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**Abstract**

This theoretical paper addresses the implementation of a diversity policy as an organizational change process, overtaking the laterality of ad-hocratic initiatives to embrace a transformative movement. Following a diachronic, multi-dimensional and multi-level perspective, the phenomenology of a diversity policy is analyzed as a complex socio-organizational dynamics inspired by institutional constraints duly “endogeneised” and “managerialised, embedded in actors’ role-games and perhaps contributing to the legitimation of the firm.

Theoretically, the paper crosses managerial and sociological theories to investigate the actors’ role-games (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977) and the processes of social regulation and collective learning that underlie an organizational change (Reynaud, 1997; Alter, 2005; Babeau & Chanlat, 2008; Lazega et al., 2008, Bruna, 2013). The investigation is enlightened by qualitative data collected during an exploratory research focused on the French case.
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**Introduction**

Capable to reinforce the moral, cognitive and, sometimes, pragmatic legitimacy of a company (within the meaning of Suchman, 1995), the implementation of a diversity policy cannot be reduced to an accumulation of punctual, sporadic, superficial or exclusively communicative or training initiatives. According to that, it can be seen as an organizational change process (Cornet & Warland, 2008), overtaking the laterality of ad-hocratic initiatives to embrace a transformative movement (Özbilgin & Tatli, 2008), aimed at renewing the company patrimony of discourses, norms and programs (first of all, in the HR and managerial field) and, if possible, organizational practices. Accordingly, it can be analyzed as a multi-dimensional and pluri-conditional changing process, based on an “endogeneization” and a “managerialization” of institutional constraints, sponsored by top-management but operationally implemented (or not) through a system of social, economic, cultural and symbolic interactions among actors having distinctive strategies, positioning and interests.

Addressing a diversity policy as an organizational question, this theoretical paper investigates the implementation of a diversity policy as a change process. The first part is dedicated to an interdisciplinary review of literature and a brief description of qualitative data collected during an exploratory inquiry (interviews, conversations, participative observation, observing participation), and of quantitative and qualitative data collected during an inter-organizational confirmatory investigation.

The paper suggests, in its second part, a cartography of the stakeholders concerned by the implementation of a diversity policy; it addresses the complex and evolving system of social, economic and symbolic interactions among key-actors implicated in diversity process conduction. Having divergent interests and differentiated and changing-with-time strategies, they manage to keep the strategic resources circulating into the organizational diversity field. Indeed, as the State cannot be transformed through a mere administrative act (Crozier, 1979), the deployment of a diversity policy (that pretends to transform the organization’s discourses, norms, programs and managerial practices) cannot be imposed through a unilateral decision of the hierarchy (chairman and top-managers). Accordingly, the paper addresses, in its third part, the socio-organizational system and the actors’ role-games in which the implementation of the policy is embedded. Following a strategic, multi-dimensional, multi-level and dynamic perspective, this article mobilizes the interpretative paradigm of the *sponsored organizational change process* (Bruna, 2013, 2014) to decrypt the phenomenology of a diversity policy (form its strategic fabrication to its effective implementation and its multi-criteria evaluation).

* 1. **Theoretical framework and methodology**

1. **Theoretical framework**

This paper is grounded on an interdisciplinary review of literature, crossing managerial and sociological theories in order to decrypt the actors’ role-games (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977), the regulatory processes and the learning movements that underlie an organizational change (Reynaud, 1997; Alter, 2005; Babeau & Chanlat, 2008; Lazega et al., 2008).

According to Crozier’s and Friedberg’s (1977) and Sainsaulieu (2014 [1977]), the strategic analysis model claim a competition among groups of actors to catch key-resources and zones of incertitude (mastership of time and schedule, ownership and superintendence of formal and informal, material and immaterial tools needed by the diversity policy conduction,control of information circulation and treatment, control of knowledge, know-how and life skills, mastership of rules elaboration, interpretation, application and sanction, supervision of relationships with diversity environment and holding representative functions…) to build new identity role and function (Sainsaulieu, 2014 [1977]).

The Crozier’s and Friedberg’s (1977) strategic analysis - which aims at decrypting the competition for the strategic resources and the control of incertitude zones among actors enjoying a limited and situated rationality - is in compliance with the “institutional work perspective” proposed by Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), and with the identity building process proposed by Sainsaulieu (2014 [1977]). Indeed, this perspective ~~r~~eveals the collective dynamics of rules, as well as the institutionalization (or des-institutionalization) and legitimation (or delegitimization) of standards and practices and the appearance of new identity. The “institutional work research” agenda relies upon a critical investigation of neo-institutionalism which reduces the actors’ behavior to a mimetic passivity as well as on the devaluation of collective and political dynamics. Furthermore, it rejects a narrow vision centered on strategists’ and institutional entrepreneurs’ manipulation and embraces a more socially oriented perspective. Through the investigation of actors’ and organizations’ initiatives to create, maintain or destabilize the existing institutions bodies (Ben Slimane and Leca, 2010, p.54), the “institutional work” agenda re-examines the relationship between the agency and the institution. The renewed understanding of the concept of intentionality, the highlighting of the notion of effort and the redefinition of the agency enlighten the "embedding paradox" of the actors in the institutions. Although the “institutional work” agenda privileges a cognitive perspective, it also commits to incorporate the agency issues. Addressing the concept of "work", Lawrence and Suddaby point-out the distributed and often rival actions, deployed to elaborate, consolidate, destroy, tinker and transform institutions.

In addition, it is mandatory to point-out the need for a sociological analysis of anti-changing resistances that are inherent to the emergency and diffusion of an organizational novelty and to the regulatory and learning processes that contributes to the appropriation and institutionalization of an innovation (Alter, 2005, Lazega & *al.*, 2008; Babeau & Chanlat, 2008; Sainsaulieu, 2001). According to Alter (2005), both social regulation and collective learning processes are placed at the heart of internal changing dynamics. The collective learning process can be analyzed through the theoretical connection linking the neo-structural reading of learning to the socio-managerial analysis of the regulatory process spanning organizational change. Thus, as argued by Bruna (2013b, 2014), it is possible to combine theoretically a neo-structural conception of learning – intended as a social process strongly linked to social discipline and hierarchical and lateral control – to the combination of “power” (authority) and “knowledge” (advisory) relationships (Lazega et *al.,* 2008)] and a sociological approach of changing (Alter, 2005, Reynaud, 1997; Sainsaulieu, 2001).

1. **Empirical evidences and methodology**

The present paper is enlightened by several empirical evidence, based on a corpus of 35 interviews and several complementary informal conversations, with 35 key-actors involved in the elaboration, the driving and the implementation of diversity policies in several French public and private organizations (such as HR Directors and Managers, Diversity Managers, Diversity Professional Experts and Advisors, Consultants…). The sample consists of 21 diversity directors and diversity managers, HR Directors and Managers as well as internal experts on CSR acting within French public or private companies engaged in a diversity and inclusion policies, 10 professional, associative and union experts and advisors acting in diversity and inclusion field, 4 French political leaders and institutional experts)[[1]](#footnote-1). Following the “interview guide”, the conversations focused on the strategic issues justifying the launching of diversity policies in French pioneers’ companies, from 2005/2006 turning-point. We paid particular attention to the phenomenology of a diversity policies and to the investigation of the actors’ plays that have accompanied and accompany their deployment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Exploratory investigation** | |
| Goal | To identify and analyze the strategic issues explaining the emergency of a diversity commitment and the launching of diversity policies in French pioneers companies, from 2005/2006.  To pay particular attention to the phenomenology of the described diversity policies and to the investigation of the actors’ plays that have accompanied and accompany their deployment. The investigation has been centered on:   * The discursive, normative, programmatic and process-based, and finality, praxistic pillars of a diversity policy, * The economic and social logics inspiring a diversity approach, (Cornet & Warland, 2008), * The organizational priorities of the policy and the key-populations addressed, * The cartography of actors engaged in the diversity policy and the analysis of their actor’s plays, * The resistances that slows down the deployment of the policy and the social mechanism and regulatory dynamics that have supporting its implementation, * The “success” or “failure” factors of a diversity policy, analyzed from the view-point of their main promoters, * The “efficiency” of a diversity policy, evaluated from a transformational point-of-view (ability of the diversity policy to transform the patrimony of discourses, norms, programs, procedures and managerial practices of the company). |
| Sample | 35 French major actors of diversity field :   * 21 diversity directors and diversity managers, HR Directors and Managers and internal experts on CSR acting within French public or private companies engaged in a diversity dynamics [76% of women ; 24% of men; 100% of them perform a top-management or a management function; Age group : 46-55 years old], * 10 professional, associative and syndical experts and advisors acting specialized in diversity and inclusion field [30% of women, 70% of men; 100% of them having a chair or director level; Age group : 46,5-55,5 years old * 4 French political actors and institutional experts [50% of women, 50% of men, 100% of them having a managerial level; Age group: 39-49 years old]. |
| Type of sources | Direct and Declarative Sources |
| Type of data | Qualitative Data |
| Methodology of data collection | 35 Semi-directive “interviews” and 15 complementary “informal conversations”. |
| Data capitalization methodology | * All the “interviews” and the “informal conversations’ resulted in a systematic note taking, that has been typed on a computer, in order to facilitate the capitalization and the classification on collected informations (thematic tables) and their analysis; * the recorded “interviews” have been transcribed |
| Data collection period | Investigation conducted, principally, from January 2011 to December 2011. Complementary investigation realized from January 2012 to March 2013. |

The principal conf inquiry, that has furnished confirmatory empirical evidences, is supported by about 20 action researches, experimentations and scientific advisory missions on CSR challenges, diversity management, gender equality challenges, policies and tools, and societal change issue, that have been incubated and delivered in the framework of the IPAG Chair ‘Towards an Inclusive Company’ from March 2016 to March 2019.

Sponsored by corporate companies[[2]](#footnote-2), the IPAG Chair ‘Towards an Inclusive Company is an open and cooperative scientific platform, developing action researches on *Business Ethics & CSR challenges* and *diversity & inclusion change processes.*

As a partnership platform based on collaboration between Institutional Leaders, Corporate Executives and Scholars, it addresses the new challenges of agility, innovation and inclusion at work and contributes to draw the profile of “leaders for tomorrow”, to be able, in the “post-modern companies”, to conciliate efficiency and inclusiveness, profitability and sustainability. It develops and disseminate knowledge, as well as (innovative, grounded and practicable) methods and tools.

As an open, transdisciplinary-oriented platform, acting as a think tank and as a do thank, the Chair promotes an agile, network-based and iterative/cooperative approach to address the challenges and socio-organizational dynamics of diversity and inclusion change.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Inter-organizational confirmatory investigation** | |
| Goal | To identify and analyze the *strategic issues* supporting and ‘justifying’ Diversity, Gender Equality & Inclusion Corporate commitment (Company’s strategic diagnostic & EDI teleological and axiological analysis),  To investigate the *strategic alignment labor* made by diversity & inclusion managers, sponsors and ambassadors to ‘give sense, effectivity and efficiency’ to Corporate diversity engagement and to embed the *Diversity Strategy* into the *Corporate Strategy* of the firm(strategic alignment dynamic & identification of *Business, Social & Organizational inspiring & justification logics* of the EDI policy),  To address the *architecture* and the *morphology* of a transformational diversity policy, looking at the *policy pillars* (discursive, normative and process-based, and finality, praxis-grounded as well) and at firm priorities and EDI target-populations, and considering a preliminary cartography of the stakeholders and available/accessible resources (the aim is to design a EDI policy as well as strategy aligned, pragmatic and realistic),  To investigate the *EDI policy phenomenology*, paying attention to:   * the mapping *of key-actors* engaged in the diversity policy and to their play-roles adopted during the socio-organizational change, * the resistances that slows down the deployment of the policy and the social mechanism and regulatory dynamics that have supporting its implementation, * the key “success” or “failure” factors of a diversity policy, analyzed from the view-point of their main promoters, * the “efficiency” of a diversity policy, evaluated from a transformational point-of-view (capability of a diversity policy to positively impact, on the light of EDI principles and values, the discourse flow, the *rules of games* as well as the normative, programmatic and process pattern and the operational (and first of all managerial) practices of the firm (and, finally, to ‘transform’ the organizational behavior within the company). |
| Sample | More than 15 French and international companies (supporting and/or cooperating with the IPAG’s Chair, ie. AXA, ENGIE, GRT Gaz, ORANGE, MICHELIN, VYV Group (Health Alliance MUTEX, Harmonie Mutuelle), CBRE Group, IFEC, Certified Accountants’ trade union, AGEFIPH, IBM, OGILVY Group…). |
| Type of sources | Direct and Declarative Sources |
| Type of data | Quantitative and Qualitative Data |
| Methodology of data collection | More than 30 Participant Observation and Observing Participation meetings on gender equality, diversity and inclusion issues,  More than 15 quantitative enquiries on gender equality topics focused on 6 Corporate companies (investigating the effective contribution of women’s and inclusive networks to EDI policies and socio-organizational change),  6 *focus groups* on gender equality topics and the role of women’s and inclusive networks both in the diversity & inclusion policies and in Corporate change management,  More than 20 *training-actions* on gender equality, diversity and inclusion issues and on socio-organizational change management (about 220 managers and executives),  An empirical investigation of the ‘enlargement of CSR policies’ (looking at the working caregivers’ professional inclusion issues)  A crossed investigation on the evolution of *Business and Social Models* and he role played by EDI challenges in the reshaping of ‘agile and inclusion’ strategies in a Regulated Profession,  A crossed action-research investigation on the effectiveness and efficiency of territorial SME’s networks addressing the disabled people’s,  A pluri-annual research on the functioning and efficacy of a Corporate Partnership Foundation of a great world-wide company of the energy sector, promoting community-solidarity and inclusion at work for disadvantage and/or long-term unemployed people, through observing observation and quantitative impact study (using the DEA methodology)  More than 70 action-research official (intermediary and final) deliverables realized in the framework of Chair’s action researches |
| Data capitalization methodology | * All the “observing participation’, ‘participating observations’ and the “informal conversations’ resulted in a systematic note taking, that has been typed on a computer, in order to facilitate the capitalization and the classification on collected data (thematic tables) and their analysis; * the empirical data from quantitative enquiries have been analysed through descriptive and analytical statistic and through statistical models (multi-variate regressions and DEA methods). |
| Data collection period | The date supporting this theoretical investigation have been collected from March 2016 to March 2019. |

|  |
| --- |
| **IPAG Chair ‘Towards an Inclusive Company: an open and cooperative scientific platform, developing action researches on *Business Ethics & CSR challenges* and *diversity & inclusion change processes***  Sponsored by corporate companies[[3]](#footnote-3), the Chair addresses the new challenges of agility, innovation and inclusion at work and contributes to draw the profile of “leaders for tomorrow”, to be able, in the “post-modern companies”, to conciliate efficiency and inclusiveness, profitability and sustainability. It develops and disseminate knowledge, as well as (innovative, grounded and practicable) methods and tools.  As a partnership platform based on collaboration between the academic sphere and companies, the IPAG Chair “Towards an Inclusive Company” deeply cooperates with the Foundation “Acting against Exclusion” (FACE, 6000 companies engaged against exclusion and discriminations), the French Association of HR Directors (ANDRH) and the ORSE (networks of major French companies engaged in CSR issues). Thanks to Institutional functions of its Director, the Chair entertains collaborative relations with the French Ministries of Labor and of Cohesion of the Territories and Head Offices (CGET, DARES), and with the OECD and more than 15 Chairs and Research-Labs in the world.  Adopting an agile, inclusive and reticular approach, the Chair is an open, transdisciplinary-oriented platform, acting as a *think tank* and asa *do thank,* practicing *learning by doing* and *learning* *by failing* approaches. It acts as a laboratory of scientific, pedagogical and operation innovation and promotes a a socio-professional network.  The Chair has published more than 30 academic papers in ranked academic reviews and academic books[[4]](#footnote-4), led 10 special issues in peer-review journals[[5]](#footnote-5), published more than 10 book-chapters and 15 contributions into Institutional reports, presented 80 papers in academic congresses, delivered more than 80 Professional Conferences for Top-Managers and Executives and elaborated more than 70 Professional Deliverables.  In addition, it has organized a dozen of conferences on Ethics, CSR and Diversity issues to contribute to the sensitization of managers and academics (300 academics and 1500 managers and executives participating in the Chair meetings). Acting as a strategic partner of Executive Education, the Chair contributes to train executive, managers and leaders of (and for) tomorrow. It leads Executive Education Programs on “Agile Leadership” and “Diversity & Inclusion”, for 30 top-executives (Executive Committees, Boards…) and 100 managers (particularly for the OGILVY France Group and Aéroports de Paris, CBRE France Group).  **IPAG Chair ‘Towards an Inclusive Company” and its action-research topics**  The Foundation “Equality Mixity” (and its Corporate sponsors : AXA, ENGIE, ORANGE, MICHELIN) supports the Chair to realize an innovative research on women’s networks and pro-gender equality networks as spaces of inclusion, platforms of agility and laboratory of managerial, technical and business innovation as well as opportunities for change). Grounded in a *social audit method* and crossing a qualitative (interviews and participating observation) and quantitative (questionnaire) approach, the action-research has been deployed, specifically, in the women’s networks of AXA (7 subnetworks), GRT GAZ, IBM (a sub-network in Nice and another in Paris), MICHELIN and ORANGE (3 sub-networks).  In cooperation and through the sponsorship of the CBRE France Group, the Chair conducts an action-research on creating, tooling and assessing a pro-gender equality network as an inclusive lab and an agile platform (incubating, driving and implementing a gender equality and pro-diversity network, as a lever for social inclusion and organizational agility). In addition, the Chair assesses, in an appreciative and continuous learning perspective, the “leaders management” program.  With the sponsorship of the Alliance MUTEX before, VYV Group after (the major French mutual health insurances trust, with more than 10 million customers), the Chair conducts a prospective and innovative action-research on the enlargement of the field of CSR and employees’ caregivers / forecasting & prospective strategies).  Under the aegis of the IFEC, main French association of Certified Accountants, and the support of the VYV Group, le Chair addresses the new challenged of Certified Accountants Offices and designs a prospective strategy on their Business Models, Social Strategies & Inclusive Practices for Tomorrow.  With the support of the CARREFOUR Group, the Chair leads an international assessment of diversity & inclusion strategies and practices of Carrefour Group in Italy and Belgium and overall analysis on women’s leadership challenges and initiatives (from *empowerment* programs to mentoring and networking).  Finally, the Chair cooperates with the AGEFIPH, the French National Agency in charge of inclusion of disabled people at work, for assess inclusive experimentations and drive experimentations on territorial SME’s networks addressing the disabled people’s inclusion; empowerment and stimulation of AGEFIPH’s executives, top-managers and partners on handicap, inclusion, agility and innovation at work). |

1. **Conducting a diversity policy as a strategic process embedded in actors’ interactions**
   1. **Brief cartography of diversity policy stakeholders**

According to the ORSE (2011, N°2:1), « a good implementation of practices aimed to prevent discriminations and promote diversity, in companies or professional branches, requires: the engagement of direction, the implication of all the actors. [Thus,] different actors can be involved [in diversity policy] according to the organization and its functioning mode, the firm culture, the financial and human resources [allocated to diversity policy], the addressed themes, the maturity of diversity policy, the employees’ level of information on diversity, the social dialogue quality”. Thus, a plurality of internal stakeholders, occupying different organizational and hierarchical positions, having divergent perceived duties and interests, and developing diversified and changing strategies, can be potentially involved in the implementation of a diversity policy, without neglecting the importance of external stakeholders (coming from political, administrative, professional, patronal, syndical, academic and associative fields).

According to Cornet & Warland (2008), Peretti (2012) and Chanlat & *al.* (2013), the implementation of a transformative diversity policies requires adoption of an internal partnership approach. Among the key-internal-stakeholders concerned and perhaps engaged in the deployment of a diversity policy, we mention: the firm governance committees (CEO, Chairmen or Chairwomen, Boards of Directors, Executive or Directors Committee…), the concerned functional directions (HR Management, Marketing and Communication Directions of the Group and its subsidiaries), the concerned operational directions (Financial, Purchase and Trade Directions, of the Group and its subsidiaries, subsidiaries General Directions), the Group’s diversity team, the functional (sectorial and/or territorial) diversity referees, the managerial function (from top-management to middle and low-street managers), the trade unions, and, more broadly, all the employees.

In addition, conducting a diversity policy requires the establishment and the consolidation of cooperative relationships among a plurality of external stakeholders. They can contribute to the “strategic fabrication” and the implementation of the policy, defining the legal framework (State, European Commission, ILO…), presiding to the “professional normalization” of the diversity management field (professional and patronal associations and think thanks…), negotiating the policy concrete implementation framework (trade unions and, with less force, affinity networks…), sustaining its implementation (professional and patronal associations, consultants, think thanks and specialized associations, accredited fund collecting and distributing agencies, universities…) and evaluating its correlated practices and its socio-economic impact (public authorities, on-financial rating agencies, standardization agencies, universities and NGOs and independent evaluation associations). These stakeholders can bring a relevant eye on the policy and might contribute to its control and independent evaluation.

* 1. **Brief resource-based cartography of internal actors involved in a diversity policy**

Moving from teleological investigation of diversity policy (legitimation issues) to phenomenological ones requires a cartography of the key-actors effectively involved in the diversity process. In other words, engaged in intentional movements aimed both at legitimating (or delegitimating the policy) and inspiring, supporting or curbing the institutionalization of “diversity” as a managerial issue. Actually, the deployment of a diversity policy is embedded in a complex social and organizational dynamics, grounded on an interaction system in which are involved a plurality of stakeholders having divergent interests and opposite points-of-view. Thus, the mobilization of a socio-managerial prism, based on Strategic Analysis (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977) and Social Regulation Theory (Reynaud, 1997) and enriched by “institutional work” agenda (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006) and identity and culture works (Sainsaulieu, 2014 [1977]; Chanlat, Davel & Dupuis, 2013), can be particularly useful to understand the challenges and the socio-organizational processes inherent to the implementation of a diversity policy. The phenomenological decrypting of a diversity policy invites to cross a strategic study (mapping of stakeholders and actors engaged in the promotion, maintenance or destabilization of the diversity policy) and a diachronic perspective (highlight of key steps).

According to Bruna’s (2013b, 2015) enquiries, the principal actors’ categories implicated in the diversity policy implementation are:

1. The *sponsors* of the diversity policy : the chairmen and the executives are the key-actors of the endogeneisation and “managerialization” (Edelman & *al.*, 2001) of an exogenous constraint (anti-discrimination duty) and of the “voluntary dressing of its legal obligation”;
2. The *diversity missionaries*: the diversity specialized team is in charge of the translation of a “pro-diversity commitment” into an effective “diversity program” (set of organizational rules, programs and processes aimed to prevent discriminations and promote diversity). They are in charge of the driving, the coordination, the monitoring and the evaluation of diversity initiatives; they impulse an “objectivation”, “neutralization” and “rationalization” of the organizational rules, plans and procedures according to diversity principles and orientations. Finally, they manage to traduce “diversity norms and programs” into diversity practices, crossing and articulating “framed (adhocratic)”, “prescribed (regular)” and “autonomous” (emergent) pro-diversity practices;
3. The *promoters* of diversity policy: this categories embraces the diversity team (the *missionaries)* and their functional correspondents at sectorial and local levels (particularly, in the HRM, Communication and Marketing, Purchasing, Sales, Finance and Audit Functions …). They constitute the networks of functional promoters of diversity programs and initiatives. Through intense, dense and durable systems of cooperation (information and day-to-day help exchange) and advices (knowledge and technical, theoretical and symbolic support), they manage to coordinate, standardize and rationalize the diversity programs and procedures and to homogenize the diversity practices;
4. The fierce *opponents* of diversity policy: occupying several diversified organizational positions (from HR Direction to Communication, Marketing, Finance, Purchase and Trade Directions), the *opponents* are non well-defined, fixed or “clearly identified” category, but more a conglomerate of actors struggling against the diversity policy for very heterogeneous, and quite precarious, reasons. They can be involved in passive slow-down or active blockage strategies[[6]](#footnote-6) aimed to block or delay the legitimation and the implementation of the diversity policy and they counteract the social and organizational recognition of “diversity issues” as managerial questions. Finally, they alternately inhibit the institutionalization or contribute to a deinstitutionalization of the diversity policy (in the sense of Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006). The deployment of anti-diversity resistance strategies, evolving with time and depending on the context, can be viewed, according to Crozier’s and Friedberg’s (1977) strategic analysis model, as a competition among groups of actors in order to catch key-diversity-resources and zones of incertitude (master of time and schedule, ownership and superintendence of formal and informal, material and immaterial tools needed by the diversity policy conduction,control of information circulation and treatment, control of knowledge and know-how, mastership of rules elaboration, interpretation, application and sanction, supervision of relationships with diversity environment and holding representative functions…), in which identity role are also involved (Sainsaulieu, 2014 [1977]);
5. The *modal actors:* this large category gathers a multiplicity of actors having an unstable attitude and a moving strategy regarding the diversity policy. The modal actors can, alternatively, simultaneously and/or successively, support or oppose the diversity policy implementation. This category regroups a strongly composite and heterogeneous group of actors having an intermediate or an interface positioning. They are key interlocutors of the *missionaries* and the *promoters*. They can assume contradictory or changing postures, going from passive brakemen to critic-oriented observers to effective allies. The trade unions are classified in this category, because their strategic position and their (more or less cooperative) attitude through the diversity policy move during the process, according to the perception of their own duties and interests (Cornet, 2014);
6. The *technical contributors*: located at the operational level, the technical contributors contribute to the local deployment of the diversity policy. They are proximity managers and law-street-actors, within all sectors and functions of the firm (ranging from HRM, Communication and Marketing to Selling and Customer Relationships and Public Affairs…).
7. The *voluntary ambassado*rs and the employees’ (affinity and/or advocacy) action-groups, inclusive networks and ‘transformational leaders and change makers networks’ : contributing to the managerial learning of the policy, the “voluntary ambassadors” are personnaly committed in the diversity field. They are often members of affinity or functional networks (supporting, acting with or on diversity issues). They are strongly connected each other and with the missionaries and the promoters.

Looking at diversity policy deployment as a changing movement, crossing a resource-based strategic analysis with the Lawrence’s and Suddaby’s (2006) institutional work perspective, means analyzing the socio-organizational dynamics based on a complex system of interactions among these six categories of key-actors, having divergent and evolving strategies and postures. It signifies also to investigate the conditions of a diversity-based transformative effect.

1. **Phenomenology and actor’s play in the conduction of a diversity policy as a dynamics for organizational change**
   1. **From “diversity promise” to “diversity programs”**

The diversity is not a novel phenomenon, burn from idle. It results from a fundamental social process studied by social sciences since their beginnings (Chanlat & Dameron, 2009; Chanlat & alii, 2013), crossing a philosophical and anthropological perspective (the relationship to otherness; Levinas, 1982; Ricoeur, 1990; Balandier, 2003) and a sociological one (sociality, Durkheim, 1930). Nevertheless, in the age of globalisation, the companies are facing a continuously growing (even if insufficient and oriented) diversity, due to their collaborators’ origins and profiles, the globalisation of their markets and the extension of their action range. In the meantime, the customers are even more segmenting and the environment turns-out more international (Chanlat & Dameron, 2009; Chanlat & *al.*, 2013; Chanlat, Davel & Dupuis, 2013).

In addition, modern man touches, through a virtual contraction of spatial distances the illusion of immediacy, sham timelessness but *in vero* trace of a spatialized time. The time of spatiality can be swallowed up but not geographical distances. This is the revolution of the *contraction of time frame of spatial distance* that plays the alchemy of modern society as well as wides the scope of its contradictions and tensions. The increased mobility of capital, the accentuation of migration, the globalization of trade, the increasing of a “cosmopolite top management”, the internationalization of enterprises and the pluralisation of their members’ trajectories, are drawing the frontiers of a changing wold in which entities simultaneously are increasingly heterogeneous and interdependent. Due to exogenous and endogenous causes as well, the diversification of Western companies is the result of dynamic connatural to modernity.

Nevertheless, in in the 2000s, the show-up in French companies of diversity management issues (and not of diversity as such) was not straightforward. Thus, the conduction of a diversity policy can be seen as a change process engendered by an “organisational novelty”: the apprehension of diversity as an organizational issue, and more precisely, as a management challenge (“*the invention of the diversity management*”; step 1). The “diversity topic” needs specific approaches relying upon an adaptation of discourses, an alteration of the actors’ behaviour and identity role and an adjustment of technical and management procedures.

According to the *sponsored organisational process for change* model, the origin of the “novelty” is not a regular invention in the organisational translation of a direction’s “need” and “will”. That actually results from the nesting of an external constraint (the hardening of the national and European legislation on non-discrimination matters and parity of chances) with company’s socio-economic considerations. Settling a diversity policy within an organisation is, first of all, a way to satisfy a corpus of legal and regulation obligations - managed and translated into an organisational grammar - aimed at straggling against discriminations and promoting equality. It can be an answer to the institutional injunction (legal, regulatory and political, as well) to develop organisational policies in the fields of discrimination prevention and promotion of equal rights, a strategic reaction to a bulk of external-origin constraints interpreted and endorsed by the direction (*moral legitimacy*). The launch of a diversity policy reports, in addition, to an attempt to conforming to the cultural expectation of several stakeholders of the companies - internal and mainly external ones – (*cognitive legitimacy*). Eventually it encourages - more or less tightly – performance, supporting the establishment of a “positive diversity climate” that, as empirically shown by Lauring & Selmer (2011), stimulates both perceived group performance and group satisfaction. In addition, according to the Business Case of Diversity, the implementation of a Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy (Özbilgin, 2009) can produce a positive effect on the firm’s performance, relying upon the improvement of the hiring and the management processes as well as the conquest of novel customers’ nests (*pragmatic legitimacy;* see Barth, 2007; Bruna & Chanlat, 2014). The settling of a diversity policy combines, that way, the “managerized” (partial and selective) satisfaction of whatever is mandatory and the deployment of a good-will move (Klarsfeld & Delpuech, 2008).

Often induced by exogenous constraints and institutional pressures (*in primis* hard and soft laws) duly “managerized”), the launch of a diversity policy certainly falls within the purview of the executive. Whether the official launching of a diversity policy relies upon a symbolic act of the Director (oral commitment against discriminations, formulation of moral pro-diversity engagements, endorsement of the Diversity Chart…), the policy implementation remains dependent on the establishment of an organizational structure capable of driving this change diversity in all its complexity. Sponsored and supported by the boss (who sometimes is a *godfather* and a *sponsor*), the settling of a diversity policy is often committed to teams of the *missionaries for diversity,* who enjoy a marginal-secant profile (Alter, 2005, 2006).

Key-drivers of diversity policy, the *missionaries for diversity* are in charge of the translation of “diversity promise” into a “diversity program”. They lead the elaboration of the policy and the designing of diversity plans; they drive, coordinate and supervise its internal dissemination and operational deployment. They support the policy appropriation by employees and stakeholders. Where top-management plays a role of "godfather" of politics - to which it grants symbolic and organizational support, the *missionaries for diversity* actually are the *actors of the change* because they endorse, according to Tatli & Özbilgin (2009), a pilot-role for the elaboration, the settling and the structuring of a strategic vision, and the surveillance of diversity-oriented initiatives, the impact of which is to be manly *transformative*. In this framework, the settling of teams devoted to the deployment of the diversity policy is of prime importance and is to be adopted as indicator of the commitment of the organisation’s endorsement of pro-change efforts (Tatli & Özbilgin, 2009). Committed to provide the direction’s directives with structure and content, the teams of *missionaries for diversity* recall the *mission administrators* mentioned by Pisani (1956) who claimed they had to be committed to “*a topic, a time, a place* ; [they had to be] *localized and specialized*”.

According to the data collected during our empirical investigation, it turns-out that in the most of the considered French companies, the conduction of a transformative diversity policy is often committed to teams made of managers enjoying a marginal-secant status within their organisation; in the mean-time, they are “*strangers*” and “*congruent-ones*”, as well as “*provided with networks*”. According to our main exploratory investigation, it turns-out that the most of the coordinators and committed-to-diversity employees enjoy a marginal secant status within their-own companies; that indicates their accomplished professional integration and their independence from the organisation’s acknowledged practices, codes and norms. Following the model of the *sponsored process for change*, the most of the *missionaries for diversity* possess a kind of *cognitive distance* vs the daily functioning of the organization. Their “*strangeness*”could take roots in a form of professional poly-socialization, which - on one side - would feed their *cognitive distance* and - on the other side - would provide them with a relational network, which could help them disseminating the policy. “*Strangers*” enjoying a marginal-secant role (Simmel, 1908; Merton, 1949; Crozier & Friedberg, 1977; Alter, 2006: 265-282), the *missionaries* have also a distance *vs* the professional system where they operate. Their strangeness seems to originate from a multiple socialisation which allowed them integrating several social networks; the diversity promoters quite often possess a natural “tendency to diversity” which reveals their personal open-mindedness to the equality of rights and non-discrimination issues either acquired during their whole - sometimes “a-typical”. Crossing “*strangeness*” and “congruence” (within the meaning of Moscovici, 1979), they could deliver a critical message both to the organization and to its operating mode.

Committed to put in gear either a declarative commitment from the direction, the diversity managers and their teams do not innovate through an opportunity choice. Opposite to the Alter’s (2005) day-to-day innovators, they do not discriminate on the opportunity to endorse a diversity policy, which emanates from the Board of Directors. On the contrary, they elaborate the content, define the domain and feature the move of this policy.

* 1. **Anti-diversity resistances, social regulation and learning processes**

Despite the widely claimed support from the direction, the *missionaries for diversity* have daily tofacenumerousorganisational resistances, which are widespread and tricky at the time (“*anti-diversity resistance phase*”, step 2). That demonstrates the transgressing and destabilizing power of the diversity policies, because they can challenge the organisation of the company, ask for in-depth changes in its norms, processes, praxis and identity (in such different domains as hiring, management, careers, supply policies, commercial, investment and donor strategies). They are also likely to have an impact on the organisational credo, because they can fuel a redistribution of functions, a novel definition of organisational tasks as well as a new sharing of the power within the companies. The growing of organisational resistances enables to feel a “worry by anticipation” (risk of a destabilisation of the whole organisational system, of a new repartition of functions and roles, of a new internal sharing of strategic resources and of status and organizational power, of a redefinition of actors’ positioning in the exchange system…). According to the *sponsored organisational process for change*, promoting diversity raises, particularly in the opening phases, diffuse organizational resistances ("fear of the resistance", "resistance transfer", "capillary resistance"), emanating from categories of stakeholders fearing to become the “losers of change”. That is why the operational deployment of a diversity policy needs a regulation dynamics, which is declined in two successive phases (“*regulation and learning phases*”, step 3):

* The *appropriation* relying upon a one-loop learning process (according to Argyris & Schön, 1978, 2002) at the intention of the *missionaries for diversity* (*missionary learning*), followed by a functional dissemination of the policy, towards the regional corresponding persons, the commitment and legitimacy of whom are still quite limited. The regulatory dynamics are particularly significant during the “appropriation step” in order to strengthen the positioning, the prerogatives and the identity of the diversity team (missionary learning) and construct an embryonic circle of diversity functional referents (functional diffusion);
* The *institutionalisation*, which is characterized by a progressive growth of the diversity teams, the structuring of the networks of *promoters*  (*missionaries for diversity* and sectorial and local referees), the progressive development of a functional learning of the policy, fed by the structuring of cooperative dynamics among *promoters*. The functional learning has allowed rationalizing the strategic orientations, standardizing the codes, and roughly homogenizing the practices (not only the personnel management, but also, communication, advertising, marketing, purchasing and selling) inherent to the diversity management policies. Such a learning dynamics enabled clarifying and reinforcing missions of the functional corresponding-persons already committed to pilot - or at least managing - the local deployment of the policy relying upon the local and/or subject-oriented networks, now under development (the form and modus operandi of which are still quite inhomogeneous).

Crossing the appropriation and the institutionalization phases, the learning dynamics interacts with a social regulation process based a social exchange system of information and hands up (supporting and being supported by the professional solidarity) and a social exchange system of guidance and advice (vector of circulation and capitalization of experiences, knowledge and best practices concerning diversity management). These processes link initially only the *missionaries* (*appropriation* step), then all the promoters (*institutionalization* step). In this context, the continuous learning process is aimed to contribute to:

* The amelioration of a still local, contextual and precarious management of “normative controversies” (Lazega & al., 2008), inherent to the diversity policy conducting: these “normative controversies” are induced by tensions on prioritization of poly-normativity (inherent to the strategic elaboration of a diversity policy) and “poly-processuality” (relative to its operationalization),
* The reduction of “dyschronic phenomena” (Alter, 2003). The notion of “dyschronia” (Alter, 2003, 2005) refers to the existence of temporal conflicts within the teams or the organizations, induced by the plurality and the heterogeneity of rhythms and learning logics into a team or an organization. It is strongly linked to the deployment of dysfunctions. When a socio-organizational systems tries out a flow of transformations corresponding to different development steps of the same process and following diverse logics (Alter, 2003:489), it faces the risk of dyschronia. Thus, the diversity movement, by its permanent, dispersed (sectorial and territorial operational decentralization of the process) and multi-level (holding, corporate, subsidiaries, local affiliated entities…) nature, includes dyschronic risk. The appropriation step is aimed to realize a rationalization and a homogenization of norms, programs and practices on diversity and, thus, to reduce the dyschronic conflicts into the “community of missionaries”. In addition, the institutionalization tries to reduce the dyschronic risks, defining a framework, a normative and procedural setting able to rationalize and standardize the diversity measures, to lessen the heterogeneity and the incertitude concerning contents, forms and deployment temporalities of diversity initiatives and, finally, to increase their predictability and reproducibility.
  1. **Reflexivity, continuous learning and “endogeneisation of diversity”**

The « success » of an organizational diversity policy depends on its capacity to call in question the “initial beliefs” that form de bases of the managerial practices (Argyris & Schön, 1978, 2002). The transformative charge of its policy is reinforced because it seeks to achieve some technical anti-discrimination and pro-diversity goals, but also to stimulate a reshaping of management (Chanlat, 2000). The transformational dimension of a diversity policy is consequently linked to the development of managerial reflexivity (step 4), the renewal of internal information and advice exchange system, the reinforcement of cooperation with colleagues and into the teams, and, finally, the revival of social dialogue among Social Partners (Cornet & Warland, 2008; Cornet, 2014).

Stimulating an attitude of detachment and a Kantian criticist position, the collective reflexivity (particularly among top-managers and managers) can stimulate a double-loop-learning dynamics (Argyris & Schön, 1978, 2002) leading to call in question the organizational patrimony of beliefs and values. The networking of the diversity policy technical contributors (diversity, handicap and gender-equality referees, CSR referees, local HR managers, purchasing, communication and/or financial managers…) and of diversity volunteer ambassadors (non-functional contributors, participating in policy implementation) can, in addition, contribute to the managerial appropriation of diversity policy.

A transformative diversity policy cannot be reduced to a « fad phenomenon” or to a “gadget policy” because it seeks to recast the normative and, more fundamentally, the axiological patrimony of the organization. Thus, it is necessary to call in question the “guiding values of the master program” (Argyris & Schön, 1978, 2002) that constitutes the basis of the organizational, and particularly, managerial practices of the firm. Opening the way to a double-loop-learning process, the stimulation of reflexivity is aimed to stimulate intermediary and proximity managers’ diversity commitment and their involvement in the implementation of the policy. And this, because they are not only the key-executants, but also the final beneficiaries of the organizational change process (Moss Kanter et *al.*, 1992; Floyd & Woolgridge, 2000).

The diversity policy has to promote the engagement of intermediary and proximity managers because they are locally involved in *sense-making* (co-construction of sense, local diversity diagnostic and elaboration of contextual solutions) and they contribute to the *sense-giving* (middle and low-level managers’ indirect influence on the top-management, that contributes to the deployment of “transfer and capillarity resistances”) (Weick, 1995, 2010; Guilmot, Vas, 2012: 84-88). Although they are frequently unreceptive to change (Autissier, Vandangeon-Derumez, 2007), the middle and low-level managers are the key-actors of the *creative decentralization* of a diversity policy. As concrete-change-artisans and final beneficiaries of the diversity move, they have to participate in the diversity managerial learning and to contribute, with the support of technical and voluntary contributors and beneficiary networks (i.e.: women’, LGBT’, juniors’ or seniors’ networks), to the policy operationalization. Thus, it is mandatory to “educate” them for diversity and to target them for “reflexivity and dialogue workshops”.

Key-factor of “success” of a diversity policy (Cornet & Warland, 2008), the managerial learning has to hinder the “pleistochratic drifts” inherent to a diversity policy (disorganized inflation of stakeholders concerned or involved in the policy), les “dyschronic conflicts” (Alter, 2003), the “normative controversies” (Lazega et *al.*, 2008) and the “procedural tensions” concerning the implementation in several fields, sectors and organizational levels of the firm.

Finally, conducting a diversity policy as a *sponsored process for change* compels addressing its very final goal: the redefinition of a systemic order integrating the recognition of diversity as a key-piece of the socio-organizational pact (step 5). To achieve this transformational aim, it is necessary to “endogenizethe diversity policy” (Bruna, 2013 a, b) and to develop pro-“diversity innovative routines”.The *endogeneisation* of diversity policy is not synonymous of its hardening, but it invites the company to adopt a collective learning and a continuous amelioration perspective that can support the thematically and territorially extension of the diversity field as well as the deepening of the diversity policy critical power. As the culmination of the policy, these pro-diversity “innovative routines” (within the Soparnot’s 2005 meaning) are expected to guarantee the procedures flexibility and adaptability and to support its managerial learning. More specifically, the “indigenization” of the policy is aimed to support the signification and the appropriation of the “question of diversity” by all managerial classes (from top managers to middle and low-street-managers), the intelligibility of socio-economic challenges that it is facing, the comprehension of its strategic orientations. Finally, it has to contribute to the integration of diversity concerns into the every-day managerial practices.

1. **Toward a curling conception of diversity change?**

According to the *sponsored organisational process for change*, the deployment of a diversity policy at the workplace is based on the interweaving of regulatory processes (appropriation and institutionalization steps) and collective learning dynamics (articulating three key-steps - the missionary, the functional and the managerial ones). Thus, regulation and learning processes are strongly correlated (combined regulation of internal diversity field and resources and missionary, functional and, finally, managerial learning of diversity values, content, priorities and perimeter; learning of rules and regulation of diversity knowledge processes…). It is by definition a social building which can take in account the anthropological background of the organization (history, cultures, nature of the activities, mission, demographic and gender compositions …) (Chanlat, 1990, 2002, 2012).

Supporting a full redefinition of management, replacing the managerial ethics at the very heart of the perspective, the implementation of a transformative diversity policy can be supported by a curling-movement combining: 1) an expansion movement; 2) a cyclic dynamics and 3) a deepening and iterative move.

We suggest that the expansion dynamics inherent to a *curling movement* can be explained by: 1) an increasing number of stakeholder concerned and involved, in different ways, with diversified degrees and temporalities, in the policy implementation; 2) more and more organizational fields (from HR and management to sales, purchasing and marketing issues…) and non-discrimination criteria addressed; 3) a larger sphere of beneficiaries and new audiences targeted by the policy (Özbilgin & Tatli, 2008).

Nevertheless, according to our empirical data, the integration of new actors’ categories (from the core - the diversity team - to the all the managerial class), and the extension of the policy perimeter (new fields, new sectors, new criteria, new beneficiaries) stimulate a cyclic learning, based on interlocking, overlapping and superposition of different *learning circles*.

Finally, a *diversity* *curling movement* is supported by a deepening and iterative process, referring to the straightening of the critical load of the policy (critics of the “initial belief”, Alter, 2005 or the “directory values”, Argyris & Schön, 1978, 2002), to its transformative impact (double-loop-learning) and to its embeddedness in a continuous improvement process.

This approach of diversity change as *curling movement* underlines the importance of temporal factor because it contributes, in a determinant way, to the implementation of a transformative diversity, able to be effective and efficient and to bring about positive impacts appreciable through neutral qualitative and quantitative indicators. Thus, this conception suggests taking time required for “situational maturing” and “procedural delivery”.

In addition, this heuristic perspective focuses on the complex social and organizational dynamics that preside to the strategic elaboration (the “strategy factory”), the driving and the implementation of a diversity policy. This approach emphasizes the importance of actors’ play-role overseeing the policy deployment, looking into the situated and evolving cartography of the internal stakeholders involved in the policy implementation.

We finally suggest that, participating in a strategic HR management and contributing to a renewal of management, the implementation of a diversity policy depends on the spreading of a strategic, as well as process-based, transversal, partnership-oriented and iterative dynamics.

**Conclusion**

At the frontier between the obligatory and the voluntary (Klarsfeld & Delpuech, 2008), and at the edge of ethics and interest (Parker, 1999; Tatli & Özbilgin, 2008), the implementation of a diversity policy can produce (conditionally and potentially) a substantial evolution of a company’s corpus of discourses, norms and programs and HR / managerial practices (Chanlat, 2000; 2012; Özbilgin & Tatli, 2008; Cornet & Warland, 2008; Peretti, 2007, 2012). Nevertheless, the transformation power of a diversity policy is not straightforward. It depends on its embeddeness in a strategic, transversal, multi-functional and sustainable process, crossing top-down and bottom-up dynamics and inscribed in a complex articulation of social regulation and collective learning.

A transformative diversity policy is, in addition, strongly determined by its integration in a curling move based, at the same time, on an expansionistic dynamics (growing number of actors affected by diversity policy and/or implied in; capacity to open and explore new organizational work-fields addressing the “diversity issue”), a cyclic -learning and regulatory- movement (interlocking and overlapping of different learning circles) and, finally, a deepening and iterative process (reinforcement of critical load of the policy; moving from one-loop to double-loop learning; continuous improvement process).

In conclusion, the transformative power of a diversity policy can be evaluated on its capacity: 1) to address the company’ strategic challenges straightening its social legitimacy *vs* its main internal and external stakeholders; 2) to improve the discursive patrimony of the company (expression of pro-diversity engagements, deployment of communication teaching programmes on diversity) in using the power of words (Boutet, 2010); 3) to revise the company’s normative, programmatic and process referential in the field of the human resources and team management according to its anthropological background (Chanlat, 1990; 2012); 4) to renew its management practices (Chanlat, 2000, 2012, 2015; Özbilgin & Tatli, 2008 ; Cornet & Warland, 2008; Peretti, 2007, 2012); 5) to impact its patrimony of values and its organizational culture.

Actually, the transformative potential of a diversity policy is fundamentally based on its capability to raise an evolution of discourses, to induce an anti-discrimination and pro-equity renewal of norms, programs and procedures and to lead a pro-diversity conversion of the organizational cultural and beliefs. Nevertheless, its effectiveness, its medium-term efficiency and long-term efficacy are accountable for its embeddedness (or not) in a strategic, partner-based, transversal and susbtainable dynamics.

Addressing a diversity policy as an organizational issue, this theoretical paper proposes a heuristic of diversity. It is a modest contribution to the elaboration of a holistic (theoretically-based and empirically-grounded) model, ranging from the teleology of a diversity policy (“why developing a diversity policy”) to its phenomenology (how, who and when implementing diversity policy?). The morphology investigation (the form of the policy) has, in addition, to be articulated with a contextual approach, as Nishii & Özbilgin (2007) and Jonsen and Özbilgin (2013) suggest (decrypting the organizational framework taking into account the culture of the company, its modes of governance and leadership). Such analysis in terms of resources, actors and culture has, finally, to be supported by a spatial investigation (the spaces, the places and the “events” of diversity). This is mandatory, on our point of view, to develop a significant, multi-dimensional and multi-level impact analysis.
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