

Conditional openness to racio-ethnic otherness: Exploring white employers' ambivalent self-Other constructions in the everyday work of reproducing whiteness

Peer-reviewed author version

BOGAERS, Sandra; VAN LAER, Koen & ZANONI, Patrizia (2024) Conditional openness to racio-ethnic otherness: Exploring white employers' ambivalent self-Other constructions in the everyday work of reproducing whiteness. In: Scandinavian journal of management, 40 (4) (Art N° 101364).

DOI: 10.1016/j.scaman.2024.101364

Handle: <http://hdl.handle.net/1942/44517>

**CONDITIONAL OPENNESS TO RACIO-ETHNIC OTHERNESS: EXPLORING
WHITE EMPLOYERS' AMBIVALENT SELF-OTHER CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE
EVERYDAY WORK OF REPRODUCING WHITENESS**

SANDRA BOGAERS, KOEN VAN LAER, PATRIZIA ZANONI

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT VOLUME 40, ISSUE 4, DECEMBER

2024, 101364

[HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1016/J.SCAMAN.2024.101364](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2024.101364)

ABSTRACT

Aiming to add to existing knowledge on the everyday operation of whiteness in organizations, this article explores how white employers attempt to construct an open self while engaging in the reproduction of whiteness. We draw inspiration from the work of Bhabha to understand the ambivalences involved and to analyse interviews with employers in Belgium. Our analysis identifies three seemingly contradictory self-Other constructions through which white employers present themselves as open while engaging in different processes of reproducing whiteness. We propose that employers' vacillation between these self-Other constructions enables the embrace of an openness that is conditional on otherness conforming to organizational whiteness characterized by an intertwinement of economic inequality and racio-ethnic inequality.

INTRODUCTION

In December 2021, the Flemish Minister for Equal Opportunities published an opinion piece in a newspaper in which he recognized the continued occurrence of racio-ethnic discrimination in the labour market, while celebrating the overall decline of blatant racism and the general tolerance and open-mindedness of Flemish society ([Somers, 2021](#)). This opinion piece reflects the dominant discourse on racio-ethnic inequality, which presents it as caused by the blatant discrimination by a few openly racist actors, rather than recognizing it as a structural problem that is reproduced on an everyday basis, including through the less visible actions of actors who consider themselves tolerant and open to diversity ([Bhopal, 2023](#), [Liu, 2017](#), [Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#), [Swan, 2010a](#)).

In the last decades, Management and Organization Studies have increasingly drawn on the concept of whiteness to explore these more invisible ways through which racio-ethnic inequality is reproduced (e.g., [Chrobot-Mason, Campbell, & Vason, 2020](#); [Dar & Ibrahim, 2018](#); [Liu & Baker, 2014](#); [Nkomo & Al Ariss, 2014](#)). These studies highlight how whiteness invisibly structures organizations and enables them to, on the one hand, appear ‘raceless’ and diversity-friendly, and, on the other hand, privilege white employees as the invisible norms in relation to which racio-ethnically othered workers are constructed as less valuable and competent ([Bhattacharyya, 2018](#), [Crevani, 2019](#), [Liu, 2017](#), [Liu and Baker, 2014](#), [Nkomo and Al Ariss, 2014](#), [Prasad, 2021](#), [Swan, 2010a](#)).

While these studies have provided crucial contributions to our understanding of the role of whiteness in the reproduction of racio-ethnic inequalities in organizations, they mainly focus on exposing the way it is institutionally embedded in the workplace and disadvantages othered workers ([Nkomo et al., 2019](#), [Twine and Gallagher, 2008](#)). While this has produced important insights into the effects and operation of whiteness as a structural system, less attention has been given to the role of white actors, or those actors occupying a racialized position of privilege in this system ([Bhopal, 2023](#), [Owen, 2007](#)), in the everyday work of

reproducing whiteness ([Nkomo and Al Ariss, 2014](#), [Nkomo et al., 2019](#), [Liu, 2021](#), [Swan, 2016](#)). This process might be characterized by ambivalence, not only as white actors are often ignorant of their own role in reproducing whiteness ([Owen, 2007](#), [Mills, 2007](#), [Swan, 2010a](#)), but also as societal norms increasingly condemn open racism and discrimination, and incite white actors to pay lip service to diversity and to appear open and tolerant ([Köllen, 2020](#), [Lansu et al., 2020](#), [Liu, 2017](#), [Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#), [Swan, 2010a](#)). To fully grasp how whiteness operates on an everyday basis in organizations, we therefore need to also understand how white actors navigate these ambivalences and attempt to maintain an sense of open self while engaging in the reproduction of whiteness.

To explore the ambiguities inherent in this everyday work of reproducing whiteness, we draw on the work of Homi [Bhabha \(1994\)](#) on the ambivalences inherent in colonial encounters and the self-Other constructions involved ([Bhabha, 1994](#), [Dar, 2014](#), [Frenkel, 2008](#), [Lô and Fatien Diochon, 2019](#), [Wettermark and Berglund, 2022](#), [Yousfi, 2014](#)). We use this perspective to analyse interviews with employers in Belgium who predominantly employ racio-ethnically othered workers for low-skilled and precarious jobs. Based on our analysis, this research identifies three seemingly contradictory self-Other constructions through which white employers present themselves as open while engaging in different processes of reproducing whiteness: a construction of themselves as open because they are willing to use otherness as a desirable economic resource; a construction of themselves as open but forced to accommodate the derision of otherness by white organizational stakeholders; and a construction of themselves as open yet threatened by a collective form of otherness. We further show how white employers ambivalently vacillate between these different constructions and propose that this vacillation enables the embrace of a form of openness that is conditional on otherness conforming to, and not disrupting, the system of organizational whiteness. Before turning to

these analyses, the article introduces theories on whiteness in organizations and the theory of Bhabha on ambivalence.

WHITENESS IN ORGANIZATIONS

In recent years, research in Critical Diversity Studies has increasingly argued that to fully grasp the ongoing reproduction of racio-ethnic inequality in the workplace, attention is required to the maintenance and masking of whiteness (e.g., [Liu, 2021](#); [Liu & Baker, 2014](#); [Nkomo et al., 2019](#); [Nkomo & Al Ariss, 2014](#); [Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#); [Swan, 2010a](#)).

While there are many different definitions and conceptualizations of whiteness, we understand it as involving a structuring property that shapes the world in a way that affords privilege to those who are conceived as white and that locates those racialized as non-white in a position of subordination and disadvantage ([Bhopal, 2023](#), [Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#), [Moreton-Robinson, 2006](#), [Owen, 2007](#), [Prasad, 2021](#)). In doing so, it installs white people as the norm against which others are evaluated, which provides them with particular symbolic, material and social privileges. One of these privileges is appearing ‘raceless’ and ‘simply human’, thereby becoming the invisible standard in relation to which others become racialized and defined as deviant and inferior racio-ethnic groups ([Bhopal, 2023](#), [Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#), [Mills, 2007](#), [Moreton-Robinson, 2006](#), [Nkomo and Al Ariss, 2014](#), [Prasad, 2021](#)). In other words, being white implies occupying a position of structural advantage in relation to those constructed as racio-ethnic others.

In Management and Organization Studies, these ideas have been used to expose how whiteness serves as an invisible norm in organizations and shapes organizational discourses, cultures, and practices that reflect and maintain the dominance of white employees ([Crevani, 2019](#), [Dar and Ibrahim, 2018](#), [Nkomo, 2009](#), [Nkomo and Al Ariss, 2014](#), Nkomo et al.,

2019; [Swan, 2016](#)). As a result, white employees can inhabit workplaces in which they are the implicit model for the ‘ideal employee’. This allows them to enjoy symbolic and material privileges, for example, as organizational cultures reflect their identities and ways of life, and they become more readily seen as qualified and suitable for certain positions ([Crevani, 2019](#), [Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013](#), [Leyerzapf et al., 2018](#), [Swan, 2016](#)). Meanwhile, the invisibility of whiteness allows these privileges to be denied, appear ‘normal’, or be explained as resulting from individual merits ([Nkomo and Al Ariss, 2014](#), [Swan, 2010a](#)). In comparison, those who are racialized as non-white are rendered hypervisible as different from, and inferior in relation to, white organizational norms. As a result, they become constructed as, for example, less competent, less suitable to hold particular jobs, and displaying ‘exotic’ and ‘problematic’ cultural traits, which can lead to their marginalization in the workplace ([Dar and Ibrahim, 2018](#), [Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013](#), [Swan, 2010a](#), [Swan, 2010b](#)).

Furthermore, these studies have shown how dominant approaches to diversity management often have little effect on, or even reproduce, whiteness in organizations. For example, they have been criticized for essentializing (non-white) racio-ethnic identities and constructing otherness as exotic and deviant ([Ahmed and Swan, 2006](#), [Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013](#), [Kornau et al., 2021](#), [Leyerzapf et al., 2018](#), [Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#), [Swan, 2010b](#)). Similarly, the colourblind perspective underlying much diversity rhetoric has been argued to reproduce rather than challenge whiteness ([Ahmed & Swan, 2006](#); [Liu, 2017](#); [Swan, 2010b](#)). As a result, mainstream diversity management approaches have been criticized for giving organizations the appearance of being inclusive and open to diversity without actually addressing the ongoing reproduction of whiteness ([Ahmed, 2012](#); [Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#); [Swan, 2010a](#)).

Overall, these studies have provided valuable insights by exposing how whiteness structures organizations, permeates organizational discourses and norms, and contributes to the racialization and marginalization of non-white workers ([Nkomo et al., 2019](#), [Swan,](#)

[2016](#), [Twine and Gallagher, 2008](#)). However, while doing so, they have mainly presented white employees and managers as embodiments of white norms and as “the unnamed normative or the benchmark against which ‘others’ are judged” ([Nkomo et al., 2019](#): 509). In doing so, they have provided less insight in the way they are, as active agents, involved in the everyday work of reproducing and reinforcing whiteness ([Nkomo and Al Ariss, 2014](#), [Nkomo et al., 2019](#), [Swan, 2016](#)). This habitual reproduction might be characterized by important ambiguities. The reason for this is that, in the context of societal norms that condemn open discrimination and embrace diversity as morally just ([Köllen, 2020](#), [Lansu et al., 2020](#)), white actors are incited to maintain a tolerant identity ([Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#), [Liu, 2017](#); [Swan, 2010a](#)). When engaging in the everyday reproduction of whiteness, white people therefore tend to strive to reconcile their involvement in the maintenance of structural inequalities with the view of themselves as open, tolerant and inclusive. However, this does not imply that they are necessarily aware of their own role in reproducing inequality, as their position in the structural system characterized by whiteness affects the degree to which people recognize the existence of this system and the privileges it affords to some ([Bhopal, 2023](#), [Owen, 2007](#), [Mills, 2007](#), [Swan, 2010a](#)). To fully grasp the everyday operation of whiteness in organizations, we therefore not only need to understand how it operates abstractly, but also how employers negotiate these ambiguities and reproduce both whiteness and the idea that they are open to racio-ethnic diversity. To explore this issue, we draw on the work of Homi [Bhabha \(1994\)](#), which has theorized the ambivalences inherent in the colonial encounter and the self-Other constructions involved ([Boussebaa et al., 2014](#), [Frenkel, 2008](#), [Jack and Westwood, 2006](#), [Lô and Fatien Diochon, 2019](#), [Wettermark and Berglund, 2022](#), [Yousfi, 2014](#)).

THE AMBIVALENCES OF THE COLONIZER'S SELF AND THE COLONIZED OTHER

In recent years, the work of Homi [Bhabha \(1994\)](#) has served as a crucial source of inspiration for postcolonial organization studies, which aim to understand how contemporary economic relations and organizational discourses and practices reflect, and are shaped by, historic relations of colonial power ([Jack, 2015](#), [Jack and Westwood, 2006](#)). In line with other important postcolonial theorists, the work of [Bhabha \(1994\)](#) pays particular attention to the operations and power effects of colonial discourses. Through their representations of colonizing societies as 'civilized', 'superior' and 'rational' and of colonized peoples and cultures as 'uncivilized,' 'inferior' and 'backward', these colonial discourses played a crucial role in justifying the political and economic ambitions underlying the colonial system. Specifically, they legitimized colonizers' conquest and governance of colonized lands, the imposition of their culture and language, and the enslavement and economic exploitation of colonized peoples ([Bhabha, 1994](#); [Fanon, 1952](#); [Said, 1968](#)).

The main contribution of [Bhabha \(1994\)](#) to these debates is his analyses of the way the colonial encounter is not simply characterized by binary understandings of difference, but rather by a "complex, ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation" ([Bhabha, 1994](#): 70). Reflecting insights developed by [Memmi \(2003\)](#) and [Fanon \(1952\)](#), he particularly argues that in the colonial relation, the colonizer's self and the colonizer's approach to the colonized is inherently determined by structures of ambivalence ([Dar, 2014](#), [Frenkel, 2008](#), [Lô and Fatien Diochon, 2019](#), [Wettermark and Berglund, 2022](#), [Yousfi, 2014](#)). Bhabha highlights that the colonizers' ideas about the colonized are not fixed and singular, but rather involve multiple and even contradictory representations, through which they become "at once an object of desire and derision" ([Bhabha, 1994](#): 67), and of "fear and desire" ([Bhabha, 1994](#): 72). As a result, the colonizer vacillates between different ideas of the colonized, for example between

viewing them as humble, grateful and hard-working servants and as dangerous, manipulative and savage threats.

This ambivalence not solely informs the way the colonizer constructs and approaches the colonized. Bhabha rather argues that the colonizers' sense of self is equally characterized by ambivalence, torn between seeing one's self as "the father and the oppressor; just and unjust; moderate and rapacious" (Bhabha, 1994: 96). In line with Memmi (2003), according to whom colonizers are constantly faced with the challenge of maintaining a view of themselves as civilized, just and superior while holding a position in the oppressive and exploitative colonial system, Bhabha argues that this causes the colonizer to look for ways to attempt to resolve these tensions. He particularly argues that the colonizers turn to the colonized with "a desire for 'authorization'" (Bhabha, 1994: 100) and for confirmation of their benevolence, morality and civility. In other words, the colonizer aims to resolve the ambivalence of seeing one's self both as the legitimate and just ruler of the colonized and as their oppressive and exploitative tyrant, by looking to the colonized with the "frustrated wish 'I want him to love me'" (Bhabha, 1994: 100).

This same type of ambivalence also permeates the way the colonizer wants the colonized to be. Bhabha (1994) argues that the colonizer not only wants to be recognized as a caring and just father by the colonized, but also wants to educate and reform them to make them "palatable in a certain way" (Fanon, 1952:135). In this, Bhabha highlights the ambivalence of mimicry. While mimicry involves a "complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline" (Bhabha, 1994: 86), the colonizers do not want the colonized to become a complete imitation of themselves (Bhabha, 1994, Wettermark and Berglund, 2022). Rather, in order to maintain their authority and their sense of superior self, colonizers desire "authorized versions of otherness" (Bhabha, 1994: 88), involving "a reformed, recognizable Other, as *a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*" (Bhabha, 1994: 86). However, the

ambivalence of mimicry also opens up possibilities for resistance, as mimicking the colonizer can be used by the colonized as a strategy “to partake in (and subvert) the machinations of colonial power” ([Jack, 2015](#): 156) ([Frenkel, 2008](#), [Wettermark and Berglund, 2022](#), [Yousfi, 2014](#)).

Bhabha’s theoretical contributions on ambivalence have also recently inspired organizational studies in their exploration of the often ambiguous and contradictory relationship between white and othered actors in organizations (e.g., [Boussebaa et al., 2014](#); [Dar, 2014](#); [Kalonaityte, 2010](#); [Yousfi, 2014](#)). They have particularly highlighted how the reproduction of racio-ethnic inequalities in (international) organizations involves complex interplays between regulation, compliance and resistance, which result in ambiguous identities. For example, exploring call centres in India serving Anglo-American companies, Boussebaa and colleagues (2014) show how the imposition of English language standards allows Indian workers who sufficiently master this language to become part of the local elite. However, at the same time, they still remain seen as inferior to ‘pure’ English speakers. This study also shows how workers resist Englishization by developing ambiguous forms of communication rather than completely switching to English. Similarly, [Dar \(2014\)](#) exposes how pressures to adopt Western forms of accountability by Indian NGO workers involve a subjugation of local knowledge but also empower those mimicking them. While opening up avenues for resistance, this mimicry nevertheless always risks remaining considered as an incomplete imitation in the eyes of the donors. While using Bhabha’s work to expose the role of ambivalence in the way othered workers construct identities and attempt to engage in resistance, these studies have paid less attention to the ambivalences characterizing the white identities in relation to which they are constructed. However, as Bhabha’s work offers valuable insights in the way colonizers experience and navigate the ambivalences of the

colonial situation, it can also help us understand the ambiguities of white employers' identities as they reproduce whiteness.

METHODOLOGY

Context of the study

This research took place in a region of Flanders, the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium, whose need for labour for its coal mining industry attracted a high number of immigrants throughout the twentieth century. These involved migrants from Poland and Czechoslovakia in the 1920s, from Spain and Italy in the fifties, and from Turkey and Morocco from the sixties until the formal end of labour migration programs in the seventies. Although originally considered 'guest workers', their residence gradually became permanent as they became permitted to stay in Belgium and bring over their families. Despite the official end of labour migration programs, migration to Flanders continues, mainly consisting of (temporary) workers from Central and Eastern Europe, family members of previously arrived immigrants, and refugees from the Asia and Africa ([Noppe et al., 2018](#)).

As a result, this region has a highly racio-ethnically diverse population. For example, in 2017, more than 20% of the population of cities in this region had a migration background, with percentages in some cities rising to 48% ([Noppe et al., 2018](#)). While Belgium has a colonial history that includes the bloody colonial rule of the modern-day Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda and Burundi, and the co-administration of the Tangier International Zone in Morocco and the concession of Tianjin, migration from Belgium's (former) colonies to Flanders was limited by official policies aimed to discourage people from those regions to come to Europe. Moreover, migrants from these countries often preferred to settle in the Francophone parts of Belgium ([Demart, 2013](#), [Kagné and Martiniello, 2001](#)).

The current views on racio-ethnic otherness in Belgium, and in this region in specific, are shaped by colonial and Islamophobic discourses. Dominant discourses often link racio-ethnically othered people to an unwillingness to work and a refusal to assimilate to the 'Flemish culture'. Especially Muslims (or those assumed to be Muslims) are constructed in a highly negative way, and for example presented as threatening 'Western values.' Such discourses are reproduced and fuelled by right-wing and populist anti-immigrant parties, which have recently obtained up to 25% of the vote in Flanders ([Bousetta and Jacobs, 2006](#), [Harder et al., 2019](#)). Meanwhile, there is a continued influence of colonial discourses, and dominant narratives on Belgium's colonial past remain infused with a sense of nostalgia, heroism and even pride. It is only since the turn of the century, and especially since recent Black Lives Matter protests, that more serious debates on the enduring effects of Belgium's violent colonial past have emerged ([Verbeeck, 2020](#)).

Meanwhile, Belgium continues to be characterized by a strong stratification of the labour market along racio-ethnic lines, in which different racio-ethnic groups are represented differently in unemployment, in high-quality and low-quality jobs, and in different sectors. On average, the best positions on the labour market are held by those born to white Belgian parents, who have the highest employment rate and are strongly overrepresented in the highest wage categories. They are generally followed by people with an origin from the other 14 states that were a member of the EU before its enlargement in 2004. On average, they also have a relatively high employment rate but are less strongly represented in the highest wage categories. Below that are people from the 13 (mainly Central and Eastern European) states that joined the EU since 2004, who have a relatively high employment rate but are overrepresented in the lower wage categories, in blue-collar jobs with insecure contracts and in temporary agency work. This is connected to the types of sectors in which they are strongly represented, such as the construction, the cleaning or the transportation sector. Below that are

people with a non-European origin, who are overrepresented in unemployment and in jobs with the lowest wages and the most precarious employment conditions. This can in part be explained by their strong representation in blue-collar jobs, temporary agency work, and sectors such as retail, food and beverage service, cleaning, landscaping, or transportation. These are sectors characterized by low wages, high levels of short-term employment, and undesirable working conditions leading to high labour shortages. Moreover, the available data suggests that this racio-ethnic stratification has been relatively stable over time and even across generations, showing the strength of the structural processes maintaining these inequalities ([Unia & FOD WASO, 2022](#)).

The interviews

Within this context, twenty-two white employers who employ racio-ethnically othered workers were interviewed. The interviewees volunteered to participate in research about racio-ethnic diversity and labour market discrimination. They were recruited through snowball sampling via the researchers' network. The sample consisted of 10 female and 12 male employers, whose ages ranged from the mid-thirties to the mid-sixties. The racio-ethnic diversity of the employers' workforces reflected that of the region, with a strong representation of workers with a background from Spain, Italy, Turkey, the Maghreb, Poland, Romania and Ukraine. Reflecting the racio-ethnic stratification of the regional labour market, these workers were primarily employed in low- to middle-skilled or technical jobs. The sectors and sizes of the employers' organizations reflected the profile of the organizations in the region. Since the closure of the mining industry and of several other major industrial plants at the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twentieth-first century, the region is strongly dominated by SMEs with many offering primarily blue-collar jobs. An overview of the interviewees, the sectors in which they are active, the size of their

organizations, and the main occupations of their employees can be found in [Table 1](#). To protect the anonymity of the interviewees, we opted not to provide more detailed information on them.

Table 1. overview of the respondents and details about their organisation.

Respondent	Sector	Number of workers	Main occupation of employees
Employer 1	Retail	> 150	Shop assistants
Employer 2	Industry	> 150	Technicians
Employer 3	Construction	0 –10	Factory workers/technicians
Employer 4	Transport	11 –50	Drivers
Employer 5	Retail	> 150	Shop assistants
Employer 6	Service	11 –50	Gardeners
Employer 7	Retail	> 150	Shop assistants
Employer 8	Industry	11 –50	Factory workers
Employer 9	Industry	0 –10	Factory workers
Employer 10	Industry	> 150	Factory workers/technicians
Employer 11	Construction	51 –100	Technicians
Employer 12	Service	51 –100	Gardeners
Employer 13	Service	> 150	Cleaners
Employer 14	Wholesale	> 150	Administrative and factory workers
Employer 15	Service	11 –50	Administrative and logistic workers
Employer 16	Agriculture	11 –50	Seasonal workers
Employer 17	Service	11 –50	Gardeners
Employer 18	Industry	51 –100	Factory workers
Employer 19	Service	11 –50	Administrative workers
Employer 20	Service	101 –150	Administrative and logistic workers
Employer 21	Service	101 –150	Cleaners
Employer 22	Service	> 150	Administrative and logistic workers

The interviews were carried out between September 2017 and June 2018 and lasted between 45 minutes and 2,5 hours. They were recorded and fully transcribed. Before the interviews, the respondents were briefed through email and in person on the overall objective of the research project, and they all provided their informed consent before participating. In each

interview, five main topics were covered: the way racio-ethnic diversity is managed in the organization; the way employers describe racio-ethnic diversity in the organisation; challenges and opportunities related to racio-ethnic diversity on the work floor; the effect of racio-ethnic diversity on relations in the organization; and the way employers understand and deal with prejudice and discrimination.

Analysis

The analysis involved a dialogue between insights that inductively emerged from the interviews and sensitizing concepts derived from the literature on whiteness and the theory of Bhabha on ambivalence. The first phase of the analysis focused on the different processes through which the employers were involved in the reproduction of whiteness, in which we focused on processes through which racio-ethnically othered workers remain in a location of disadvantage in relation to white actors ([Bhopal, 2023](#), [Owen, 2007](#)). Doing so, we identified the exploitation of racio-ethnically othered workers as cheap labour in jobs at the bottom of the stratified labour market that are no longer wanted by white employees, the exclusion of racio-ethnically othered workers from organizations and the demand of racio-ethnically workers to assimilate to white organizational norms.

Next, we explored employers' self-Other constructions involved in the processes through which whiteness is reproduced. This showed that this involved different, seemingly contradictory, constructions. We analysed this observation through the lens of [Bhabha's \(1994\)](#) idea that the colonized are at once an "object of desire and derision" ([Bhabha, 1994](#): 67), and of "fear and desire" ([Bhabha, 1994](#): 72). The exploitation of racio-ethnically othered workers as cheap labour involved constructions of otherness being an economic resource for the organization and employers as desiring this resource. Excluding or requiring otherness to assimilate to white norms involved two self-Other constructions. First, constructions of otherness as an object of derision by other white actors, and employers and employees as

being unable to address this derision. Second, constructions of otherness as forming threatening collectives, and employers as being potential victims of these threats. When analysing the use of these constructions in individual interviews, it became clear that employers often combined these constructions. While all employers constructed themselves as desiring otherness as an economic resource, they often combined this with the construction of otherness as derided and as threatening.

Next, we further focused on how employers constructed themselves as open while adopting these different positions and being involved in the connected reproduction of whiteness. When constructing themselves as desiring otherness as a resource, the willingness to use racio-ethnically othered workers as cheap labour becomes itself used as signifying openness. This self-construction is further reinforced through constructions of otherness as inferior, as disadvantaged by other employers and as loyal and grateful. Meanwhile, constructing otherness as an object of derision involved shifting the blame for the exclusion of otherness or the demand for it to assimilate onto white employees and clients. Constructing otherness involved forming threatening collectives, openness was maintained by shifting the blame onto racio-ethnically othered workers.

Reflections

Inspired by a postcolonial epistemology, this study is based on the assumption that knowledge is produced in a specific socio-political and historical context, emerges out of interactions between respondents and a specific researcher, and is shaped by the researcher's positionality and theoretical lens ([Holck and Muhr, 2021](#), [Liu, 2021](#)). In the following paragraphs we will therefore explicate and reflect on a number of elements that have shaped this research.

A first issue that needs to be acknowledged is that adopting the lens of whiteness has a number of implications for the way we approach our respondents. In line with this

perspective, we use the term white to refer to people occupying a location of structural privilege in a society where power and resources are distributed based on race and ethnicity ([Bhopal, 2023](#), [Owen, 2007](#)). Adopting this lens means acknowledging that respondents' approach to themselves and otherness is shaped by this position of privilege, which provides them with a particular perspective on the world. One of the potential consequences of being white in a system in which whiteness operates as an invisible norm, is not recognizing one's self as raced ([Owen, 2007](#)). Consequently, our respondents might not necessarily think of themselves as white. Nevertheless, we opted to label them as such. Not doing so would mean not making their location of privilege visible, which would contribute to reproducing the invisibility of whiteness and undercut this study's goal of exposing the operation of whiteness. Moreover, assuming that whiteness provides individuals with a specific perspective on the world means acknowledging that individuals' behaviours and attitudes concerning otherness cannot be simply seen as reflecting their 'personal views or intentions'. Rather, these are to some degree connected to the system in which they are embedded. When discussing our respondents, it is therefore not our intention to pass judgment on them as individuals, but rather to problematize the system of which they are part, and which informs, and becomes reproduced by, their actions and views.

Second, as we consider otherness to be a socially constructed phenomenon, we did not a priori define the groups that are considered as racio-ethnically othered workers. Rather, the aim of this paper is to understand how white employers construct otherness. This means that when we talk about racio-ethnically othered workers, we do not talk about a group with clear boundaries. Rather, it is the group that is defined by the respondents as being the Other. In this, they rarely made distinctions based on individuals' nationality or country of birth, which means that the group of racio-ethnically othered individuals included migrants as well as the Belgian-born children or grandchildren of migrants. Moreover, while this means that racio-

ethnically othered workers can also include European migrants, employers, in line with dominant discourses, mainly othered people of colour and those perceived to be Muslim ([Liu, 2021](#), [Paz and Kook, 2021](#)). More broadly, it should be noted that employers' constructions of otherness should not be read as 'objective' descriptions of reality. Just like we do not claim to be able to deduce the 'real' intentions of employers, it cannot be assumed that any description they give of (the behaviour of) racio-ethnically othered workers simply reflects reality. Rather, it should be read as ways in which employers make sense of their reality and legitimize their own behaviour.

Third, it is important to recognize how our own whiteness as researchers affected our research ([Jack and Westwood, 2006](#), [Liu, 2021](#)). It potentially helped our in-depth interviews with employers, as the first author, who conducted the interviews, was potentially recognized as 'the same'. This might have contributed to employers' willingness to more openly express their experiences and opinions on racio-ethnic otherness ([Holck & Muhr, 2021](#)). Nevertheless, reflecting the idea that white actors are incited to maintain an open and non-racist image, some interviewees expressed unease to discuss occurrences of racism and discrimination with the interviewer. Seemingly fearful to be judged, they often strongly emphasized how they are not racist and even seemed to ask for confirmation that this was not the case. The researcher and her professional attempt to be non-judgmental during the interview thereby potentially became understood by the interviewees as agreeing with their statements. To account for our own particular perspective to the subject matter, caused by our own positionality and the adopted theory, the first author engaged in continuous reflection with the co-authors as well as with fellow academics. While we do not believe this can ever lead to 'impartial' research, it did raise our conscious awareness of the effects of our choices on our research.

FINDINGS

In the next sections, we will introduce the three different self-Other constructions involved in employers' presentation of themselves as open while engaging in different processes of reproducing whiteness. In the first section, we will introduce the construction of openness while reproducing whiteness by using otherness as an economic resource. Further illustrations of this construction will also be offered in the second section, which introduces the two other self-Other constructions, order to highlight how employers combine these self-Other constructions.

Constructions of openness while using otherness as an economic resource

The first way in which employers construct themselves as open while reproducing whiteness is through a self-Other construction that involves presenting the desire to use racio-ethnically othered labour for the jobs at the lowest strata of the labour market as a sign of openness. Exemplary of this construction is the following statement of Employer 17, a male owner of a gardening company:

We try not to look at ethnic background anymore, to be open-minded. It does not interest us anymore. Everybody should get a chance, no matter their gender or nationality. We are open like that. [...] When they [othered workers] come to apply, we think: 'hooray, somebody who will stay.' We are happy when somebody like that comes to apply for a job because then we know they will stay on. [...] A normal Belgian, who has been to school until his 18th birthday and who starts here, well, maybe there is only one in ten who will still be here in a year. Employer 17 – male

In this excerpt, Employer 17 presents himself as an open employer as he is willing to give racio-ethnically othered workers a chance to work in dirty, low-paid and precarious jobs that 'normal Belgians' no longer want to do. He thereby constructs racio-ethnic otherness as a desirable economic resource that can benefit his organization, and presents the economic

necessity to employ racio-ethnically othered workers as a sign of his openness. He further highlights how this openness in turn is recognized by racio-ethnically othered workers, as they are willing to remain loyal to him.

Constructing racio-ethnically othered workers as loyal and grateful is not the only way through which employers construct themselves as open while using otherness as a desirable economic resource for the jobs at the lowest strata of the labour market. This also occurs through comparing themselves to other employers who in turn become constructed as not as open and even as disadvantaging racio-ethnically othered workers. Introducing a form of ambiguity within the construction of otherness as a desirable resource, employers also reproduce their openness by constructing racio-ethnically othered workers as a desirable resource, yet one that is inferior to white workers. The willingness to employ racio-ethnically othered workers, despite this supposed inferiority, thereby serves as a further sign of openness. In this way, employing ‘inferior’ racio-ethnically othered workers in jobs no longer wanted by white employees becomes constructed as saving them from their disadvantaged labour market position caused by other white employers’ discrimination, which is rewarded with loyalty and gratitude. The following statement of Employer 13, who owns an organisation that offers cleaning services, exemplifies a combination of these themes:

It’s extremely difficult to find people. I really noticed times have changed. [...] We are open, we have a very broad and open view on who is welcome here to work. We absolutely don’t mind other nationalities or cultures. It’s just, we don’t expect much from our employees to be honest. We lowered the bar. Basically: everybody who wants to work and is a bit motivated is welcome here. We offer them a chance. [...] There was a girl here yesterday from Eastern Europe. She really wanted to work, she really did her best. For eight months she was in Belgium and nobody wanted to help

her. You do it with such joy to help her then. Like that, we are different than other companies in the sector. Employer 13 – female

Employer 13 constructs her reliance on racio-ethnically othered workers in unfavourable jobs at the bottom of the stratified labour market as a sign of openness. She specifically constructs herself as saving othered workers, despite their constructed inferiority, from their disadvantaged position caused by less open employers.

Constructions of openness while excluding otherness or requiring it to assimilate

In this section, we introduce the other two self-Other constructions through which employers construct themselves as open while simultaneously excluding otherness or requiring it to assimilate to white norms. As these constructions are often combined with the previous self-Other construction of desiring otherness as an economic resource, we will also include further illustrations of this construction in the two subsections.

Openness through blaming white employees' and clients' derision

A first self-Other construction involved in white employers' presentation of themselves as open while excluding otherness or demanding its assimilation, involves constructing otherness as derided by white employees and clients and themselves as forced to accept this. In doing so, excluding otherness or demanding its assimilation is constructed as beyond their individual control, as employers present themselves as economically dependent on white employees and customers. Exemplary is Employer 3's statement, the owner of a gardening company:

In our sector, it is difficult to find employees. It is physically extremely hard work, very burdensome on the body. Due to the weather, it is not always pleasant work.

Because of that, it is easier for us to employ low-educated people. [...] We have our first foreigner working here. I employed him out of pity, you know. He wanted to work, but nowhere else he would get the chance because of this background. [...]

What is important is people who are presentable to the customers. People who speak Dutch well. They come into people's houses. [...] The first one [applicant] came from Eritrea or Morocco. [...] I am very sorry, but that is not going to work with the customers. Who will give their key to such a person? Mind you, I don't have prejudices, I trust him, but not everybody does. [...] No, our customers never say anything about it, but I'm certain that some of our biggest customers would have issues with it. Employer 3 – female

In this statement, Employer 3 ambiguously vacillates between constructing racio-ethnically othered workers as a desirable economic resource, and constructing them as a possible economic liability for her organisation. On the one hand, she articulates a desire to 'save' racio-ethnically othered workers by employing them in jobs for which she no longer finds white employees. On the other hand, she describes deliberately excluding othered workers. However, she presents this as the result of her white customers who deride otherness and who force her to exclude them for economic reasons, despite her openness.

Presenting themselves as open while reproducing whiteness through the exclusion of otherness or the demand for its assimilation can also involve the construction of being forced to do so by their white employees' derision of otherness. For example, Employer 3 further described the following:

The staff would have an issue with people from another culture. They really have prejudices, being quite racist and such. Future employees have to fit the group, you know. We are a small family company. Employer 3 – female

While in the previous quote, Employer 3 constructs herself as needing racio-ethnically othered workers for economic reasons, she simultaneously argues that she can only employ them if they are accepted by her ‘quite racist’ white employees. The exclusion of otherness or the demand for it to assimilate is thereby constructed not as the result of her own lack of openness, but blamed on her employees.

Analogously, in the following statement, Employer 21 emphasises how she considers herself forced, for economic reasons, to accommodate her customers’ derision of racio-ethnically othered employees:

I welcome everybody, but we are dependent on the customers who buy our services. [...] We have to show our product in a nice way, so that as many people as possible will buy it. I don’t want to offend anybody, because if my customers would be intimidated by a woman with a headscarf, then perhaps I would sell less. [...] In the end, our employees come into the houses of the clients. These clients then tell us: ‘I don’t want somebody with a brown skin, I don’t want a foreigner with a headscarf.’ – Employer 21, female

Comparing her employees to products to be sold, Employer 21 presents herself as open to all ‘products’, but as having no choice but to exclude certain racio-ethnically othered workers as these would not be ‘bought’ by certain white clients.

A similar construction is used when reproducing openness while expecting racio-ethnically othered workers to endure derisive remarks. This can be illustrated with the following statement of Employer 1, from an international chain store in consumer items:

I do believe you have to be open for it [othered workers]. You have to be an open employer. If you think everybody has to be of Belgian descent and be perfect, then you get stuck as an employer. [...] I now have Turkish and Moroccan girls, while I

also employed some Eastern European types. Of course, they will not speak perfect Dutch, but you have to be open to that. [...] We hear clients sometimes say: 'go back to your country', and 'go work for IS [Islamic State].' You hear that once in a while. [...] But we need all the customers we can get. [...] If the girls wear a headscarf, that is technically not forbidden. But we do specifically ask them, as these comments of clients will come, whether they can handle that. 'Do you think you are strong enough to handle such remarks?' [...] Depending on the areas where the shops are located, we sometimes change the girls. Employer 1 – female

Employer 1 describes herself as open to racio-ethnic otherness by stating how she is even willing to employ 'inferior' racio-ethnically othered workers in her organisation.

Simultaneously, she presents herself as forced, for the good of the organization, to accommodate her clients and take their potential derision into account when making personnel decisions.

Openness through blaming the threat of otherness

A second self-Other construction involved in white employers' presentation of themselves as open while excluding otherness or demanding its assimilation, involves presenting themselves as being 'forced' to do so because of the threat posed by collective forms of otherness.

Employers thereby present excluding othered workers or demanding them to assimilate to white organizational norms not as the result of their lack of openness, but rather as the result of the danger otherness itself poses to the organization. Exemplary is Employer 7's statement:

We are a very diverse and open organization. That is part of the organizational culture here. Now, I also have to be honest, of course, we also face the need to employ such people. [...] You always have to pay attention to the shops where a lot of Turkish people are working in a Turkish neighbourhood. That's for sure. Otherwise, they start

talking Turkish to each other. You need to manage that, to make clear that those things are not acceptable. For example, you see that then they start to reform that shop into a 'neighbourhood shop', where they give discounts to everybody. Employer 7 – male

In this example, Employer 7 constructs the desire to employ othered workers in hard-to-fill vacancies not wanted by white workers. However, when they have become employed, othered workers become presented as a potential threat that needs to be monitored more closely.

Specifically, they are constructed as potentially forming a collective that displays problematic behaviour because of its otherness, and that might collude against the employer's interests. As a result, he constructs himself as forced by their potentially threatening behaviour to suppress specific forms of otherness, for example prohibiting Turkish workers to speak Turkish.

Employers similarly maintain themselves as open while excluding othered workers or demanding them to assimilate by constructing themselves as facing the threat of racio-ethnically othered workers forming collectives that are less compliant. Exemplary of this is the statement by Employer 5 from a large retailer:

For me, you have to be open as an employer. [...] It is certainly not always easy to find people who want to work in a warehouse with changing hours. Therefore, we are happy to have this warehouse located here [the local region of the research]. Let's just say we are located in a region with a lot of second- and third-generation migrants.

They are still willing to roll up their sleeves, you know. [...] Many companies still try to pretend as if different nationalities do not exist. I think that's wrong. You have to take it as an added value, as an asset for your company. These differences are good.

You can take advantage of that as an organization. [...] I must say, we always employ the best candidates. But we also constantly monitor the presence and size of a certain nationality. Otherwise, there is always the risk that they take the upper hand, posing a

problem for the organisation. So, we make sure we have a mix of Italians, Turkish, Moroccans. Employer 5 – male

Employer 5 on the one hand constructs himself as open to employing racio-ethnically othered workers, as they are described as still willing to work hard. On the other hand, he also deliberately excludes racio-ethnically othered workers. However, he presents this as not in opposition to his openness by blaming the fact that racio-ethnically othered workers potentially form collectives that are less compliant. Employer 8 from a technology company, similarly linked collective otherness to resistance and blames racio-othered workers for forcing him to exclude them:

I would not let those prejudices be part of my decision, that's not me. In the selection of future employees, I do not let migration background be an issue. [...] We had the feeling that the amount of Turks increased in the company, from 3–4 employees to 10–12. In the past I did not feel there were groups present. But then suddenly, those people really started to stand together during breaks. Then they start to stick together and get stronger. They become more vocal, and they feel stronger. [...] Some of them [Turkish employees] had a temporary contract. The fact that they left, while we focused our hiring on more diverse people, solved the issue. Employer 8 – male

While Employer 8 highlights his openness to otherness, he feels the desired compliance of othered workers cannot be assured if they form a collective. In order to maintain his authority in the organization and avoid the formation of a threatening form of collective otherness, he presents himself as forced by their behavior to reduce the number of Turkish workers he employs.

This construction of openness can be further reproduced by constructing exclusion not only necessary to ensure compliance, but also to protect white employees. An example was given by Employer 18, the owner of the meat-processing factory:

For certain jobs, we specifically look for workers through an organization that helps ethnic minority workers find jobs. And they [othered workers] do their very best to stay on board in our company. Sometimes these are people with a lot of knowledge and experience, who start anew in a different country, and who are indeed overqualified for our jobs. They have difficulties with finding a job somewhere else, so they are happy. [...] Turks and Moroccans, that is a problem. [...] Because together, they feel strong and they start expressing that. Especially because we have women in our team and they don't accept anything from women at that point anymore. [...] Then you get a cultural problem. They don't accept your authority anymore. That is why we limit the amount of Turkish and Moroccan people in one team. Employer 18 – female

On the one hand, Employer 18 constructs racio-ethnically othered workers as desirable economic resources, as they are loyal and grateful, and willing to do the jobs white employees are no longer willing to do. On the other hand, she also deliberately excludes them. However, she presents this not as the result of her own lack of openness, but rather because their otherness causes workers to form threatening collectives. As she constructs these collectives of otherness to be less compliant and more resistant, especially to female employees, she presents herself as forced to prevent their emergence by deliberately excluding certain othered workers.

DISCUSSION

In order to add to our understanding of the everyday operation of whiteness in organizations, this study aimed to explore how employers navigate the ambivalences involved in maintaining an sense of open self while engaging in the reproduction of whiteness. To do so, we drew on Bhabha's theory on the ambivalences in self-Other dynamics in the colonial encounter and analysed interviews with white employers in Belgium. In the next section, we will further discuss the contributions of this research. We conclude by identifying a number of limitations that open up avenues for further research.

Conditional openness to otherness through vacillating between different self-Other constructions.

Inspired by the theoretical insights from [Bhabha \(1994\)](#) on the ambivalences inherent in the colonial encounter, this study adds to the knowledge on the everyday operation of whiteness in organizations by first identifying a number seemingly contradictory self-Other constructions through which white employers present themselves as open while engaging in different processes of reproducing whiteness. Further contributing to the existing knowledge, this study shows how white employers ambivalently vacillate between these different constructions. We propose that this vacillation enables the embrace of a form of condition openness to otherness. To unpack this idea and conceptualize the idea of conditional openness, we first offer a postcolonial reading of the three identified self-Other constructions between which white employers vacillate. Then, we will further discuss how the vacillation between these constructions implies a form of conditional openness.

This study identifies three self-Other constructions involved in white employers' construction of themselves as open while reproducing whiteness. The first one involves presenting themselves as open because they are willing to treat otherness as a desirable economic resource. Echoing constructions of colonizers as fatherly masters ([Bhabha, 1994](#)), this construction entails the reproduction of whiteness, as it involves the economic exploitation of

workers' disadvantaged position in the racio-ethnically stratified labour market ([Bhattacharyya, 2018](#), [Prasad, 2021](#)). In turn, this maintains racio-ethnically othered workers' disadvantaged position in relation to white workers, as it means employing them in jobs that white workers abandon for more privileged labour market positions. Nevertheless, white employers construct this as a sign of openness. Reflecting colonizers' construction of being a caring father to the colonized ([Bhabha, 1994](#)), they do so through presenting themselves as benevolently saving racio-ethnically othered workers from their disadvantaged position by employing them. In line with colonizers seeking recognition from the colonized that they are just ([Bhabha, 1994](#)), employers further reproduce their openness through the constructed loyalty and gratitude of othered workers, who are presented as happily accepting their position at the bottom of the stratified labour market.

The second identified self-Other construction involved in white employers' construction of themselves as open while reproducing whiteness, entails presenting themselves as open but forced to accommodate the derision of otherness by white organizational stakeholders (such as employees and clients). Echoing self-constructions of colonizers as powerless cogs in the colonial machine ([Bhabha, 1994](#), [Memmi, 2003](#)), it involves the reproduction of whiteness as it means employers accept and accommodate white actors' dominance over racio-ethnic workers. While this can result in white employers excluding otherness or demanding its assimilation, they maintain a construction of openness. Reflecting colonizers attempting to distance themselves from the injustices of the colonial system they are part of ([Bhabha, 1994](#), [Memmi, 2003](#)), they do so by presenting themselves as different from, yet forced to acquiesce to, white clients and employees who deride otherness.

The third identified self-Other construction involved in white employers' construction of themselves as open while reproducing whiteness, entails presenting themselves as open yet threatened by a collective form of otherness. Echoing constructions of colonizers as

constantly fearing a potential revolt by the colonized ([Bhabha, 1994](#)), this construction involves the reproduction of whiteness as it entails selectively racializing behaviour perceived as disruptive. This, in turn, results in judging and punishing othered workers as a collective for it ([Memmi, 2003](#)), and in white employers targeting racio-ethnically othered workers as a group with exclusion or demands for assimilation. While doing so, they maintain a construction of openness by constructing themselves as victims of their own openness and as forced to protect themselves and their employees from the threat posed by otherness itself ([Bhabha, 1994](#)), thereby presenting the reproduction of whiteness through assimilation or exclusion as economically or even morally justified.

Through its unpacking of the role of ambivalences in colonial relations, Bhabha's theory helps us understand how these seemingly contradictory self-Other constructions play a role in the reproduction of whiteness in a context in which societal norms promote diversity and condemn open discrimination ([Köllen, 2020](#), [Lansu et al., 2020](#), [Liu, 2017](#), [Mayorga-Gallo, 2019](#), [Swan, 2010a](#)). We propose that the vacillation between these seemingly contradictory constructions enables the embrace of a particular form of openness by white employers: conditional openness. In line with Bhabha's idea of the colonizer desiring a reformed form of otherness (1994), this conditional openness is an openness to a particular type of otherness. Specifically, it is openness that is conditional on otherness conforming to, and not disrupting, the system of organizational whiteness characterized by an intertwinement of economic inequality and racio-ethnic inequality ([Nkomo et al., 2019](#), [Prasad, 2021](#), [Romani et al., 2021](#)). Its conditionality therefore means that while employers desire otherness to occupy jobs at the bottom of the labour marker, they will exclude it and demand it to assimilate if it threatens the whiteness of the organization.

Reflecting the idea of white ignorance ([Mills, 2007](#), [Swan, 2010a](#)), employers maintain their own openness and justify this conditionality through vacillating between the identified self-

Other constructions. These imply fundamentally different ways in which racio-ethnically othered workers and white actors are racialized, economically valued, and approached. Specifically, while white employees and clients are constructed as core to the economic survival of the organization, racio-ethnically othered workers are presented as both a potential economic resource and a potential liability for the organization. While this liability is blamed on both white actors' derision and racio-othered workers' collective threat, employers construct their power over these two groups in the employment relation ([Romani et al., 2021](#)) as fundamentally different. Downplaying their power as employers in this economic relation with white employees, they present themselves as not only unable to reform their derisive behaviour, but even forced to seek their authorization of otherness. In this process, white actors do not become recognized as a collective benefitting from whiteness or blamed as a collective for the derision of otherness ([Bhopal, 2023](#)), but viewed as individuals and as raceless, and thereby 'normal', workers and clients. As they already conform to whiteness, white employees and other white organizational stakeholders can therefore simply expect to be treated with openness by employers.

By contrast, when dealing with racio-ethnically othered workers, employers present themselves as occupying a powerful position in the employment relation ([Romani et al., 2021](#)), and as able to govern them as resources, to demand them to reform or to exclude them if this is deemed necessary. This exclusion or demand to assimilate is not only constructed as necessary when otherness lacks authorization by white actors, but also when it becomes seen as less economically exploitable because it forms a threatening racialized collective.

Reflecting the role of the imposition and selective enforcement of specific moral frameworks by colonizers to maintain colonial power ([Bhabha, 1994](#); [Fanon, 1952](#); [Said, 1968](#)), white employers thereby assume the privilege to unequally respond to behaviour they perceive as problematic or morally wrong. Actions by racio-ethnically othered workers considered as

wrong or disruptive, either by employers or other white actors, can legitimize collective punishments through the use of racio-ethnic exclusion. By contrast, behaviour by white actors considered by white employers to be wrong becomes normalized and requires acceptance rather than punishment. Together, this indicates that white employers' conditional openness to an otherness that conforms to, and not disrupt, the system of organizational whiteness involves openness to an individualized form of otherness that is authorized by white actors and that can be economically exploited in the most disadvantaged labour market positions.

Limitations and future research

First, while this paper paid less attention to the intersection between racio-ethnic identities and other social identities, studies on whiteness could benefit from adopting an intersectional lens ([Chrobot-Mason et al., 2020](#)). A focus on differences between white employers' constructions of different racio-ethnic groups might also allow for a further historicization and contextualization of the reproduction of whiteness. Second, while this research exposes the everyday work by employers of reproducing whiteness, future research is needed on how different societal and organizational policies, as well as how different actors, both inside and outside of organizations, can contribute to disrupting the reproduction of whiteness. Third, while this paper highlighted the importance of ambivalences in the reproduction of whiteness, Bhabha's theory also highlights how they open up opportunities for the colonized to resist colonial power ([Bhabha, 1994](#), [Frenkel, 2008](#), [Wettermark and Berglund, 2022](#), [Yousfi, 2014](#)). While white employers' construction of collective forms of otherness as a threat highlights the possibility of resistance by othered workers, our research mainly shows how this resistance is defused by white employers. Future research should further explore how white employers' ambivalent self-Other constructions can open up potential avenues for racio-ethnically othered workers' resistance and disruption of whiteness. However, we also hope this study's use of Bhabha's theories to study white employers inspires future research

to further draw on it to understand the role of ambivalences in the operations of whiteness, in the manifestations of white privilege, in contemporary expressions of discrimination by actors considering themselves as open to otherness, and in the reproduction of racio-ethnic inequalities in workplaces aiming to be inclusive.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, S., & Swan, E. (2006). Doing diversity. *Policy futures in Education*, 4(2), 96–100. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2006.4.2.96>
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Bhattacharyya, G. (2018). *Rethinking racial capitalism: Questions of reproduction and survival*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bhopal, K. (2023). Critical Race Theory: Confronting, Challenging, and Rethinking White Privilege. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 49, 111–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-031021-123710>
- Bousetta, H., & Jacobs, D. (2006). Multiculturalism, citizenship and Islam in problematic encounters in Belgium. In T. Modood, A. Triandafyllidou, & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds.), *Multiculturalism, Muslims and citizenship* (pp. 23–36). Routledge.
- Boussebaa, M., Sinha, S., & Gabriel, Y. (2014). Englishization in offshore call centers: A

postcolonial perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(9), 1152–1169.

<https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.25>

Chrobot-Mason, D., Campbell, K., & Vason, T. (2020). *Whiteness in Organizations: From White Supremacy to Allyship*. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*, 31. Oxford University Press. <<https://oxfordre.com/business/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.001.0001/acrefore-9780190224851-e-195>> .

Crevani, L. (2019). Privilege in place: How organisational practices contribute to meshing privilege in place. Article 101049 *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 35(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2018.09.002>.

Dar, S. (2014). Hybrid accountabilities: When western and non-western accountabilities collide. *Human Relations*, 67(2), 131–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713479620>

Dar, S., & Ibrahim, Y. (2018). The Blackened body and White governmentality: Managing the UK academy and the production of shame. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 26(9), 1241–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12395>

Demart, S. (2013). Congolese migration to Belgium and postcolonial perspectives.

African Diaspora, 6(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18725457-12341239>

Fanon, F. (1952). 2008. *Black skin, white mask*. New York: Grove Press.

Frenkel, M. (2008). The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 924–942.

Ghorashi, H., & Sabelis, I. (2013). Juggling difference and sameness: Rethinking strategies for diversity in organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 29(1), 78–86.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2012.11.002>

Harder, R., Temmerman, M., & Coesemans, R. (2019). Berichten in het grensgebied tussen opinie en haat: Een analyse van de communicatie van Vlaamse politieke accounts op sociale media. Unia.

Holck, L., & Muhr, S. L. (2021). White bodies in postcolonial ethnographic research. In S. N. Open, A. Risberg, & F. Villes`eche (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Organizational Diversity Research Methods* (pp. 36–50). Routledge.

Jack, G. (2015). Advancing postcolonial approaches in critical diversity studies. In R. Bendl, I. Bleijenberg, E. Henttonen, & A. J. Mills (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity in Organizations* (pp. 153–174). Oxford University Press.

Jack, G., & Westwood, R. (2006). Manifesto for a postcolonial international business and management studies: a provocation. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 3(3), 42–63. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17422040710775021>

Kagn`e, B., & Martiniello, M. (2001). L`immigration subsaharienne en Belgique. *Courrier Hebdomadaire Délután CRISP*, 1721(16), 5–49.

Kalonaityte, V. (2010). The case of vanishing borders: Theorizing diversity management as internal border control. *Organization*, 17(1), 31–52

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508409350238>

Köllen, T. (2020). Worshipping equality as organizational idolatry? A Nietzschean view of the normative foundations of the diversity management paradigm *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 36(2), Article 101108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2020.101108>.

Kornau, A., Knappert, L., & Erdur, D. A. (2021). Advertising, avoiding, disrupting, and tabooing: The discursive construction of diversity subjects in the Turkish context

Scandinavian Journal of Management, 37(2), Article 101151.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2021.101151>.

Lansu, M., Bleijenbergh, I., & Benschop, Y. (2020). Open talking? Middle managers negotiating problem ownership in gender equality interventions *Scandinavian Journal of*

Management, 36(2), Article 101110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2020.101110>.

Lô, A., & Fatien Diochon. (2019). Unsilencing power dynamics within third spaces. The case of Renault's Fab Lab *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 35(2), Article 101039.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2018.11.003>.

Leyerzapf, H., Verdonk, P., Ghorashi, H., & Abma, T. A. (2018). We are all so different that it is open normal." Normalization practices in an academic hospital in the Netherlands.

Scandinavian Journal of Management, 34(2), 141–150.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2018.03.003>

Liu, H. (2017). Beneath the white gaze: Strategic self-orientalism among Chinese Australians.

Human Relations, 70(7), 781–804. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726716676323>

Liu, H. (2021). Diversity beyond whiteness: The possibilities for anti-racist diversity research.

In S. N. Open, A. Risberg, & F. Villes`eche (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to*

Organizational Diversity Research Methods (pp. 24–36). Routledge.

Liu, H., & Baker, C. (2014). White knights: leadership as the heroicisation of whiteness.

Leadership, 12(4), 420–448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715014565127>

Mayorga-Gallo, S. (2019). The white-centering logic of diversity ideology. *American*

Behavioral Scientist, 63(13), 1789–1809. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642198426>

Memmi, A. (2003). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Earthscan.

Mills, C. W. (2007). White Ignorance. Pp. 13-38. In S. Sullivan, & N. Tuana (Eds.), *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance* (pp. 13–38). State University of New York Press.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2006). Towards a new research agenda? Foucault, whiteness and indigenous sovereignty. *Journal of Sociology*, 42(4), 383–395.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783306069995>

Nkomo, S. M. (2009). The sociology of race: The contributions of W.E.B. Du Bois. In

P. Adler (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Sociology and Organization Studies: Classical Foundations* (pp. 375–398). Oxford University Press.

Nkomo, S. M., & Al Ariss, A. (2014). The historical origins of ethnic (white) privilege in US organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(4), 389–404.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2012-0178>

Nkomo, S. M., Bell, M. P., Roberts, L. M., Joshi, A., & Thatcher, S. M. B. (2019). Diversity at a critical juncture: New theories for a complex phenomenon. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(3), 498–517. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2019.0103>

Noppe, J., Vanweddigen, M., Doyen, G., Stuyck, K., Feys, Y., & Buysschaert, P. (2018). Vlaamse Migratie- en Integratiemonitor 2018. Agentschap Binnenlands Bestuur.

Owen, D. S. (2007). Towards a critical theory of whiteness. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 33(2), 203–222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453707074139>

Paz, A., & Kook, R. (2021). It reminds me that I still exist'. Critical thoughts on intersectionality; refugee Muslim women in Berlin and the meanings of the hijab. *Journal of*

Ethnic and Migration Studies, 47(13), 2979–2996.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1757417>

Prasad, P. (2021). True colors of global economy: In the shadows of racialized capitalism.

Organization, 30(5), 1113–1129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084211066803>

Romani, L., Zanoni, P., & Holck, L. (2021). Radicalizing diversity (research): Time to resume talking about class. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 28(1), 8–23.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12593>

Said, E. (1968). *Orientalism*. Penguin books.

Somers, B. (2021, December 20). De woke-filosofie maakt samenleven onmogelijk. De

Standaard. https://www.standaard.be/cnt/dmf20211219_97911514.

Swan, E. (2010a). States of white ignorance, and audit masculinity in English higher education. *Social Politics*, 17(4), 477–506. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxq016>

Swan, E. (2010b). Commodity diversity: Smiling faces as a strategy of containment.

Organization, 17(1), 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135050840935004>

Swan, E. (2016). Diversity studies: The contribution of Black philosophers. In R. Mir, H.

Willmott, & M. Greenwood (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy in Organization Studies* (pp. 370–378). Routledge.

Twine, F. W., & Gallagher, C. (2008). The future of whiteness: A map of the ‘third wave.

Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31(1), 4–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701538836>

Unia, & FOD WASO (2022). Socio-economische Monitoring. Unia & FOD

Werkgelegenheid, Arbeid en Sociaal Overleg.

Verbeeck, G. (2020). Legacies of an imperial past in a small nation. Patterns of

postcolonialism in Belgium. *European Politics and Society*, 21(3), 292–306. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1080/23745118.2019.1645422)

doi.org/10.1080/23745118.2019.1645422

Wettermark, A., & Berglund, K. (2022). Mutuality between selves and others in social entrepreneurship: Not a mission impossible? *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 38(3), 101219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2022.101219>.

Yousfi, H. (2014). Rethinking hybridity in postcolonial contexts: What changes and what persists? The Tunisian case of Poulina's managers. *Organization Studies*, 35(3), 393–421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613499751>