on the relative and individual perception of (dis)similarity related to a particular attribute within a given unit. Similar to Acker's understanding of gender as a process (1992), the relational approach suggests a dynamic understanding of the concept of diversity, as the perception of (dis)similarity in terms of a particular attribute may change depending on the (composition of the) respective unit. However, the operationalization of such dynamic concepts for research purposes almost inevitably results in absolute categorizations along the lines of diversity attributes, such as ethnicity or gender. Absolute categorization bears the danger of fixation on and essentialization of these particular categories across various contexts (Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013). Therefore, applying absolute categories in diversity research seems to contradict with the relational approach to diversity. However, not applying any form of categorization would make it impossible to pinpoint systematic differences or inequalities between particular social groups (Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013).

Ghorashi and Sabelis (2013) suggest strategic essentialism as a way out of the dilemma of operationalizing dynamic concepts without falling into the trap of supporting their essentialization. Accordingly, strategic essentialism provides the opportunity for observers to strategically focus on differences, while simultaneously perpetuating "possibilities for situative, changeable, and ongoing choices in dealing with cultural difference on an everyday basis. The temporary quality inherent in this approach serves to further bring about a focus on action, flexibility, and impermanence" (Ghorashi & Sabelis, 2013, p. 82). In order to study a particular phenomenon of assumed or observed systematic inequality between different social groups, the idea of strategic essentialism suggests to a priori choose to focus on a particular category, which appears to be most prominent in terms of the observed systematic inequality within a given context. While focusing on this predefined category, the idea of strategic essentialism also asks for constant awareness of the situativeness of the categorization, both in relation to time and space as well as in relation to additional potentially relevant identity characteristics. As such, strategic essentialism allows for the operationalization of ethnic and gender diversity along the lines of predefined and absolute categories in order to both highlight and better understand a particular phenomenon of systematic inequality between different ethnic or gender groups, as long as constant awareness for the particular (time)context is granted.

As previously delineated, when considering the phenomenon of systematic career inequalities in Western professional organizations, ethnicity and gender appear to be prominent categories within this given context. In order to further explore the underlying processes (re)producing these systematic career inequalities between members of different ethnic or gender groups, throughout my studies I therefore a priori choose for applying ethnicity and gender as predefined and absolute categories as a general framework to denote the individual experiences

of members of different social groups. At the same time, when analyzing experiences of members of these different social groups, I pursue to be constantly sensitive to the particular context, which may or may not reflect salience of the predefined and absolute social categories. By these means, I intend to pay "constant attention to implicit (taken for granted) power relations and a balancing act between approaching difference in a non-hierarchical manner without essentializing otherness" (Ghorashi & Sabelis, 2013, p. 82).

This thesis is explicitly situated in the Dutch context. All data were collected in organizations in the Netherlands and the findings have been positioned within the western European and Dutch context. I chose ethnicity as the category of analysis throughout the entire thesis, as ethnicity rather than race is used in scientific research in the Netherlands and in western Europe (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000). Given this particular context, I chose to operationalize ethnicity along the lines of the official definition of ethnic group membership of the Central Bureau of Statistics in the Netherlands (CBS): "a person is considered 'allochtoon' [a member of the minority ethnic group], if at least one parent is born abroad [meaning, outside of the Netherlands] " (CBS, 2012, translated from Dutch by the author). In consequence, a person whose parents were both born in the Netherlands is considered 'autochtoon' [a member of the Dutch ethnic group]. In addition, the general group of minority ethnics in the Netherlands is further specified in western and non-western minority ethnics, according to the following definition: "All European countries (except for Turkey), North America, Oceania, Japan, and Indonesia (including the former Dutch-Indies) are considered western countries of origin. Non-western countries of origin are Turkey and all African countries, Latin America, and Asia (excluding Japan and Indonesia). (…) If a group is very similar to the Dutch population in socio-

economic or in cultural terms, it is considered to be one of the western minority ethnic groups)"
(CBS, 2012, translated from Dutch by the author).

Following from the previous definition, the operationalization and categorization in terms of ethnicity applied throughout this thesis distinguish between dominant ethnics (i.e. Dutch ethnics) and minority ethnics (i.e. western and/or non-western minority ethnics). The interdependencies between different ethnic groups are not necessarily a matter of numerical representation of their respective members within specific units, such as societies or organizations (DiTomaso et al., 2007; Yoder, 1994). Rather, among sociologists, these interdependencies are considered in terms of intergroup power relations (Ragins, 1997). "Dominant" and "minority" are not exact antonyms of each other, neither in the power- nor in the numerical sense of the word. The explicit choice of contrasting these terms, however, stresses the underlying complexity of categorization along the lines of ethnicity. Kenny and Briner's statement that "ethnicity is something that we all possess" (2007, p. 439) inspired me to follow their example in using "ethnic" both as a noun and as an adjective, always preceded by either "dominant" or "minority".

1.4. Main Focus of the Research

In this thesis, I focus on understanding systematic inequalities in careers between dominant ethnic and minority ethnic professionals in the Netherlands. While I will not directly address the impact of diversity management practices on career development of dominant ethnics and minority ethnics, which is an important suggestion made by Yang and Konrad (2011), I will reflect on how the HR strategy of recruiting diverse ethnic employees plays out in terms of individual careers. As delineated above, in this thesis I will follow up on the suggestion to be sensitive to the essential role of power when studying inequality and diversity (Foldy, 2002;

Linnehan & Konrad, 1999). Starting from the observed inequalities in careers between dominant

ethnic and minority ethnic professionals, and inspired by my analysis of the existing literature

and the data collected throughout this research project, three themes emerged, namely identity,

organizational patterns and practices, and social networks. These themes are the product of an

iterative process between inductive and deductive approaches and reasoning, cutting across

ethnicity and careers. A posteriori exploring these themes through a power lens enhanced my

understanding of the construction and maintenance of both tangible and tacit inequalities in

careers between members of different social groups. In the following, I will introduce the focal

themes to further explore how they affect careers differently for members of different social

groups through their close interdependency with power. As such, I will not utilize the notion of

power as a direct means to understand inequality. Instead, I will focus on identity, organizational

patterns and practices, and social networks as potential outlets for underlying power relations to

affect individual careers more or less favorably compared to others.

  1.4.1. Power and identity. It has been stated previously that identity is the basis for

understanding diversity (Nkomo & Cox, 1996). In line with this, Kenny and Briner (2007)

suggest that ethnic diversity can best be studied in terms of ethnic identity. In addition, Kenny

and Briner encourage others "to ascertain the extent to which and in what ways people feel that

their ethnicity impacts on their organizational experience" (p.447). Within this thesis, I more

specifically explore the role of ethnic identity in terms of organizational careers and career

experiences, as aspects such as the individual understanding of the self, self-knowledge, and

individual sensemaking have been related to careers and career construction (Cohen et al., 2004;

Cohen & Mallon, 2001; Killeen, 1996), as delineated previously.

Identity itself can be described as a constant process, which happens as a continuous interplay between individuals and their social environments, influenced by time and context, leading to a multitude of self-definitions individuals draw from when interacting in everyday (organizational) life (Ghorashi, 2003; Jenkins, 2004). This process definition of identity shows congruence with the relational approach to diversity, which also highlights the individual experience of similarity or difference through the ongoing interaction of the self with others in a given unit (Guillaume et al., 2013).

In addition, power is considered to be central to the construction of identity (Foldy, 2002). More specifically, the discursive view of power suggests that the relationship between power and identity is characterized by reciprocity: "particular, historical power relations create particular identities which then serve to maintain those power relations" (Foldy, 2002, p. 100). Accordingly, adopting a power lens may help to illuminate the role of identity in relation to systematic career inequalities between different ethnic groups.

In doing so, it is important to be aware of the interdependencies between diversity, identity construction, and power when trying to understand the continuous encounters between individuals and their social environments, particularly in the context of ethnic diversity and careers in organizations.

1.4.2.   Power and organizational practices. As I delineated earlier in this introduction, organizational practices may be considered carriers of legitimized power relations and dominant beliefs. In fact, especially when promoted in diverse environments, organizational practices have recently been challenged to (re)produce rather than reduce inequalities between diverse employees (Castilla, 2008; Castilla & Benard, 2010). As organizational practices, understood as routinizations influenced by the particular organizational environment (Kostova & Roth, 2002;

Reckwitz, 2002), are established in the context of particular cultural frameworks and the interplay with institutions and other actors (Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007), they may be affected by the societal ethnic hierarchy (Verkuyten et al., 1996), or the gendering of organizations (Acker, 1990, 1992, 2006). Acker introduced the idea of inequality regimes effective in organizations, which through "loosely interrelated practices, processes, actions, and meanings (…) result in and maintain class, gender, and racial inequalities within particular organizations" (Acker, 2006, p. 443). Thus, it is important to further explore how organizational practices transfer established power relations between social groups into systematic career inequalities between these social groups.

Prasad et al. state that "a considerable part of the exclusion and marginalization occurring in the contemporary workplace is predominantly a result of culturally constructed and institutionalized practices rather than the product of irrational stereotypes and prejudices held only at the individual level" (2007, p. 22). Therefore, it has been suggested not to focus on the individual level only, but to take a broader perspective when studying diversity and inequality in organizations (Guillaume et al., 2013; Prasad et al., 2006). The claim for incorporating these different levels when studying diversity and inequality in organizations is also reflected by the conceptualization of both power as well as identity, as both are described to be constituted at the individual, the interactional, and the institutional or organizational level (Jenkins, 2004, 2008; Ragins, 1997; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989). Nevertheless, only limited research has been conducted in order to investigate how "institutional patterns, such as organizational rules, procedures, customs, habits, expectations, and images that may not appear to be overtly discriminatory " (Prasad et al., 2007, p. 25) result in inequalities between dominant and minority social group members. Following up on these suggestions and shortcomings, in this thesis I will

consider the individual, the interactional, and the institutional level as a means to come closer to a comprehensive understanding of how inequalities in careers between different social groups come about. Just as I will move back and forth between these levels within and across the different chapters, I will also utilize different approaches to elaborate on diversity, ranging from studying the role of stereotypes (individual level) to studying the role of organizational practices (institutional level) within a diverse organizational environment.

   1.4.3.   Power and social networks. From a power-perspective, social networks have been described as a means to lead to social closure in particular social groups in societies (Portes, 1998) and in organizations. An individual's position in the organization's informal hierarchy has been suggested to determine the individual's power by means of being able to access and control particular resources (Ibarra & Andrews, 1993). Accordingly, by taking the role of gatekeepers (Kanter, 1977), the power-holders in a particular environment hold the position to select, and thus *empower* some, while excluding and thus not empowering others. Social capital, the resources derived from an individual's social network (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998), has been identified as a crucial predictor for objective career success (Ng et al., 2005). Both differential access to and career benefits from social networks and resulting social capital have been identified in favor of dominant ethnic and men professionals compared to minority ethnic and women professionals (Bevelander & Page, 2011; Ibarra, 1992, 1993, 1995, 1997; Parks-Yancy, 2006; Parks-Yancy et al., 2006; Van den Brink & Benschop, 2014). The separate relationships between social capital, objective career success, and ethnic or gender group membership have been studied previously. However, there is only limited research on the process by which a relative lack of social capital leads to less achquisition of objective career success for members of different social groups (Bielby, 2012). However, a better understanding of these processes

may provide more insights in how career is affected by social group membership in the specific context of the relationship between social capital and objective career success over time.

As active network development is promoted as a means to support career development in many organizations, it can be considered an organizational practice particularly relevant in the context of careers. As such, active network development, just as other institutional patterns or organizational practices, is pervaded by power relations and beliefs reflecting the preferences of the dominant organizational group. In addition, as I have mentioned previously referring to the discursive view, power itself is considered to exist through a formation of dominant structures or relations affecting actions of different social groups in the same normalizing way (Ghorashi & Sabelis, 2013). As such, social networks reflecting a certain structure of social relationships between different individuals, may not only be considered a stepping stone for individual careers, but also a playing field of power and a fertile ground for the creation and maintenance of specific power relations with matching consequences.

When studying active network development, not only the structural component of social capital, but also the behavioral component of networking should be taken into consideration (Wolff, Moser, & Grau, 2008). Networking, understood as building, maintaining, and using social network contacts (Wolff et al., 2008), is an important antecedent of network structure and its subsequent benefits (Forret & Dougherty, 2001, 2004; Wolff & Moser, 2009; Wolff et al., 2008). In social network research, there is an increasing interest in combining information based on network structure and network agency (e.g. Kilduff & Brass, 2010; Van den Brink & Benschop, 2014) to further understand social network development and related outcomes, such as career development.

While active network development is frequently promoted as a means to enhance individual careers, this organizational practice seems to play out more favorably for some compared to others. Several studies found inequalities between diverse professionals in terms of access to and/or benefits derived from social networks and resulting social capital in the organizational environment (Bielby, 2012; Ibarra, 1993, 1995, 1997; Ibarra & Deshpande, 2007; Parks-Yancy, 2006; Parks-Yancy et al., 2006). Similarly, differences in networking and subsequent outcomes within organizational settings have been found between these social groups (Ibarra, 1993, 1995; McGuire, 2000, 2002). Ibarra showed, for instance, that minority ethnics and women have different access to social networks and subsequent social capital compared to dominant ethnics and men, leading to disadvantages in terms of various career markers (Ibarra, 1992, 1993, 1995, 1997). These findings indicate that the organizational practice of active network development may facilitate inequality between different social groups within organizations, even though it is implemented to enhance each individual's career equally.

Similar to inequality in careers observed between members of different social groups, the current state of knowledge concerning the role of organizational practices in general, and the role of active network development in particular, in creating these inequalities constitute the figures, but often lack the deeper understanding of the underlying patterns leading to these inequalities. As an exception, Ibarra and Deshpande (2007) state that professional identity and social networks are reciprocally related and affect individual career development.

1.4.4. Opportunities for research. Next to drawing attention to persistent systematic inequalities in careers between members of different ethnic groups, the previous delineation shows an explicit need for a better understanding of underlying processes (re)producing systematic career inequalities among diverse professionals. Adopting a power lens suggests the

need for further investigating the role of both identity as well as organizational practices, such as active network development. Incorporating individual, interactional, and institutional levels of analysis, such as identity, social networks, and organizational patterns and practices is even more important, as individual differences in human capital for instance appear insufficient to explain persisting inequalities (Heath et al., 2008; SCP, 2012). As a means to shed more light on the actual outcomes and the underlying processes (re)producing inequalities between careers of members of different social groups, I will zoom in on the three afore mentioned themes, namely the role of identity, organizational practices, and social networks based on the premise that these concepts are all pervaded and thereby directed by underlying power relations.

In addition to the power perspective, my research was continuously inspired and guided by further suggestions by Kenny and Briner (2007) on how to improve the study of ethnicity in organizations. First, as a considerable body of research has been conducted on what happens prior to selection, Kenny and Briner (2007) suggest to focus more on how ethnicity may affect what happens after organizational entry. In addition, Kenny and Briner (2007) discuss the need for more research on minority ethnic professionals in organizations rather than unskilled workers, as minority ethnic professionals may face a unique situation compared to dominant ethnic professionals: As I mentioned earlier in this introduction, their high level of education may privilege minority ethnic professionals in terms of careers compared to less educated others, while their minority ethnic background may marginalize them compared to dominant ethnic professionals. Also, Kenny and Briner (2007) encourage more theorization of the phenomenon as such; up until now, such theorization is lacking and opportunities of cross-fertilization from other disciplines are missing. In addition, more comprehensive understanding of the actual experiences of individuals of different ethnic groups in organizations will be enhanced by conducting more

qualitative research (Kenny & Briner, 2007). Thomas and Alderfer (1989) already suggested to study both the dominant ethnic and the minority ethnic group in order to further understand different outcomes and career experiences for dominant ethnics and minority ethnics in organizations. About 20 years later, Zanoni, Janssens, Benschop, and Nkomo (2010) still call for further exploring the sensemaking and lived experiences of the diverse workforce including both minority ethnics and dominant ethnics, instead of perpetuating the study of diversity in organizations from the perspective of (top)managers or policy makers.

Also, I embraced Prasad et al.'s suggestion to be aware of and to appreciate the various research genres and perspectives when studying diversity in organizations (Prasad et al., 2006). As such, my research moves back and forth between positivist and non-positivist genres in diversity research: Taking a power lens, I both explicitly consider the individual, the interactional, and the institutional level of analysis (more positivist), while also studying the role of identity salience depending on the context (more non-positivist) (Prasad et al., 2006). Furthermore, the combination of quantitative (more positivist) and qualitative (more non-positivist) data follows the call for triangulation:

> "Qualitative, non-positivist work might uncover new constructs which might be usefully assessed quantitatively to follow the comparison across situations as well as generalization through a positivist frame. Positivist work might identify statistical associations that could be elaborated and contextualized with a non-positivist approach" (Prasad et al., 2006, p. 18).

Considering the previous suggestions, I designed my research in a way that explicitly focuses on highly educated dominant ethnic and minority ethnic professionals after organizational entry. In addition, I incorporated both a theoretical chapter, as well as three chapters based on both quantitative and qualitative empirical data collected at three different organizations within the Netherlands. This way, my research does not only combine diverse

perspectives in terms of content, but also in terms of methodology. By these means, I pursue to enhance our understanding of the (re)production of inequalities between dominant ethnic and minority ethnic, men and women professionals' careers in a comprehensive manner.

In Chapter 2, I present three teaching cases, illustrating concrete examples of both tangible and tacit inequalities in terms of objective career indicators as well as subjective career experiences between dominant ethnic and minority ethnic, and men and women professionals. In Chapter 3, I conceptually elaborate on the reciprocal relationship between social capital and objective career success and how this relationship is affected by ethnic group membership over time. In Chapter 4, I describe how individual ethnic identity affects individual career experiences, reflecting systematic differences between dominant ethnic and minority ethnic professionals. In Chapter 5, I consider how the organizational practice of active network development plays out for dominant ethnic and minority ethnic, men and women trainees over time in terms of career experiences and opportunities. In Chapter 6, I discuss the main findings of the separate studies and the themes crosscutting the different chapters. Furthermore, I present theoretical and practical implications and the limitations of this thesis.

1.5.   Organizations and Data Collection

This thesis is based on empirical data collected at three different organizations, one professional service firm and two large urban municipalities, which are all based in the Netherlands. Access to the professional service firm was granted as I assisted an external consultant hired by the organization to study obstacles and stimulators of careers of particularly diverse ethnic professionals. In total, we conducted and analyzed about 80 interviews with dominant ethnic and minority ethnic professionals, together with longitudinal quantitative information derived from the firm's Personnel Information System. Parts of the collected data

were used in master theses, which I supervised. Parts of the quantitative data derived from this firm can be found in Chapter 2 - Teaching case 1, while separate parts of the qualitative data can be found in Chapter 2 - Teaching case 2, and in Chapter 4.

Access to the first municipality was organized with the help of one of my supervisors, who enabled the relationship with the municipality's diversity manager. We agreed that I would collect qualitative data to explore the role of ethnic identity in relation to networking and career experiences of ethnic diverse trainees and non-trainees. In total, assisted by a Master student, I conducted 26 interviews with ethnic diverse trainees and non-trainees. The collected data forms the basis for master theses, which I supervised. Also, parts of the data can be found in Chapter 2 – Teaching case 3.

I gained access to the second municipality by meeting the municipality's diversity manager at a workshop. After proposing to conduct a study at the municipality, we agreed that I would collect longitudinal quantitative data on network structure and qualitative data on network agency among a group of ten diverse incoming trainees. In total, I took eight quantitative measurements of the network structure throughout a period of about six months. About one year after the first measurement, I conducted semi-structured interviews with all ten trainees, investigating how they actively engaged in networking to establish social networks throughout the first year of their employment. Parts of the collected quantitative and qualitative data can be found in Chapter 5.

Having collected data both in the private, as well as in the public sector among professionals provided the opportunity to not only focus on one particular sector, but to get a broader view of ethnic diversity and careers in the Dutch work environment. At the same time, the professionals I studied were quite comparable across the different types of organizations: All

of them were highly educated, they were at the beginning of their professional careers, and they all found themselves in a similar rather hierarchical career system. Professional service firms largely have an up-or-out career system in place (Kumra & Vinnicombe, 2008; Martell, Emrich, & Robison-Cox, 2012; Vinkenburg & Weber, 2012). Similarly, the municipalities also have a rather strict promotion scheme with the different positions organized according to a hierarchical structure. Nowadays, as many of the Dutch municipalities stopped hiring externally, the trainee-program is one of the rare opportunities to still enter the organization. Similarly, many of the professionals in professional service firms enter the organization as a trainee immediately after finishing their higher education. Thus, even though situated in different sectors, I consider the career systems in place at the different organizations under study as quite comparable.

More detailed information on the organizations and the methods of data collection in relation to the particular studies can be found in the respective chapters.

1.6.   Thesis Outline

The remainder of this thesis constitutes of five additional chapters (Chapter 2 through Chapter 6). The subsequent summaries of each chapter will present the structure and the focus of each of these chapters.

Chapter 2, entitled "Entering the field: Three teaching cases leading the way", consists of three independent teaching cases based on empirical data, which has not been used in the subsequent chapters. I understand this chapter as a bridge between Chapter 1 and the subsequent chapters, as it forms the connection between the theoretical introduction and the scientific part of this thesis. Chapter 2 illuminates the concepts and matters discussed theoretically in the introductory Chapter 1 from an everyday-perspective. Thereby, Chapter 2 introduces the reader to the practical relevance of the focus of my research by means of three empirical examples.

Each of the three teaching cases focusses on one of the phenomena introduced in Chapter 1. These phenomena will also reoccur in the subsequent chapters (Chapter 3 through Chapter 5). Teaching case 1, entitled "Careers in numbers", illustrates differences in career development for dominant ethnic and minority ethnic, and for men and women professionals at a professional service firm in the Netherlands, based on quantitative data derived from the firm's Personnel Information System. Furthermore, this teaching case alludes to the question of whether or not quantitative data is sufficient to fully understand particular (organizational) phenomena. Teaching case 2, entitled " '(You are) who you are' – And what does this mean?" presents the importance of prototypes and diverse identities in the organizational context related to career experiences, based on qualitative data collected by means of semi-structured interviews at a professional service firm in the Netherlands. Teaching case 3, entitled "To b(orrel) or not to b(orrel): That is the question", focuses on one particular organizational practice closely related to the dominant ethnic culture and considered as one of the best opportunities to engage in networking or social capital acquisition: The *borrel*, or company drinks. Presenting quotes from dominant ethnic and minority ethnic, men and women trainees from one of the large urban municipalities in the Netherlands, this teaching case illustrates how members of different social groups may experience this particular organizational practice differently.

Chapter 3, entitled "Ethnic diversity and social capital in upward mobility systems: Problematizing the permeability of intra-organizational career boundaries", conceptually explores and models the relationship between social capital and objective career success for minority ethnics compared to dominant ethnics over time. Describing the relationship between social capital and objective career success in the form of an upward career spiral over time, we show how Lin's (2001) three mechanisms of return deficit of social capital affect this

relationship by means of four underlying principles of social interaction. Building our line of reasoning along the lines of several propositions, we finally propose that: "As intra-organizational career boundaries are more permeable for dominant ethnics compared to minority ethnics, dominant ethnics do not only achieve more social capital and greater objective career success compared to minority ethnics, but they also advance exponentially faster in their careers compared to minority ethnics".

Chapter 4, entitled "Ethnic identity positioning at work: Understanding professional career experiences", illuminates the role of ethnic identity construction in relation to dominant ethnic and minority ethnic professionals' career experiences in the specific context of a professional service firm in the Netherlands. Based on semi-structured interviews, we unravel how both dominant ethnic and minority ethnic identity work is conflated with processes of "othering" in relation to the hegemonic norm, reflected in individual sensemaking, interaction, and institutional practices. We further discover and problematize the normalization of othering, by illustrating potential consequences for individual career experiences. While opening up the discussion of identity matters in professionals' career experiences, we also suggest means to move away from processes of othering by making room for alterity.

Chapter 5, entitled "Enlaced in a network of inequality? How an organizational practice plays out in diverse trainees' career opportunities" investigates how the organizational practice of active network development within a large urban Dutch municipality may (re)produce inequalities in career opportunities among a group of ten ethnic and gender diverse trainees over time. Combining quantitative data on network structure and qualitative data on network agency, we show that all trainees acknowledge and enact active network development as an organizational practice, while it plays out more favorable for some compared to others. We

conclude that similarities and differences in both network structure and network agency among dominant and minority social group members may, but do not necessarily have to be bound to similarities or differences in diversity attributes, such as ethnicity and gender. Furthermore, our study shows the added value of combining both network structure as well as network agency data when pursuing to understand development and (re)production of network structures and their consequences.

In *Chapter 6*, entitled "Discussion", I relate the findings of the previous chapters to each other and I present a number of general conclusions. Furthermore, I discuss a number of theoretical and practical implications and the limitations of this thesis.

All in all, adopting a power lens, this thesis focuses on the three themes of identity, organizational practices, and social networks. Combined, the six chapters provide answers and posit new questions concerning inequality in careers between different social groups.

1.7. Overview Status Publications and Presentations per Chapter

Table 1.1: Overview status publications and presentations per chapter.

Chapter	Authors	Title	Status
2	Ossenkop, C.	Teaching case 2: "(You are) who you are" – And what does this mean?	*Submitted to* EFMD 2014 Case Writing Competition, October, 2014
3	Ossenkop, C., Vinkenburg, C.J., Jansen, P.G.W., & Ghorashi, H.	Ethnic diversity and social capital in upward mobility systems: Problematizing the permeability of intra-organizational career boundaries.	*Revise and resubmit at* Career Development International, July 2014
		Ethnic diversity and the relationship between social networking and career success over time.	*Paper presentation at* European Academy of Management Annual Conference, Tallinn, Estonia 2011
		Ethnic diversity, social networking, and career success: A theoretical exploration.	*Paper presentation at* Congress of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology, Maastricht, NL, 2011
			Paper presentation at European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology, Small Group Meeting on Managing Diversity in Organizations, Birmingham, UK 2010
4	Ossenkop, C., Vinkenburg, C.J., Jansen, P.G.W., & Ghorashi, H.	How does ethnic identity work at work? Identity matters in professionals' career experiences.	*Under review at* Scandinavian Journal of Management, December 2013
			Paper presentation at European Group for Organizational Studies Colloquium, Montreal, Canada 2013
			Paper presentation at Congress of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology, Münster, Germany 2013
			Paper presentation at PREBEM Conference, Amsterdam, NL, 2013
5	Ossenkop, C., Van de Bunt. G.G., & Vinkenburg, C.J.	Social networks, networking, and ethnic group membership in a talent pool.	*Paper presentation at* ISA World Congress of Sociology, Yokohama, Japan, 2014

1.8. References

Abele, A. E., & Spurk, D. (2009). How do objective and subjective career success interrelate over time? *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 82*(4), 803-824. doi: 10.1348/096317909X470924

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139-158. doi: 10.1177/089124390004002002

Acker, J. (1992). From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology, 21*(5), 565-569. doi: 10.2307/2075528

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society, 20*(4), 441-464. doi: 10.1177/0891243206289499

Arnold, J., & Cohen, L. (2013). Careers in Organizations. In W.B. Walsh, M.L. Savickas & P. J. Hartung (Eds.), *Handbook of Vocational Psychology: Theory, Research, and Practice* (4 ed., pp. 273-304). New York and London: Routledge.

Arthur, M. B., Khapova, S. N., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2005). Career success in a boundaryless career world. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(2), 177-202. doi: 10.1002/job.290

Avery, D. R. (2011). Why the playing field remains uneven: Impediments to promotions in organizations. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.* (Vol. 3: Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization., pp. 577-613). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(2), 235-249. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.235

Barley, S. R. (1989). Careers, identities, and institutions. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *The Handbook of Career Theory* (pp. 41-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baruch, Y. (2004). Transforming careers: From linear to multidirectional career paths: Organizational and individual perspectives. *Career Development International, 9*(1), 58-73. doi: 10.1108/13620430410518147

Benschop, Y. (1999). Diversiteit aan het werk. In H. Doorewaard & W. de Nijs (Eds.), *Organisatieontwikkeling en Human Resource Management* (pp. 253-272). Utrecht: Lemma BV.

Benschop, Y. (2007). *Van Lippendienst tot Tegengas. Een Kritische Benadering van Gender in Organisatieverandering*. Oratie. Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit.

Benschop, Y., & Doorewaard, H. (1998). Covered by Equality: The gender subtext of organizations. *Organization Studies, 19*(5), 787-805. doi: 10.1177/017084069801900504

Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch Jr., M. (1972). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review, 37*(3), 241-255. doi: 10.2307/2093465

Bevelander, D., & Page, M. J. (2011). Ms. Trust: Gender, networks and trust - implications for management and education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10*(4), 623-642. doi: 10.5465/amle.2009.0138

Bielby, W. T. (2012). Minority vulnerability in privileged occupations: Why do African American financial advisers earn less than Whites in a large financial services firm? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 639*(1), 13-32. doi: 10.1177/0002716211422338

Bleijenbergh, I., Van Engen, M., Terlouw, A., & Schalk, R. (2014). Laws, policies and practices of diversity in the Netherlands revisited. In A. Karlsfeld, L. A. E. Booysen, E. Ng, I. Roper & A. Tatli (Eds.), *International Handbook on Diversity Management at Work Second Edition Country Perspectives on Diversity and Equal Treatment* (pp. 162–174). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Brubaker, R., & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond "Identity". *Theory and Society, 29*(1), 1-47. doi: 10.2307/3108478

Carton, A. M., & Rosette, A. S. (2011). Explaining bias against black leaders: Integrating theory of information processing and goal-based stereotyping. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(6), 1141-1158. doi: 10.5465/amj.2009.0745

Castilla, E. J. (2008). Gender, race, and meritocracy in organizational careers. *American Journal of Sociology, 113*(6), 1479-1526. doi: 10.1086/588738

Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 55*(4), 543-676. doi: 10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543

CBS-Statline. (2014a). Bevolking; kerncijfers. Retrieved 06.07.14 http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=37296ned&LA=NL

CBS-Statline. (2014b). Bevolkingscijfers. Retrieved 08.06.14 www.cbs.statline.nl

CBS. (2012). *Standaarddefinitie allochtonen*. Central Bureau of Statistics in the Netherlands. Retrieved from http://www.cbs.nl/NR/rdonlyres/26785779-AAFE-4B39-AD07-59F34DCD44C8/0/index1119.pdf

Cohen, L., Duberley, J., & Mallon, M. (2004). Social constructionism in the study of career: Accessing the parts that other approaches cannot reach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*(3), 407-422. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2003.12.007

Cohen, L., & Mallon, M. (2001). My brilliant career? Using stories as a methodological tool in career research. *International Studies of Management & Organization, 31*(3), 48-68. doi: 10.2307/40397508

Cox, T. H. (1994). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research and Practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Cox, T. H., & Nkomo, S. M. (1991). A race and gender-group analysis of the early career experience of MBAs. *Work and Occupations, 18*(4), 431-446. doi: 10.1177/0730888491018004004

Dahl, R.A. (1957). The concept of power. *Behavioral Science, 2*(3), 201-215.

DiTomaso, N., Post, C., & Parks-Yancy, R. (2007). Workforce diversity and inequality: Power, status, and numbers. *Annual Review of Sociology, 33*, 473–501. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131805

Duberley, J., Cohen, L., & Mallon, M. (2006). Constructing scientific careers: Change, continuity and context. *Organization Studies, 27*(8), 1131-1151. doi: 10.1177/0170840606064105

Engbersen, G., & Gabriels, R. (1995). Voorbij segregatie en assimilatie. In G. Engbersen & R. Gabriels (Eds.), *Sferen van Integratie. Naar een Gedifferentieerd Allochtonenbeleid* (pp. 15-48). Meppel: Boom.

Eriksen, T. H. (2002). *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Antropological Perspectives* (2nd ed.). London: Pluto Press.

Essed, P. (2002). Cloning cultural homogeneity while talking diversity: Old wine in new bottles in Dutch organizations. *Transforming Anthropology, 11*(1), 2-12. doi: 10.1525/tran.2002.11.1.2

Foldy, E. G. (2002). Managing diversity: Identity and power in organizations. In I. Aaltio-Marjosola & A. J. Mills (Eds.), *Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations* (pp. 92-112). London, NY: Routledge.

Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2001). Correlates of networking behavior for managerial and professional employees. *Group & Organization Management, 26*(3), 283-311. doi: 10.1177/1059601101263004

Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2004). Networking behaviors and career outcomes: Differences for men and women? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(3), 419-437. doi: 10.1002/job.253

Forrier, A., Sels, L., & Stynen, D. (2009). Career mobility at the intersection between agent and structure: A conceptual model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82*(4), 739-759. doi: 10.1348/096317909x470933

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ghorashi, H. (2003). Multiple identities between continuity and change: The narratives of Iranian women in exile. *Focaal: European Journal of Anthropology, 42*, 63-77.

Ghorashi, H. (2006). *Paradoxen van Culturele Erkenning. Management van Diversiteit in Nieuw Nederland*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.

Ghorashi, H. (2010). From absolute invisibility to extreme visibility: Emancipation trajectory of migrant women in the Netherlands. *Feminist Review, 94*(1), 75-92. doi: 10.1057/fr.2009.38

Ghorashi, H. (Forthcoming). Routet connections in late modern times. In U. M. Vieten (Ed.), *Revisiting I M Young on democracy, inclusion and normalisation*: Palgrave Pivot.

Ghorashi, H., & Ponzoni, E. (2014). Reviving agency: Taking time and making space for rethinking diversity and inclusion. *European Journal of Social Work, 17*(2), 161-174. doi: 10.1080/13691457.2013.777332

Ghorashi, H., & Sabelis, I. (2013). Juggling difference and sameness: Rethinking strategies for diversity in organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 29*(1), 78-86. doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2012.11.002

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *The Academy of Management Journal, 33*(1), 64-86. doi: 10.2307/256352

Groeneveld, S., & Verbeek, S. (2012). Diversity policies in public and private sector organizations: An empirical comparison of incidence and effectiveness. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 32*(4), 353-381. doi: 10.1177/0734371x11421497

Guillaume, Y. R. F., Brodbeck, F. C., & Riketta, M. (2011). Surface- and deep-level dissimilarity effects on social integration and individual effectiveness related outcomes in work groups: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85*(1), 1-36. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02005.x

Guillaume, Y. R. F., Dawson, J. F., Woods, S. A., Sacramento, C. A., & West, M. A. (2013). Getting diversity at work to work: What we know and what we still don't know. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 86*(2), 123-141. doi: 10.1111/joop.12009

Hardy, C. , & Clegg, S. T. (1996). Some dare call it power. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 622-641). London: Sage.

Hardy, C., & Leiba-O'Sullivan, S. (1998). The power behind empowerment: Implications for research and practice. *Human Relations, 51*(4), 451-483. doi: 10.1177/001872679805100402

Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as seperation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1199-1228. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2007.26586096

Heath, A. F., Rothon, C., & Kilpi, E. (2008). The second generation in Western Europe: Education, unemployment, and occupational attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34*(1), 211-235. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134728

Heslin, P. A. (2005). Conceptualizing and evaluating career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(2), 113-136. doi: 10.1002/job.270

Ibarra, H. (1992). Homophily and differential returns: Sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*(3), 422-447. doi: 10.2307/2393451

Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *The Academy of Management Review, 18*(1), 56-87. doi: 10.2307/258823

Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *The Academy of Management Journal, 38*(3), 673-703. doi: 10.2307/256742

Ibarra, H. (1997). Paving an alternative route: Gender differences in managerial networks. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 60*(1), 91-102. doi: 10.2307/2787014

Ibarra, H., & Andrews, S. B. (1993). Power, social influence, and sense making: Effects of network centrality and proximity on employee perceptions. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*(2), 277-303. doi: 10.2307/2393414

Ibarra, H., & Deshpande, P. (2007). Networks and identities: Reciprocal influences on career processes and outcomes. In H. Gunz & M. Peiperl (Eds.), *Handbook of Career Studies* (pp. 268-283). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

James, E. H. (2000). Race-related differences in promotions and support: Underlying effects of human and social capital. *Organization Science, 11*(5), 493-508. doi: 10.1287/orsc.11.5.493.15202

Janssens, M., & Zanoni, P. (2014). Alternative diversity management: Organizing practices fostering equality at work. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 30*, 317-331. doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2013.12.006

Jenkins, R. (2004). *Social Identity* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Jenkins, R. (2008). *Social Identity* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz Jr., R. D. (1995). An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(3), 485-519. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01767.x

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Kenny, E. J., & Briner, R. B. (2007). Ethnicity and behaviour in organizations: A review of British research. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 80*(3), 437-457. doi: 10.1348/096317906X156313

Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2010). Organizational social network research: Core ideas and key debates. *Academy of Management, 4*(1), 317 - 357.

Killeen, J. (1996). Career theory. In A. G. Watts, B. Law, J. Killeen, J. M. Kidd & R. Hawthorn (Eds.), *Rethinking Careers Education and Guidance: Theory, Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Kirton, G. (2003). Developing strategic approaches to diversity policy. In M. J. Davidson & S. L. Fielden (Eds.), *Individual Diversity and Psychology in Organizations* (pp. 3-18). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Kostova, T., & Roth, K. (2002). Adoption of an organizational practice by subsidiaries of multinational corporations: Institutional and relational effects. *The Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 215-233. doi: 10.2307/3069293

Kumra, S., & Vinnicombe, S. (2008). A study of the promotion to partner process in a professional services firm: How women are disadvantaged. *British Journal of Management, 19*, S65-S74. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2008.00572.x

Linnehan, F., & Konrad, A. M. (1999). Diluting diversity: Implications for intergroup inequality in organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 8*(4), 399-414. doi: 10.1177/105649269984009

Lounsbury, M., & Crumley, E. T. (2007). New practice creation: An institutional perspective on innovation. *Organization Studies, 28*(7), 993-1012. doi: 10.1177/0170840607078111

Lukes, S. (1974). Power: A Radical View. London: Macmillan.

Martell, R. F., Emrich, C. G., & Robison-Cox, J. (2012). From bias to exclusion: A multilevel emergent theory of gender segregation in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 32*(0), 137-162. doi: 10.1016/j.riob.2012.10.001

Maume, D. (2012). Minorities in management: Effects on income inequality, working conditions, and subordinate career prospects among men. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 639*(1), 198-216. doi: 10.1177/0002716211420230

McGuire, G. M. (2000). Gender, race, ethnicity, and networks: The factors affecting the status of employees' network members. *Work and Occupations, 27*(4), 500-523. doi: 10.1177/0730888400027004004

McGuire, G. M. (2002). Gender, race, and the shadow structure: A study of informal networks and inequality in a work organization. *Gender & Society, 16*(3), 303-322. doi: 10.1177/0891243202016003003

Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *The Academy of Management Review, 23*(2), 242-266. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1998.533225

Ng, T. W. H., Eby, L. T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 367-408. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00515.x

Nkomo, S. M., & Cox, T. H. (1996). Diverse identities in organizations. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 338-356). London: Sage.

Parks-Yancy, R. (2006). The effects of social group membership and social capital resources on careers. *Journal of Black Studies, 36*(4), 515-545. doi: 10.1177/0021934704273501

Parks-Yancy, R., DiTomaso, N., & Post, C. (2006). The social capital of gender and class groups. *Sociological Spectrum, 26*(1), 85-113. doi: 10.1080/02732170500269651

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*(1), 1-24. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.1

Prasad, P., D'Abate, C., & Prasad, A. (2007). Organizational challenge at the periphery: Career issues for the socially marginalized. In H. Gunz & M. Peiperl (Eds.), *Handbook of Career Studies* (pp. 169-188). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Prasad, A., & Prasad, P. (2002). Otherness at large: Identity and difference in the new globalized landscape. I.Aaltio-Marjosola & A.J. Mills (Eds.), *Gender, Identity and Culture of Organizations*. London, New York: Routledge.

Prasad, P., Pringle, J. K., & Konrad, A. M. (2006). Examining the contours of workplace diversity: Concepts, contexts and challenges. In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J. K. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Diversity* (pp. 1-24). London: Sage.

Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *The Academy of Management Review, 22*(2), 482-521. doi: 10.2307/259331

Ragins, B. R., & Sundstrom, E. (1989). Gender and power in organizations: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychological Bulletin, 105*(1), 51-88. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.105.1.51

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory, 5*(2), 243-263. doi: 10.1177/13684310222225432

Ridgeway, C. L. (1991). The social construction of status value: Gender and other nominal characteristics. *Social Forces, 70*(2), 367-386. doi: 10.1093/sf/70.2.367

Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 637-655. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00233

Riordan, C. M. (2000). Relational demography within groups: Past developments, contradictions, and new directions. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 19*, 131-173. doi: 10.1016/S0742-7301(00)19005-X

Rivera, L. A. (2012). Diversity within reach: Recruitment versus hiring in elite firms. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 639*(1), 71-90. doi: 10.1177/0002716211421112

Roberson, L., Galvin, B. M., & Charles, A. C. (2007). When group identities matter: Bias in performance appraisal. *The Academy of Management Annals, 1*(1), 617-650. doi: 10.1080/078559818

Scott, J. W. (1986). Gender: A useful category of historical analysis. *The American Historical Review, 91*(5), 1053-1075. doi: 10.2307/1864376

SCP. (2011). *Vluchtelingengroepen in Nederland*. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

SCP. (2012). *Discriminatie Monitor*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Siebers, H. (2010). The impact of migrant-hostile discourse in the media and politics on racioethnic closure in career development in the Netherlands. *International Sociology, 25*(4), 475-500 doi: 10.1177/0268580909351322

Siebers, H., Verweel, P., & De Ruijter, A. (2002). *Management van diversiteit in arbeidsorganisaties*. Utrecht: Lemma.

Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Peiperl, M. A. (1988). Staffing policy as a strategic response: A typology of career systems. *The Academy of Management Review, 13*(4), 588-600. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1988.4307437

Thomas, D.A., & Alderfer, C.P. (1989). The influence of race on career dynamics: Theory and research on minority career experience. In M.B. Arthur, D.T. Hall, & B.S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of Career Theory* (pp.133-158). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Van de Vijver, F. (2009). Perspectief vanuit de crossculturele psychologie: Polarisatie is universeel. In Raad voor Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling (Ed.), *Polarisatie. Bedrijgend en verrijken* (pp. 29-45). Amsterdam: SWP Amsterdam.

Van den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2014). Gender in academic networking: The role of gatekeepers in professorial recruitment. *Journal of Management Studies, 52*(3), 460-492. doi: 10.1111/joms.12060

Van Oudenhoven, J. P., & Ward, C. M. (2013). Fading majority cultures: The implications of transnationalism and demographic changes for immigrant acculturation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 23*(2), 81-97. doi: 10.1002/casp.2132

Verkuyten, M., Hagendoorn, L., & Masson, K. (1996). The ethnic hierarchy among majority and minority youth in the Netherlands. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*(12), 1104-1118. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb01127.x

Vinkenburg, C. J., & Weber, T. (2012). Managerial career patterns: A review of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(3), 592-607. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2012.02.001

Volkskrant, D. (2014). Nauwelijks allochtonen in de top van "BV Nederland". Retrieved 01.02.2014, from http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2680/Economie/article/detail/3567665/2013/12/27/Nauwelijks-allochtonen-in-de-top-van-BV-Nederland.dhtml

Walton, S., & Mallon, M. (2004). Redefining the boundaries? Making sense of career in contemporary New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 42*(1), 75-95. doi: 10.1177/1038411104039470

Wolff, H. G., & Moser, K. (2009). Effects of networking on career success: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 196-206. doi: 10.1037/a0013350

Wolff, H. G., Moser, K., & Grau, A. (2008). *Networking: Theoretical foundations and construct validity*. Paper presented at the Personality at Work, Lüneburg.

Yang, Y., & Konrad, A. M. (2011). Understanding diversity management practices: Implications of institutional theory and resource-based theory. *Group & Organization Management, 36*(1), 6-38. doi: 10.1177/1059601110390997

Yoder, J. D. (1994). Looking beyond numbers: The effects of gender status, job prestige, and occupational gender-typing on tokenism processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57*(2), 150-159.

Zanoni, P., Janssens, M. Benschop, Y, & Nkomo, S. (2010). Unpacking diversity, grasping inequality: Rethinking difference through critical perspectives. *Organization, 17*(1), 9-29. doi: 10.1177/1350508409350344