

Cracking the Culture Code:

A Tri-Level Model for Cultivating Inclusion in Organizations

Toni Schmader

University of British Columbia

Hilary B. Bergsieker

University of Waterloo

William M. Hall

Brock University

Word Count: 5088

Organizations are increasingly motivated to diversify their workforce and capitalize on the potential benefits that diverse teams can have for creative problem-solving and innovation (Galinsky et al., 2015). One challenge of working in diverse environments is that—even in the absence of any conscious group-based preferences—deep-rooted natural inclinations toward homophily (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001) can lead people to seek out working relationships with similar others and avoid those who are different. For those who have a devalued minority identity, the result can be a feeling of alienation (Woodson, 2015). These disparities are exacerbated when the culture of the organization is defined by and adheres closely to the preferences, interests, and working styles of the majority. In engineering, for example, a field that is 80% male, women show disproportionately higher rates of attrition from the field and often attribute their departure to problems of ill-fitting organizational culture (Fouad & Singh, 2011; Margolis & Fisher, 2003). Low numeric representation per se can deter women from many fields (Murphy, Steele, & Gross, 2007). However, some fields (e.g., law, medicine) have been markedly quicker to desegregate than others (e.g., engineering, computer science; Carli, Alawa, Lee, Zhao, & Kim, 2016), suggesting that the culture of the latter occupations may impede women's entry and advancement.

Culture and mutual constitution

Social psychology's defining purpose is to understand how social environments impact the individual's thoughts, feelings, and actions. Through this lens, social-cultural psychologists have endeavored to understand the relationship between culture and identity (Markus & Hamedani, 2007). The prevailing understanding is that cultures are embedded systems that both define and are defined by the identities of the individuals in that society and are formed and

reformed through social interactions and relationships (Markus & Kitayama, 2010). Through this process of mutual constitution, shared cultural norms are partly created by the beliefs, attitudes, and preferences of the majority or dominant groups. The stronger the majority, the more likely that the group's beliefs and practices become polarized as similar individuals interact with one another and reinforce each other's shared tendencies (Isenberg, 1986). Once created, these norms for what to believe, what to like, and how to behave become codified in both explicit and implicit ways. These norms then have the power to shape the way in which people perceive and interact with one another. Those interactions, as well as the broader cultural beliefs and norms, then also have the power to change individuals' own attitudes, beliefs, self-views, and behavior.

Although cultural psychologists have typically used these ideas to frame our understanding of people from different societies or regions of the world, these same basic processes are likely to prove useful for understanding the culture of organizations. More practically, we might better isolate the levers for changing organizational culture by importing social-psychological theory of what defines a culture. Here we focus on three distinct but interconnected levels of organizational culture: the institutional, interpersonal, and individual levels. First, we describe how each level potentially contributes to the experienced culture of the organization. We then use this framework to discuss how different kinds of interventions could change workplace culture. Although the processes described may apply broadly to many groups or contexts, and to cultural change in general, the primary example used throughout this chapter involves changing organizational culture in highly male-dominated careers (such as engineering, finance, and technology) to become more gender inclusive.

Institutional level: Organizational policies and practices

The culture of an organization is signaled by its policies, procedures, and expressions of organizational identity (Schein, 2004). Just as individuals leave clues to their own personality in the online and physical spaces they inhabit (Gosling, Ko, Mannarelli, & Morris, 2002), organizations also broadcast aspects of their culture in their websites, promotional materials, and physical layout of their workspaces. Many organizations aim to present an image of inclusion by using images of diverse people (Pippert et al., 2013; Swan, 2010) or even by explicitly and prominently displaying a diversity mission statement, already a common corporate practice by the mid-1990s (Kelly & Dobbin, 1998).

These efforts on the part of organizations to advertise an inclusive ideology are then used by perceivers to make assumptions about the culture of an organization (Kaiser et al., 2013; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlemann, & Crosby, 2008). In fact, diversity statements can create the impression of an egalitarian workplace culture so effectively that perceivers doubt claimed acts of discrimination and even penalize the claimants (Kaiser et al., 2013). Such institutional cues to inclusion not only shape the perceptions of outside observers, but also signal fit (or lack thereof) for those who would typically be underrepresented. Members of devalued groups habitually attend to cues related to *social identity contingencies*, namely, the judgments, stereotypes, opportunities, constraints, and treatments tied to one's social identity in a given setting (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). Research increasingly finds in educational settings, for example, that physical reminders of a "typical student," institutional practices that preference only one way of learning, or syllabus statements referencing an entity orientation to success can all be cues that trigger a reduced sense of belonging or authenticity for students from underrepresented groups (Cheryan, Plaut, Davies, & Steele, 2009; Stephens, Hamedani, & Townsend, 2019; Fuesting et al., 2019; Schmader & Sedikides, 2018).

In organizational settings, companies ideally institute diversity policies and practices not only to signal an inclusive culture, but in a sincere effort to attract and retain diverse talent. Analysis of these practices at hundreds of organizations over time suggests that some of these strategies are indeed effective for boosting diversity in leadership positions (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Most notably, evidence-based best practices include engaging in active recruitment of diverse candidates; making hiring and promotion committees accountable for their record of diverse selections; and appointing equity, diversity, and inclusion officers to manage these efforts. These types of institutional initiatives, on average, boost the representation of women and minorities into management positions (Kalev et al., 2006). In addition, these and other inclusion-oriented policies may signal that the culture of the organization (or at least its leadership) values inclusion. For example, even when women or minorities are underrepresented in an organization, simply knowing that the organization has a stated interest in promoting diversity can make that company seem like a more desirable place to work for members of underrepresented groups (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008; Hall, Schmader, Aday, Inness, & Croft, 2018). *Individual level:*

Implicit and explicit beliefs, biases, and self-views

Cultures are broad networks of norms, beliefs, and attitudes that guide the behavior of individuals. Thus, the emergence of organizational culture involves the dynamic interplay of top-down influences, such as the formal mission or policies set by leadership, and bottom-up attitudes and actions of individual employees. Through a cycle of mutual constitution, the actions of individuals help to create, maintain, and change the culture as a function of their own idiosyncratic preferences, self-views, and life experiences. From this logic, organizations that have a broader representation of women or minorities, are likely to also have (at least on

average) more favorable attitudes toward diversity policies and cultural practices that favor their own group. Indeed, members of marginalized groups attend closely to numeric representation as a cue to an environment's inclusiveness (Murphy et al., 2007; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). Although it is not the case the different disadvantaged groups will necessarily band together to support diversity and inclusion more broadly, they are more likely to support broad-based policies of inclusion when their shared disadvantage with other marginalized groups is made salient; Cortland et al., 2017). Moreover, given the power of leaders to set influential norms (Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Kingstone, & Henrich, 2013), the benefits of diverse representation for an inclusive workplace culture will most strongly be realized when the diversity of representation occurs in positions of leadership throughout the organization rather than within lower-status roles within the organizational hierarchy. Women in lower-status positions tend to have lower network centrality (Bartol & Zhang, 2007), often limiting the influence their own individual attitudes can have on the broader culture.

Increased diversity of representation can contribute to a more inclusive workplace culture, but is neither necessary nor sufficient for creating a culture of inclusion. Understanding why involves acknowledging that cultures dwell in the minds of individuals at both implicit and explicit levels (Markus & Kitayama, 2010). At an implicit level, people learn automatically activated associations to social categories based on some combination of group members' actual representation in different roles and one's own salient experiences with them (Asgari, Dasgupta, & Cote, 2010; Asgari, Dasgupta, & Stout, 2012). These implicit associations can diverge strongly from people's explicitly reported beliefs and attitudes toward the same groups (Nosek, 2005). Even women with successful careers in engineering exhibit a significant tendency to associate their concept of "engineering" (vs. "family") more with "male" than with "female"

(Block et al., 2018). These automatic tendencies to associate science and engineering more with male than female correlate with women's lower ratings of self-confidence, self-efficacy, and organizational commitment (Block et al., 2018; Stout, Dasgupta, Hunsinger, MacManus, 2011; Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002).

That implicit stereotypes and attitudes can be internalized, even if to a lesser degree (Block et al., 2018), by members of the underrepresented groups means that simply boosting representation will not guarantee an increasingly inclusive workplace culture. For example, in studies that have documented gender biases in evaluative or hiring contexts, these biases have been exhibited both by women and men (Madera, Hebl, Dial, Martin, & Valian, 2018; Moss-Racusin, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, & Handlesman, 2012), and as a function of internalizing the assumed biases held by other sexist leaders (Vial, Brescoll, & Dovidio, 2019). Notably, however, individuals act within a broader cultural context. Simply associating Science and Men at an implicit level, for example, does not automatically entail expressions of bias or discriminatory actions toward women in science (Crandall & Eshleman, 2013; Devine, 1989; Fazio, 1990). Rather, the surrounding cultural context can either license these implicit biases to shape behavior and decision-making, or cue perceivers to suppress or counteract them (Forbes, Cox, Schmader, & Ryan, 2012; Murphy, Kroeper, & Ozier, 2018; Murphy & Walton, 2013).

For example, members of 39 different evaluation committees recently took part in an evaluation of gender bias in their real-life selections for women and men into elite scientific research positions (Regner et al., 2019). Approximately half the members also completed measures of their implicit science=male stereotypes and their explicit beliefs about the reasons for gender disparities in science. Over the course of the yearlong evaluation, committees' tendency to hire women into these positions did not simply correlate with the implicit biases of

their members. Rather, these implicit biases only translated into adverse impact for women in the competition if, at an explicit level, committee members (on average) believed that external barriers such as discrimination partly explain women's underrepresentation in science. Notably, these effects emerged independently of the representation of women on selection committees. These findings imply that, just as individuals can successfully regulate their own implicit biases when motivated to do so (Cunningham et al., 2004), groups may also dynamically regulate the biases of their members. In the presence of shared explicit norms for inclusion, implicit biases might cease to have much impact on behavior.

Interpersonal level: Daily interactions between people

Most attention given to organizational culture—both in academic literature and public discourse—focuses on what institutions themselves can do either to communicate and change their culture from upper levels of leadership or by educating individual employees. An organizational focus certainly makes sense in light of evidence that organizational culture is signaled, in part, from the overt and covert messaging, policies, and practices that are created and maintained at the level of the institution. Likewise, an individual focus is appealing because of the increased liability posed by the discriminatory conduct of bad actors. However, adopting a social-psychological understanding of culture entails recognizing that culture is also communicated through the *interactions* of individuals with each other within a cultural-defined setting (Mead, 1934). The average adult with full-time employment spends over one-third of their waking hours at work. Thus, unsurprisingly, people's emotional well-being and general satisfaction with life are heavily impacted by their daily interactions with coworkers (Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2008). When people leave an organization or even a career path due to

concerns with the culture, these day-to-day interactions are likely to be where cultural mismatches are most strongly felt.

Some of the interpersonal experiences that signal a lack of inclusion are overt instances of hostility, harassment, or feeling that others are undermining one's work (Berdahl, Cooper, Glick, Livingston, & Williams, 2018). For example, relative to men, women are more likely to experience acts of aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996), bullying (Rayner & Hoel, 1997), incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), emotional abuse (Keashly, Harvey, & Hunter, 1997), sexism (Cortina, 2008), and sexual harassment (Berdahl & Raver, 2011). Even in the absence of explicitly negative interactions, however, a less-than-inclusive workplace culture can manifest in subtler ways.

In male-dominated workplaces, for example, women sometimes feel isolated from informal networks where they could otherwise build relationships and learn about new opportunities (Bartol & Zhang, 2007; Forret & Doherty, 2004). Organizational literature “strongly suggests that women do not have equal access to social capital because they are often excluded from the social networks most important for power acquisition and career success” (Wang, 2009, p. 33). Women seek connections both with socially similar coworkers (women) and high-status coworkers (typically men), but a dilemma arises in men's reciprocation of these choices: “If network contacts are chosen according to similarity and/or status considerations, [women] are less desirable network choices for men on both counts” (Ibarra, 1992, p. 440). In contrast, female-focused networking events may be denigrated as affording fewer relevant work opportunities. As one in-depth analysis of women's underrepresentation observed:

For years [these female engineers] had avoided women's networking events because they were “packed with lawyers and HR types,” not people in the “business of the business.”

If one of these female engineers walked into a room filled with women, she promptly walked back out. As one explained, “By definition nothing important is going on in this room: In this company men hold the power.” These women seemed to have learned to avoid and look down on other women. (“The Athena Factor” ; Hewlett et al., 2008; p. 11)

Due either to perceivers’ prejudices and stereotypes or to targets’ own stigma consciousness, interactions between members of diverse groups can be plagued by feelings of *social identity threat*, namely, concerns about negative evaluation based on one’s group membership (Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002; Vorauer, 2006). For women working in male-dominated STEM environments, feelings of social identity threat arise when women report feeling a lack of complete acceptance from male (but not female) colleagues while discussing work-related (but not social) topics (Hall, Schmader, Aday, & Croft, 2019). These concerns carry consequences: On those days when women report less acceptance from male-colleagues, they also report a greater experience of psychological burnout, an effect statistically mediated through feelings of social identity threat (Hall et al., 2019).

Of course, one could argue that the interpersonal factors affecting women’s daily workplace experiences have little to do with the culture of an organization and more to do with idiosyncratic bad encounters with a few biased coworkers. Although such explicitly negative interactions do occur, our evidence suggests that they do not drive these effects, and that the rules of engagement for workplace interactions are, at least in part, shaped by the cultural norms signaled by the organization (Hall et al., 2018). Moreover, we typically look to leaders and those in higher-status positions to model our behavior and beliefs (Cheng et al., 2013). Thus, leaders and the institutions they represent have the power to create signals of inclusive culture that manifest in the norms of how people interact.

Organizations adopting inclusive workplace policies may create a stronger norm for respectful and inclusive interactions among diverse individuals. Indeed, our own research indicates that women working in engineering report feeling less daily social identity threat to the extent that their organization has more gender-inclusive policies in place. Critically, this relationship was mediated by women's reports of experiencing more accepting and respectful daily interactions with their male colleagues in organizations with more gender-inclusive policies (Hall et al., 2018). In sum, cultural norms may be signaled at the institutional level and represented in the minds of individuals, but they are often experienced by diverse people as the manner in which people interact with each one another.

Cultivating an Inclusive Culture

Organizational culture not only forms but also evolves through the dynamic interplay of institutional, individual, and interpersonal factors. The simple understanding that culture exists at these three levels can help provide a playbook for how best to change the culture of an organization. It also implies that different types of change might be better targeted at different levels, and that change at one level can variously catalyze change or encounter inertia at another level.

At the institutional level. As already mentioned, organizational science suggests that certain institutional policies are effective for increasing the representation of diverse leaders in an organization. Although these policies might have tangible benefits for some individuals, they might only result in meaningful cultural change if most people in the organization are aware of and support these policies. Our own research suggests that women and men who perceive that others' attitudes toward gender-inclusive institutional policies have improved over time come to feel a greater sense of value fit with the organization, which in turn predicts an increase in

women's organizational commitment (Hall, Schmader, Aday, & Croft, 2019). This research suggests that merely enacting policy changes toward inclusion will prove insufficient unless organizations educate their employees about the value of those policies.

Institutional changes can also be informed by more recent social-psychological evidence about identity safety. Organizations can aim to debias their workplaces by looking for ways they can signal inclusive organizational values. This process can include websites, office imagery, pronouns, land acknowledgements, accessibility, bathroom facilities, and properly sized equipment (Chaney & Sanchez, 2018; Murphy & Taylor, 2012). To effect change, these updates must seem sincere, not like hollow or disingenuous gestures. When they are enacted to signal a true organizational value toward inclusion, such cues may instill a stronger sense of fit for those who are traditionally likely to be devalued in that space (Schmader & Sedikides, 2018).

At the individual level. Another common strategy for changing the culture of an organization involves targeting the biases and beliefs in the minds of individuals. Equity, diversity, and inclusion training is not only common practice, but also a burgeoning business, with such programs now offered at over half of mid-sized and large U.S. companies (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016), often emphasizing implicit or “unconscious” bias (Onyeador, 2017). As with many efforts to import ideas generated from academic research into practice, up until quite recently, there has been little to no evidence demonstrating that these training programs indeed work (Paluck, 2006). One challenge arises because implicit biases prove quite resistant to long-term change among adults who have had a lifetime to internalize cultural associations (Lai et al., 2014, 2016). If the goal is to actually change individuals' biases, successful interventions may need to target younger age groups who are still forming categories and associations between them (Baron & Banaji, 2006; Gonzalez, Dunlop, & Baron, 2017).

A more successful approach involves teaching individuals strategies to recognize and control their automatically activated biased responses (Carnes et al., 2015; Devine et al., 2017; Forscher, Mitamura, Dix, Cox, & Devine, 2017; Moss-Racusin et al., 2018). For example, in an extensive program of research, Devine and colleagues have been carrying out Breaking the Bias Habit workshops that educate individuals about the nature of automatic and controlled processes in bias and teach people specific strategies for bias identification and control. This research reveals that a gender bias version of this intervention carried out with academic scientists not only increased awareness and self-efficacy to control one's biases but also boosted the proportion of women hired by 18 percentage points (a marginally significant increase) in the two years after the workshop took place (Carnes et al., 2015; Devine et al., 2017). In contrast to this face-to-face training program, the typical format for organizational diversity training is often online—to scale easily across many sites and employee schedules. Recent research suggests that individual online training has much more limited success (Chang et al., 2019).

Here, we contend that efforts to change the implicit biases—or, more realistically, the explicit beliefs or motivations—of individuals in an organization are more likely to succeed when accounting for other levels in this model. For example, at the institutional level, some of the most effective policies to promote inclusion are organizational accountability programs where clear metrics are tracked and committees and managers must report EDI (Equity, Diversity, Inclusion) processes and outcomes of their decision-making (Kalev et al., 2006). Such accountability policies incentivize careful decision making in ways that circumvent perceivers' tendencies to sometimes fall back on implicit biases when overwhelmed by complex hiring and promotion decisions (Bohnet, 2016; Bohnet, van Green, & Bazerman, 2015; Uhlmann & Cohen,

2005). Thus, combining Devine's Break the Bias Habit program with an accountability policy would likely achieve better results than either initiative alone.

At the interpersonal level. Finally, as interpersonal contexts often provide the proximal conduit for how people feel included, efforts to change the culture of an organization would do well to target efforts directly at this level as well. In fact, social psychology has a long and largely successful tradition of reducing intergroup biases in applied settings using positive intergroup contact (Sherif & Sherif, 1953; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Guided by Gordon Allport's recommended recipe for successful contact, interventions in schools, workplaces, and other conflict situations have sought to orchestrate successful contact between different groups placed on a level playing field and working together toward a common goal. Other key ingredients catalyzing effective contact include support for these efforts from institutional leadership and the potential to create real connections or even friendships between the interacting individuals. These are not necessary but rather facilitating conditions: Experimental efforts to create contact can reduce intergroup biases even with only some of these ingredients in place (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2006, 2008). Although contact experiences are more effective at reducing the negative intergroup attitudes held by the majority or higher-status group (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005), some laboratory evidence suggests that a structured positive contact experience helps minority group members more readily rebuild trust after an intergroup transgression (Bergsieker, 2012).

Although the intergroup contact literature underscores the general effectiveness of contact for changing attitudes, it is notably underutilized in most interventions aimed at creating a more inclusive workplace culture for women in male-dominated workplaces. This omission likely reflects an assumption that lack of contact is not the problem facing interactions between

women and men. For example, whereas situations of intergroup conflict often include antipathy toward the other group, men's attitudes toward women tend to be positive to begin with (Krys et al., 2018). Moreover, contact that creates "friendship potential" (as recommended by Pettigrew, 1997), risks merely inviting the opportunity for unwanted sexual advances.

However, the manner in which men and women interact in male-dominated workplaces might bear more similarity to other intergroup contexts than has been recognized previously. First, because women can often feel excluded from or overlooked in organizational networks and organizations often show substantial gender segregation at different status levels (Ibarra, 1992), the assumption that close contact already occurs in the work context might not be true. Second, although people feel warmth toward women in traditional roles (e.g., housewives), stereotypes and attitudes about successful working women are notably less warm (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) and may reflect backlash (Rudman & Glick, 2001). Finally, well-publicized efforts to create more opportunities for women in these fields risk giving the impression that certain career opportunities and rewards are distributed in a zero-sum fashion between men and women (Kuchynka, Bosson, Vandello, & Puryear, 2018), setting the stage for realistic intergroup conflict over resources.

Thus, although intergroup contact has not typically been employed as a means to change the culture of male-dominated workplaces, interventionists may find some of these strategies useful. In particular, education about gender biases could be effectively combined with interpersonal dialogues that elicit greater perspective taking and mutual understanding, to instill a shared goal of creating more inclusive workplace cultures. However, positive intergroup contact and intergroup harmony can also reduce minority groups' support for collective action to support institutional changes (Dixon, Levine, Reicher, & Durheim, 2012; Hasan-Aslih, Pliskin,

van Zomeren, Halperin, & Saguy, 2019). Thus, contact approaches might be successfully paired with institutional remedies to changing culture as well.

Notably, acting at these three levels to cultivate more inclusive organizational cultures offers broad benefits. Research suggests that efforts to include members of a given underrepresented group can create spillover benefits for other groups. For example, a recent randomized control trial of diversity training focused exclusively on gender biases improved employees' attitudes and behaviors (e.g., mentoring) towards racial minorities in the workplace (Chang et al., 2019). Following a separate intervention project targeting gender bias in academia, not only women but also men in participating departments reported greater comfort bringing up family issues, and even receiving more appreciation for their research months after the training (Carnes et al., 2015). Similarly, environments with less homophobia also benefit straight men by reducing suspicion about their identity claims and weakening gender-traditional constraints on their behavior (Oakes, Eibach, & Bergsieker, 2019). Just as all-inclusive multiculturalism garners more support from Whites than traditional diversity messaging (Jansen, Otten, & van der Zee, 2015; Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008), highlighting the non-zero-sum nature of cultural change and spillover benefits can underscore the value of inclusion for everyone, leading to more support and proactive involvement from members of all groups.

The Need for More Research

This chapter provides a brief overview of what social psychology might uniquely contribute to our understanding of how to change organizational cultures to become more inclusive. We have structured this review around conceptualizing organizational cultures as comprising three interrelated institutional, individual, and interpersonal levels. Using the specific example of women's experiences in male-dominated careers, we reviewed empirical evidence

suggesting that cues at each level have the potential to signal either presence or absence of an inclusive culture. The implication, of course, is that interventions aiming to change the culture of an organization can target any of these levels, and may be most successful if they integrate efforts across levels.

The evidence summarized to make these points often comes from studies with clear limitations either on their ability to explain causal processes or to generalize findings to real-world situations. Organizational studies of inclusive workplace policies have the benefit of summarizing actual data from the field, but often omit measures of employees' own attitudes, experiences, and outcomes. Such research helps illustrate how policies and practices can change representation, but leaves important gaps in our knowledge of how they directly change the culture of organization itself. For example, when an organization adopts new gender-inclusive policies, to what degree do these changes have a causal role in changing the norms by which men and women interact in the workplace?

Social psychological studies, conversely, often provide controlled experimental tests of contextual or social cues that boost feelings of belonging or reduce intergroup biases, but these mechanisms still need to be tested in organizational settings to examine real-world outcomes. Finally, research efforts are often siloed to just one of these levels, seldom trying to examine the interrelations among these levels within a broader cultural system. For example, does an experimental manipulation designed to educate people about gender bias combined with intergroup contact to foster respect and mutual understanding increase employees' support for policies changes that might help to institutionalize an inclusive culture?

Granted, examining all aspects of this model at once, within a field setting, using rigorous experimental methods is an expensive if not an unfeasible proposition. And yet understanding

how our basic social science of inclusion translates to organizational cultural change requires moves in this direction. Conducting such research requires considerable investment from and/or partnership with the organizations that stand to benefit from this work. These partnerships have the benefit of leveraging financial commitments made by organizations hoping to better understand and implement cultural change. But the relationships between researchers and partnering organizations can also help keep researchers accountable for asking questions that seem clearly relevant. This research presents clear risks and pitfalls: It is costly not only from a budgetary perspective but also in requiring considerable time and effort, which can be difficult to commit when students and junior researchers need a brisk, consistent rate of publications to secure and keep jobs (Cialdini, 2009).

A second risk involves potentially losing one's objective stance on the questions and the science in the face of organizations or other funders hoping for positive results. In response, researchers need to emphasize the uncertainty of the research process alongside the value (societal and financial) of using evidence-based methods to accurately identify why does and what does not work to change organizational culture. Despite these risks, clear intellectual and societal benefits can arise when we as social scientists begin putting our ideas to the test in the very environments where they stand to make a difference. We encourage researchers and practitioners with an interest in the science of cultural change to work collaboratively toward this goal.

Conclusions

We have proposed that inclusive organizational cultures form and evolve through the dynamic interplay of institutional, individual, and interpersonal factors. Through an integration of theories from social, cultural, and organizational psychology we have unpacked how, through

a process of mutual constitution, inclusive organizational cultures can emerge. An implication of our approach is that an individuals' biases cannot be fully understood without also attending to facts of the cultural context (i.e., outside of the mind) and, similarly, an organizations' culture cannot be understood without reference to the biases (i.e., the minds) of the individuals who make it up. Thus, interventions are likely to fail when they aim to merely free people from prejudicial representations while not acknowledging the dominant social, material, and structural facts of the context. To fully leverage the power of a diverse workforce, organizations must make efforts to collectively constitute an inclusive culture through individual psychological tendencies, patterns of social relationships, and institutional policies and practices. Taken together, our approach offers a framework promoting inclusion and maximizing human potential in organizational contexts.

References

- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*, 452-471.
- Asgari, S., Dasgupta, N., & Cote, N. G. (2010). When does contact with successful ingroup members change self-stereotypes? A longitudinal study comparing the effect of quantity vs quality of contact with successful individuals. *Social Psychology*, *41*, 203–211.
<https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000028>
- Asgari, S., Dasgupta, N., & Stout, J. G. (2012). When do counterstereotypic ingroup members inspire versus deflate? The effect of successful professional women on young women's leadership self-concept. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*, 370–383.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211431968>
- Bartol, K. M., & Zhang, X. (2007). Networks and leadership development: Building linkages for capacity acquisition and capital accrual. *Human Resource Management Review*, *17*, 388–401.
- Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). The Development of Implicit Attitudes: Evidence of Race Evaluations from Ages 6 and 10 and Adulthood. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 53–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01664.x>
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior*, *22*, 161-173.
- Berdahl, J. L., Cooper, M., Glick, P., Livingston, R. W., & Williams, J. C. (2018). Work as a masculinity contest. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*(3), 422-448.

- Berdahl, J. L., & Raver, J. L. (2011). Sexual harassment. In *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol 3: Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 641–669). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bergsieker, H. B. (2012). *Building, betraying, and buffering trust in interracial and same-race friendships*. (Ph.D., Princeton University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (1039542921).
- Block, K., Hall, W. M., Schmader, T., Inness, M., & Croft, E. (2018). Should I stay or should I go? Women's implicit stereotypic associations predict their commitment and fit in STEM. *Social Psychology, 49*, 243–251. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000343> (Supplemental)
- Bohnet, I. (2016). *What works*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bohnet, I., Van Geen, A., & Bazerman, M. (2015). When performance trumps gender bias: Joint vs. separate evaluation. *Management Science, 62*, 1225-1234.
- Carli, L. L., Alawa, L., Lee, Y., Zhao, B., & Kim, E. (2016). Stereotypes about gender and science: Women ≠ scientists. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40*, 244-260.
- Carnes, M., Devine, P. G., Manwell, L. B., Byars-Winston, A., Fine, E., Ford, C. E., ... Sheridan, J. (2015). The effect of an intervention to break the gender bias habit for faculty at one institution: A cluster randomized, controlled trial. *Academic Medicine, 90*, 221–230. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000552>

- Chaney, K. E., & Sanchez, D. T. (2018). Gender-inclusive bathrooms signal fairness across identity dimensions. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*, 245–253.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617737601>
- Chang, Edward H., Milkman, K. L., Gromet, D., Rebele, R., Massey, C., Duckworth, A. , & Grant, A. (2019). *Can an hour of online diversity training promote inclusive attitudes and behaviors at work?* Manuscript under review.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*, 103-125.
- Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: How stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 1045-1060.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2009). We have to break up. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*, 5–6.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01091.x>
- Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 55-75.
- Cortland, C. I., Craig, M. A., Shapiro, J. R., Richeson, J. A., Neel, R., & Goldstein, N. J. (2017). Solidarity through shared disadvantage: Highlighting shared experiences of discrimination improves relations between stigmatized groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *113*, 547.

- Crandall, C. S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 414–446.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.414>
- Cunningham, W. A., Johnson, M. K., Raye, C. L., Gatenby, J. C., Gore, J. C., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). Separable neural components in the processing of black and white faces. *Psychological Science*, *15*, 806–813.
- Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Cox, W. T. L., Kaatz, A., Sheridan, J., & Carnes, M. (2017). A gender bias habit-breaking intervention led to increased hiring of female faculty in STEM departments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *73*, 211–215.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.07.002>
- Dixon J., Levine M., Reicher S., Durrheim K. (2012). Beyond prejudice: Are negative evaluations the problem and is getting us to like one another more the solution? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *35*, 411-425. doi:10.1017/S0140525X11002214
- Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2016). Why diversity programs fail and what works better. *Harvard Business Review*, *94*(7–8), 52–60.
- Fazio, R. H. (1990). Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behaviour: The MODE model as an integrative framework. In M.Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 75–109).
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 878–902.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878>

- Forbes, C. E., Cox, C. L., Schmader, T., & Ryan, L. (2012). Negative stereotype activation alters interaction between neural correlates of arousal, inhibition and cognitive control. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 7, 771–781. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsr052>
- Forret, M. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (2004). Networking behaviors and career outcomes: Differences for men and women? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 419–437.
- Forscher, P. S., Mitamura, C., Dix, E. L., Cox, W. T. L., & Devine, P. G. (2017). Breaking the prejudice habit: Mechanisms, timecourse, and longevity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 72, 133–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.04.009>
- Fouad, N. A., & Singh, R. (2011). Stemming the tide: Why women leave engineering. *University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Final Report from NSF Award, 827553*.
- Fuesting, M. A., Diekmann, A. B., Boucher, K. L., Murphy, M. C., Manson, D. L., & Safer, B. L. (2019). Growing STEM: Perceived faculty mindset as an indicator of communal affordances in STEM. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000154.supp> (Supplemental)
- Galinsky, A. D., Todd, A. R., Homan, A. C., Phillips, K. W., Apfelbaum, E. P., Sasaki, S. J., ... Maddux, W. W. (2015). Maximizing the gains and minimizing the pains of diversity: A policy perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10, 742–748. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615598513>
- Gonzalez, A. M., Dunlop, W. L., & Baron, A. S. (2017). Malleability of implicit associations across development. *Developmental Science*, 20, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12481>

- Gosling, S. D., Ko, S. J., Mannarelli, T., & Morris, M. E. (2002). A room with a cue: personality judgments based on offices and bedrooms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 379-398.
- Hall, W., Schmader, T., Aday, A., Inness, M., & Croft, E. (2018). Climate control: The relationship between social identity threat and cues to an identity-safe culture. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 115*, 446–467. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000137>
- Hall, W. M., Schmader, T., Aday, A., & Croft, E. (2019). Decoding the dynamics of social identity threat in the workplace: A within-person analysis of women's and men's interactions in STEM. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*, 542-552.
- Hasan-Aslih, S., Pliskin, R., van Zomeren, M., Halperin, E., & Saguy, T. (2019). A darker side of hope: Harmony-focused hope decreases collective action intentions among the disadvantaged. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 45*, 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218783190>
- Hewlett, S. A., Luce, C. B., Servon, L. J., Sherbin, L., Shiller, P., Sosnovich, E., & Sumberg, K. (2008). The Athena factor: Reversing the brain drain in science, engineering, and technology. *Harvard Business Review Research Report, 10094*, 1-100.
- Ibarra, H. (1992). Homophily and differential returns: Sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 422–447.
- Isenberg, D. J. (1986). Group polarization: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 1141–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.6.1141>

- Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., & van der Zee, K. I. (2015). Being part of diversity: The effects of an all-inclusive multicultural diversity approach on majority members' perceived inclusion and support for organizational diversity efforts. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 18*, 817-832.
- Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 504–519. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030838>
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review, 71*, 589-617.
- Keashly, L., Harvey, S., & Hunter, S. (1997). Emotional abuse and role state stressors: Relative impact on resident assistants' stress. *Work and Stress, 11*, 35-45.
- Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action became diversity management: Employer response to antidiscrimination law, 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*, 960-984.
- Krys, K., Capaldi, C. A., van Tilburg, W., Lipp, O. V., Bond, M. H., Vauclair, C. -Melani., ... Ahmed, R. A. (2018). Catching up with wonderful women: The women-are-wonderful effect is smaller in more gender egalitarian societies. *International Journal of Psychology, 53*(Suppl 1), 21–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12420>
- Kuchynka, S. L., Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., & Puryear, C. (2018). Zero-sum thinking and the masculinity contest: Perceived intergroup competition and workplace gender bias. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*, 529–550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12281>

- Lai, C. K., Marini, M., Lehr, S. A., Cerruti, C., Shin, J.-E. L., Joy-Gaba, J. A., ... Nosek, B. A. (2014). Reducing implicit racial preferences: A comparative investigation of 17 interventions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*, 1765–1785.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036260>
- Lai, C. K., Skinner, A. L., Cooley, E., Murrar, S., Brauer, M., Devos, T., ... & Simon, S. (2016). Reducing implicit racial preferences: II. Intervention effectiveness across time. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *145*, 1001-1016.
- Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 95-107.
- Madera, J. M., Hebl, M. R., Dial, H., Martin, R., & Valian, V. (2018). Raising doubt in letters of recommendation for academia: Gender differences and their impact. *Journal of Business and Psychology* (First Online). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9541-1>
- Margolis, J., & Fisher, A. (2003). *Unlocking the clubhouse: Women in computing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Markus, H.R., & Hamedani, M.G. (2007). Sociocultural psychology: The dynamic interdependence among self-systems and social systems. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 3–46). New York: Guilford.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves: A cycle of mutual constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*, 420-430.

- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415-444.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society* (Vol. 111). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109, 16474–16479. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Pietri, E. S., Hennes, E. P., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Roussos, G., & Handelsman, J. (2018). Reducing STEM gender bias with VIDS (video interventions for diversity in STEM). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 24, 236-260.
- Murphy, M. C., Kroeper, K. M., & Ozier, E. M. (2018). Prejudiced places: How contexts shape inequality and how policy can change them. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 5, 66-74.
- Murphy, M. C., Steele, C. M., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Signaling threat: How situational cues affect women in math, science, and engineering settings. *Psychological Science*, 18, 879-885.
- Murphy, M. C., & Taylor, V. J. (2012). The role of situational cues in signaling and maintaining stereotype threat. In M. Inzlicht & T. Schmader *Stereotype threat: Theory, process, and application* (pp. 17-133). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, M. C. & Walton, G. M (2013). From prejudiced people to prejudiced places: A social-contextual approach to prejudice. In C. Stangor & C. Crandall (Eds.). *Frontiers in social psychology series: Stereotyping and prejudice*. Psychology Press: New York, NY.

- Nosek, B. A. (2005). Moderators of the relationship between implicit and explicit evaluation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 134*, 565–584.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.134.4.565>
- Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Math = male, me = female, therefore math \neq me. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 44–59.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.1.44>
- Oakes, H., Eibach, R., & Bergsieker, H. B. (2019). *How closets create climates of suspicion: Stigmatizing environments raise doubts about claims to majority identity*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Onyeador, I. N. (2017). *Presumed unintentional: The ironic effects of implicit bias framing on Whites' perceptions of discrimination* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Los Angeles, CA: University of California.
- Paluck, E. L. (2006). Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action research. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 577–595. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00474.x>
- Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 339–367.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607>
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 173–185.

- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751–783.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 922–934.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.504>
- Pippert, T. D., Essenburg, L. J., & Matchett, E. J. (2013). We've got minorities, yes we do: Visual representations of racial and ethnic diversity in college recruitment materials. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 23*, 258-282.
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: how diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 615-630.
- Rayner, C., & Hoel, H. (1997). A summary review of literature relating to workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 7*, 181-191.
- Régner, I., Thinus-Blanc, C., Netter, A., Schmader, T., & Huguet, P. (2019). Implicit bias predicts promoting fewer women in science when evaluators deny discrimination. Manuscript under review at *Nature Human Behavior*.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 743-762.
- Schein, E. (2004). H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey.

- Schmader, T., & Sedikides, C. (2018). State authenticity as fit to environment: The implications of social identity for fit, authenticity, and self-segregation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 22*, 228–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868317734080>
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. *Groups in harmony and tension*. New York, NY: Harper, 1953.
- Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 379-440). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Stephens, N. M., Hamedani, M. G., & Townsend, S. S. M. (2019). Difference matters: Teaching students a contextual theory of difference can help them succeed. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 14*, 156–174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618797957>
- Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 44*, 116-133.
- Stout, J. G., Dasgupta, N., Hunsinger, M., & McManus, M. A. (2011). STEMing the tide: Using ingroup experts to inoculate women's self-concept in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 255–270. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021385>
- Swan, E. (2010). Commodity diversity: Smiling faces as a strategy of containment. *Organization, 17*, 77-100.
- Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*(12), 951-957.

- Uhlmann, E. L., & Cohen, G. L. (2005). Constructed criteria: Redefining merit to justify discrimination. *Psychological Science, 16*(6), 474-480.
- Vial, A. C., Dovidio, J. F., & Brescoll, V. L. (2019). Channeling others' biases to meet role demands. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 82*, 47-63.
- Vorauer, J. D. (2006). An information search model of evaluative concerns in intergroup interaction. *Psychological Review, 113*, 862-886.
- Wang, J. (2009). Networking in the workplace: Implications for women's career development. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 122*, 33-42.
- Woodson, A. (2015). *The Politics of Normal: A Critical Race Inquiry into the Lived Experience of Civic Disempowerment*. Michigan State University. Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education.