Strategies for Managing Diversity in the Workplace: Lessons from Successful Organizations

Dr. Samantha Evans
Dr. Asma Hyder

Institute of Management Sciences (IMS), Peshawar at- samantaEv@gmail.com
INSEAD Business School, France at- asmahyder@gmail.com

Abstract

The question of whether the social world is largely made up of substances or processes, of static "things" or of dynamic, changing interactions, is one of the most fundamental questions that sociologists grapple with in the modern day. Either overtly or implicitly, a variety of structuralisms and holisms, rational-actor and norm-based models, and statistical "variable" analyses all continue to support the traditional point of view. This "manifesto" adopts a separate "relational" approach, presenting its core philosophical framework before going into its consequences for both theoretical and applied research. In contrast, the previous "manifesto" uses a "objective" method. The author devotes the last few chapters of the book to a study of some of the modern difficulties and restrictions encountered by relational analysis. These chapters address a variety of topics in a sequential manner, including causality, boundaries and entities, network dynamics, and normative implications.

Key words: Strategies for Managing Diversity in the Workplace: Lessons from Successful Organizations

Introduction

In the latter few chapters of the book, the author delves into some of the challenges and obstacles that relational analysis is up against in the modern world. (The ontology of the topic is underlined throughout the whole text, with epistemological issues thrown in for good measure.) I make no claim that I am the first person to address any of these problems; rather, a number of renowned sociologists working in a variety of theoretical and empirical contexts have employed a relational framework of analysis for a very long time. In point of fact, social philosophers and intellectuals dating all the way back to before the time of the pre-Socratics have supported and advanced this

idea. In addition, I do not assert that the bibliographic references and comments on the text that I have provided are exhaustive.

Ideas that have any significance or impact come in groups, not alone, and because the essayist is primarily a transcriber of ideas from elsewhere into his networks, you can be certain that a number of significant, and frequently independent, discussions and implementations could be cited for each idea (White 1994a, p. 4). I have just made an attempt to synthesise the many philosophical, theoretical, and empirical lines of reasoning in this approach and show how they present a serious challenge to ideas that are widely accepted. By doing so, I seek to forestall the form of eclecticism that readily blends substantialist and relational assumptions. This type of eclecticism is principally responsible for the problematic character of much cutting-edge research that is being conducted today.Not "material versus ideal," "structure versus agency," "individual versus society," or any of the other widely articulated dualisms are the most important issues facing sociologists today; rather, it is the choice between substantialism and relationalism, which is the most pressing problem.

Consideration of both the substantial and the relativistic

Comparing the substantialist stance to the relational viewpoint on historical development and social activity is the most effective method for elucidating the relational viewpoint on historical evolution and social action. The latter begins with the notion that various substances (things, entities, and essences) are the fundamental building materials that are common to all lines of investigation. The concept of self-agency is still widely discussed in contemporary philosophy, notably within the domain of liberal political theory. Hobbes, Locke, and Kant are some of the philosophers that have been influential in shaping this school of thought. In addition, many different interpretations of "the will" and the notion of methodological individualism in the social sciences both mirror this concept in their own ways.

The component parts of the matter scatter and look for different homes, typically within or in close proximity to the organism that makes up the human body.

Both psychologists and sociologists continue to use the term "mind" as if it were a "agent," which alludes to the self-operating "soul" that does not longer preserve its everlasting existence. It is not possible to rewrite the text in an academic style using the information provided by the user. The publication that Dewey and Bentley wrote in 1949 together. One strategy that is becoming more widespread includes people who have a rational and calculative bent of mind and who say that their many interests, goals, and "preference schedules" are preset and unchangeable. An advocate of the rational-choice theory named Jon Elster asserts that the action of a single human being should be regarded as the fundamental unit of social life.

According to Elster (1989), one of the most important aspects of their argument is the demonstration of how individuals engage in social activity and conduct themselves in order to establish social institutions and promote social progress. When rational-choice theorists engage with other actors, the consequences of such interactions have an influence on the theorists' own conduct, which leads to results that would not have been foreseeable if the theorists had behaved in isolation. Once again, the idea that preset entities display self-action is seen to be the case, but this time only in a few specific cases. Even when players are participating in interactions with one another, the essential identities, interests, and other aspects of the actors remain intact. The basic tenets of game theory hold that in order for a game to be considered "played," there must be at least two individuals competing against one another.

Every person has the opportunity to pick two or more strategies that they want to use. Every conceivable combination comes with its own set of advantages as well as cons. The amount of the award that is given to each player is determined not only by their personal evaluations but also by the evaluations that are given by the other people who are taking part in the competition. It has been hypothesised that the participants engage in autonomous decision-making since there are no agreements that are legally binding and that may help them coordinate their decisions with one another (Elster, 1989, page 28). The relational method, which will be expounded upon in the

following discussion, is coming under increased scrutiny as a more intellectually mature and rigorous alternative.

One approach that is gaining traction in this regard is the rational-actor approach, which also includes forms of game theory that are comparable. The investigation of norm-following individuals and the internal processes that drive their conduct is the primary emphasis of an alternative method that challenges rational choice theories. This approach's main objective is to provide an alternative to rational choice theories. The depiction shows persons as independent and self-sufficient entities who comply to internalised norms that are pre-established and maintained throughout the observed sequence of actions. These standards are shown to be upheld while the activities are being watched.

In this way, the study of nonrational behaviour is confined to this method, which has been central to sociological inquiry for decades. Differentiating itself from economics, which had taken the rational-actor approach for a long time, sociology has always had "a fundamental need for a theory of action that defines different types of action on the basis of their specific difference from rational action." It calls for seeing people's daily lives as part of a web, rather than as a series of unrelated events that happen to coincide by chance... The forefathers of sociology looked to Kant and his idea of autonomous, moral conduct as a shield against the utilitarian perils of the notion of rational action (Joas 1993, pp. 246-47). Microsociology, critical theory, and value analysis are just a few fields that hold on to the norm-following, neoKantian worldview.

However, the idea of self-activity is introduced into social theory by holistic theories and "structuralisms" that argue that "societies," "structures," or "social systems" rather than individual persons are the only sources of action. Proponents of these approaches, which range from systems theorists and neofunctionalists to diverse historical-comparative analysts, usually make the assumption that strong, coherent entities are the proper basis for sociological inquiry. These items exhibit emergent

properties that defy reduction to their constituent parts. Groups, countries, and civilizations are seen as the reified entities accountable for all action in social existence.

In certain cases, a set of steps will allow you to reach your goal. Trajectories "that repeat... time after time in essentially the same form" (Tilly 1995a, p. 1596) are seen to characterise the development of social movements and nationalist wars, for example. Therefore, in many real-world social science contexts, processes and structures develop as autonomous actors.According to Dewey and Bentley, interaction is the second most important sort of substantialism."Thing [as] balanced against thing in causal interconnection," as Dewey and Bentley (1949, p.108) put it, "means that entities no longer generate their own action and that the relevant activity instead occurs between the things themselves." It is often misunderstood in regard to purely interpersonal perspectives. These entities are consistent and stable throughout this type of contact.

The most known formulation of the interactional method is often attributed to Sir Isaac Newton. Beginning with Galileo's departure from Aristotelian tradition and continuing until the time of Comte, physics began to place a premium on isolating and analysing constituent parts and their interactions.Newton provided clear and conclusive documentation on the topic by laying the groundwork for the selection and structuring of particles within the framework of investigating motion. At this point in time, the lecture was delivered in a way that demonstrated a natural flow of participation. According to their article (pages 105-111) from 1949, Dewey and Bentley conducted a research.

The concept of interaction plays a central role in modern sociology, shaping many different elements of the field through both overt and covert means, in approaches as varied as historical comparative analysis and survey research. Abbott (1988, p. 170) explains that what sets apart the "variable-centered approach" from others is its view of entities as fixed with changeable qualities. Outcomes, which are

themselves observable characteristics of the fixed entities, are generated by the causal or real-time interactions of these entities.Six in total. In this light, it is clear that the substances at issue are not the determining causes of behaviour. Nothing of consequence happens outside of this network of substances, which function as virtual vacuums.

In the field of interactional research, the variables themselves demonstrate agency or initiative, as evidenced by the occurrence of "increased competitiveness resulting from a disadvantaged position," even in the absence of any human engaged in competitive behaviour. That a variable 'doing something' in a story is usually suggestive of causality, analysts claim (Abbott, year).According to Abbott (1992a, p. 58), the selected approach is more likely to employ realistic phrases in which variables play a causal role. The realist metaphysics entailed in treating variables as universals was, nonetheless, well accepted at the time of Aquinas. Researchers that use a variable-centered approach utilise a variety of quantitative methods, such as event history analysis, multiple regression, and factor analysis, to provide evidence for their hypothesis about the nature of the causal relationships between variables of interest.

Conclusion

Even with these problems and limits that haven't been fixed, a relational method to sociological study has a lot of potential. It presents a big logical, theoretical, and empirical challenge to standard self- and interactional views, as well as to those who support them in variable-based, neo-Kantian, rational-choice, and structure sociologies. This huge potential has already been shown by unique and exciting ways of analysing culture, social structure, and social psychology, as well as by ongoing attempts to rebuild basic theoretical concepts. Also, this frame of reference is quickly becoming the de facto standard among social theorists from a wide range of academic backgrounds, national traditions, analytical and empirical views, and often without the full effects of this trend being understood.

A set of assumptions, or what some might call a paradigm, that first appeared in

sociological theory around the turn of the century and then in other fields like physics (though their roots go back much further) are now getting the attention they so richly deserve at the end of the century. Even though there are a lot of other debates, dualisms, and oppositions in sociology that get a lot of critical attention, the choice between substantiveist and relational modes of inquiry, which is a choice of basic assumptions about the nature of social reality, is quickly becoming the most important and consequential line of division in sociological inquiry.

There are many problems to solve. Only a few of the biggest ones were talked about in the previous part. Relationship researchers and thinkers have to think about a lot of different things right now. One is to study the analytical levels of culture and collective emotions with more vigour, using many of the same insights and research methods that network analysts have already developed, as well as new methods that sociolinguists and social psychologists have come up with. Even though the number of culture analysts has been steadily growing, the social psychology aspect, which is the study of transpersonal mood shifts, has not yet been fully explored. Second, and this is linked to the first point, transactional experts should work hard to keep all levels of analysis consistent with their theories. This means not only coming up with more case-specific answers, but also, and this is the most important part, trying to come up with more general ideas. Social scientists don't like to use a lot of theories because they've had trouble with the Parsonian stock in the past.

This might make it too easy to use mixed models, like those that combine network analysis and rational agent theory.Lastly, transactional philosophers should start putting together some of the different ways that their own school has talked about important topics and problems. Once analysts realise, for example, that Bourdieu and Foucault have different ideas about "power," Tilly and Somers have different ideas about "culture," and Dewey and White have different ideas about "intelligence," but they all start from the same philosophical assumptions about processes in relationships, internal debates will become more interesting and theory-building will be easier.

Only then would transactional sociologists (and the sociology field as a whole) be able to reach the theoretical clarity and reflexivity they have shown for so long. Only then will they be able to fully understand all of their choices and possibilities.

References

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. "Transcending General Linear Reality." Sociological Theory 6:169–86. ———. 1992a. "What Do Cases Do? Some Notes on Activity in Sociological Analysis." Pp. 53–82 in What Is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry, edited by Charles C. Ragin and Howard S. Becker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ———. 1992b. "Of Time and Space: The Contemporary Relevance of the Chicago School." Sorokin Lecture, delivered at the meeting of the Southern Sociological Society. ———. 1996. "Things of Boundaries." Social Research 62:857–82. ———. 1997. "On the Concept of Turning Point." Comparative Social Research 16: 85–105.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1983. Theoretical Logic in Sociology. Vol. 4, The Modern Reconstruction of Classical Thought: Talcott Parsons. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. ———. 1988. Action and Its Environments: Toward a New Synthesis. New York: Columbia University Press. Alexander, Jeffrey C., and Philip Smith. 1993. "The Discourse of American Civil Society: A New Proposal for Cultural Studies." Theory and Society 22:151– 207.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1986. "The Problem of Speech Genres." Pp. 60–102 in Speech Genres and Other Late Essays, edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press. ———. 1993.

Bates, Frederick L., and Walter Gillis Peacock. 1989. "Conceptualizing Social Structure: The Misuse of Classification in Structural Modeling." American Sociological Review 54:565–77.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1989. "Hermeneutics and Modern Social Theory." Pp. 34–55 in Social Theory of Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and His Critics, edited by David Held and John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Bearman, Peter S. 1993. Relations into Rhetorics: Local Elite Social Structure in Norfolk, England, 1540–1640.

New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. Benhabib, Seyla. 1992. Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics. New York: Routledge.

Benjamin, Jessica. 1988. The Bonds of Love: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the Problem of Domination. New York: Pantheon. Bernstein, Richard J. 1966. John Dewey. Atascadero, Calif.: Ridgeview. Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc J. D. Wacquant. 1992. An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Breiger, Ronald L. 1974.

Blau, edited by Craig Calhoun, Marshall W. Meyer, and W. Richard Scott. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ———. 1991. Explorations in Structural Analysis: Dual and Multiple Networks of Social Interaction. New York: Garland. Burt, Ronald S. 1980. "Models of Network Structure." Annual Review of Sociology 6:79–141. ———. 1992. Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Campbell, D. T. 1958. "Common Fate, Similarity, and Other Indices of the Status of Aggregates of Persons as Social Aggregates." Behavioral Science 3:14–25.

Carley, Kathleen M. 1994. "Extracting Culture through Textual Analysis." Poetics 22:291–312.

Carley, Kathleen M., and David S. Kaufer. 1993. "Semantic Connectivity: An Approach for Analyzing Symbols in Semantic Networks." Communication Theory 3: 183–213.

Cassirer, Ernst. 1953. Substance and Function, translated by William Curtis Swabey and Marie Collins Swabey. New York: Dover. Chodorow, Nancy J. 1978. The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. ———. 1989a.

Colapietro, Vincent M. 1990. "The Vanishing Subject of Contemporary Discourse: A Pragmatic Response." Journal of Philosophy 87:644–55.

Collins, Randall. 1981. "On the Microfoundations of Macrosociology." American Journal of Sociology 86:984–1014. 313 This content downloaded from 143.107.8.10 on Tue, 16 Apr 2013 11:06:12 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions American Journal of Sociology ———. 1993. "Emotional Energy as the Common Denominator of Rational Action." Rationality and Society 5:203–30.

Commons, John R. 1924. Legal Foundations of Capitalism. New York: Macmillan. Cooley, Charles Horton. 1962. Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Derrida, Jacques. 1974.

Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press. Dewey, John, and Arthur F. Bentley. 1949. Knowing and the Known. Boston: Beacon Press. Durkheim, É mile. 1995. The Elementary Forms of Religious Life, translated by Karen E. Fields. New York: Free Press. Elias, Norbert. 1978. What Is Sociology? translated by Stephen Mennell and Grace Morrissey. New York: Columbia University Press. Elster, Jon. 1989. Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Emirbayer, Mustafa. 1996. "Useful Durkheim." Sociological Theory 14:109–30.

Emirbayer, Mustafa, and Jeff Goodwin. 1994. "Network Analysis, Culture, and the Problem of Agency." American Journal of Sociology 99:1411–54. ———. 1996. "Symbols, Positions, Objects: Toward a New Theory of Revolutions and Collective Action." History and Theory 35:358–74. ———. 1997. "Positions, Symbols, Objects: A Relational Theory of Social Action and Historical Change." Manuscript. New School for Social Research, Department of Sociology. Emirbayer, Mustafa, and Ann Mische. 1998. "What Is Agency?" American Journal of Sociology, in press. Emirbayer, Mustafa, and Mimi Sheller. 1996. "Publics in History: A Programmatic Statement." Paper presented at the meeting of the Social Science History Association, New Orleans. Epstein, Steven. 1994. "A Queer Encounter: Sociology and the Study of Sexuality." Sociological Theory 12:188–202.

Foucault, Michel. 1979. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books. ———. 1990. The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1, An Introduction, translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books. Gergen, Kenneth J. 1994. Realities and Relationships: Soundings in Social Construction. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior. New York: Pantheon. Goodwin, Jeff. 1995. "A Case for Big Case Comparison." Comparative Historical Sociology Newsletter 8:1, 6. Gould, Roger V., and Roberto M. Fernandez. 1989. "Structures of Mediation: A Formal Approach to Brokerage in Transaction Networks." Sociological Methodology 19:89–126.

Gumperz, John J. 1972. Introduction to Directions in Sociolinguistics, edited by John J. Gumperz

and Dell Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. Habermas, Ju¨rgen. 1983. "Hannah Arendt: On the Concept of Power." Pp. 173–89 in Philosophical-Political Profiles, translated by Frederick G. Lawrence. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 314 This content downloaded from 143.107.8.10 on Tue, 16 Apr 2013 11:06:12 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions Manifesto ———. 1984–87. The Theory of Communicative Action, 2 vols. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press. Halliday, M. A. K. 1976. System and Function in Language: Selected Papers, edited by G. R. Kress. London: Oxford University Press. ———. 1978. Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. London: Edward Arnold. Hanks, William F. 1990. Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Husserl, Edmund. 1960. Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology, translated by Dorion Cairns. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. James, William. 1976. Essays in Radical Empiricism. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.

Joas, Hans. 1985. G. H. Mead: A Contemporary Re-examination of His Thought, translated by Raymond Meyer. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. ———. 1993. Pragmatism and Social Theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ———. 1996. The Creativity of Action, translated by Jeremy Gaines and Paul Keast. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Knoke, David. 1990. Political Networks: The Structural Perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Kreps, David M. 1990. Game Theory and Economic Modelling. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lamont, Miche`le, and Marcel Fournier, eds. 1992. Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.