The Im-/Possibility of Hybrid Inclusion

Disrupting the 'Happy Inclusion' Story with the Case of the Greenlandic Police Force

Dobusch, Laura; Holck, Lotte; Muhr, Sara Louise

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript

Published in:
Organization

DOI:
10.1177/1350508420973310

Publication date:
2021

License
Unspecified

Citation for published version (APA):
Dobusch, L., Holck, L., & Muhr, S. L. (2021). The Im-/Possibility of Hybrid Inclusion: Disrupting the 'Happy Inclusion' Story with the Case of the Greenlandic Police Force. *Organization*, *28*(2), 311-333. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420973310

The im-/possibility of hybrid inclusion: Disrupting the 'happy inclusion' story with the case of the Greenlandic Police Force

Abstract

The notion of uniqueness, as articulated at the centre of most organizational inclusion literature, is inextricably tied to Western-centric idea(l)s of the autonomous, individual and self-sufficient subject stripped off historical inequalities and relational embeddedness. Following a critical inclusion agenda and seeking alternatives to this predominant view, we apply a Bhabhaian postcolonial lens to the empirical study oforganizational efforts aiming at including indigenous Kalaallit people in the Greenlandic Police Force. Greenland has home rule, but is still part of the Kingdom of Denmark, which has also authority over defence policy, including the police force. With Bhabha's notion of mimicry, we explore how officers, through performing 'Danish' (Western) culture and professionalism, both confirm and resist colonial stereotypes and even open up pathways towards fundamental hybridity. Building on the officers' experiences we introduce the term of 'hybrid inclusion' by which we emphasize two interrelated dimensions necessary for advancing critical inclusion studies: first, a certain understanding of the to-be-included subject that simultaneously acknowledges the fluidity and emergence of ontologically singular identity constructions and, on the other hand, the relational embeddedness of these identity constructions in a collective colonial past and present; second, a certain practical signpost that emphasizes that organizing for inclusivity means to address and work with the actual impossibility of a 'happy inclusion' story free of contradictions and conflicts.

Key words: Exclusion, Greenland, Homi Bhabha, hybridity, inclusion, mimicry, postcolonial theory, stereotype

Introduction

In organization studies, postcolonial research has shown how the historical colonial rule of the West'[1] is carried forward into present-day organizational life by a Western-centric and neocolonial domination of politics, economics and culture, which organizes people along racialized hierarchies in jobs, professions and organizations (e.g. Alcadipani et al., 2012; Banerjee and Linstead, 2001; Jack et al., 2011; Khan and Khosul, 2011; Mir and Mir, 2012; Nkomo, 2011; Srinivas, 2012). This othering has led to systematic biases in favour of those who seem to effortlessly fit the Western norms (e.g. Essers and Benschop, 2009; Mir and Mir, 2012; Prasad, 2003; Van Laer and Janssens, 2014; Zanoni and Janssens, 2007), while it has resulted in marginalization and exclusion from positions of power in societies and their organizations for those who are perceived as 'Non-Western' (see Césaire, 1955/1972; Fanon, 1952/2008; Mohanty, 1984; Huddart, 2006; Spivak, 1985). As a result, immigrants in Western countries (e.g. Ashley, 2016; Essers and Benshop, 2009; Muhr and Salem, 2013; Thomson and Jones, 2015), indigenous populations (e.g. Banerjee, 2003, 2011; Lammers, 2003) as well as peoples from the East and Global South (e.g. Boussebaa et al., 2014; Dar, 2018; Kothiyal et al., 2018; McKenna, 2011; Siltaoja et al., 2019; Yousfi, 2014) continuously struggle for inclusion within Western organizations and for obtaining positions of power on equal terms with people who more easily comply with Western (white) norms (Ahmed, 2004, 2007).

Against this background, at first sight it seems surprising that the currently growing field of organizational inclusion studies (Ferdman and Deane, 2014; Oswick and Noon, 2014), with its focus on how to build genuinely diversity-friendly organizations, has not yet touched the 'postcolonial question' (see for instance Shore et al., 2018) in a similar way as for example critical diversity management studies (see e.g. Holck and Muhr, 2019; Jack, 2015; Kaasila-

[1] Here, we purposefully reproduce the dichotomy West/East and Western/Non-Western as it is often used in Management and Organization Theory (e.g., Banerjee and Linstead, 2001; Jack et al., 2011). This dichotomy does not necessarily refer to 'Western' as a geographical term since the USA, for example, are classified as 'Western', whereas several countries in South America are not. Rather, the distinction between Western/non-Western countries relies on a white/non-white or an assumed 'civilized'/'non-civilized' dichotomy than a geographical one. The West/East distinction, albeit analytically necessary, is not unproblematic and can best be thought of as what Spivak (1993) called 'strategic essentialism'.

Pakanen, 2015; Kalonaityte, 2010; Prasad, 2006). However, at second glance it becomes apparent that organizational inclusion research first and foremost approaches differences in terms of individual uniqueness (Shore et al., 2011), viewing the relationship between minority and majority employees as potentially beneficial – and thus reconcilable – for organizational goal achievement (Ferdman and Deane, 2014; for critical accounts see Janssens and Steyaert, 2019a; Tyler, 2019). Consequently, a postcolonial approach to organizational inclusion, which problematizes the hierarchical cultural demarcations implicit in minority/majority constructions, where the (inferior) minority is to be included into the (superior) majority, seems not to fit with the 'happy inclusion' story.

However, we argue that when organizational inclusion efforts do not acknowledge existing inequalities and power imbalances tied to minority/majority constructions, they hold very little potential to level the organizational playing field for historically disadvantaged and marginalized groups (Holck and Muhr, 2017; Holvino and Kamp, 2009; Muhr and Salem, 2013; Tatli, 2011; Özbilgin and Tatli, 2011). In fact, such efforts may even complicate the struggle for recognition and redistribution of these groups, because they are more or less complicit with the structural asymmetries between the 'included' (colonized) and the 'includer' (colonizer) (Prasad, 2006).

As stated in the call for papers for this special issue, there is a need for both showing the limitations of 'innocent' inclusion concepts and at the same time venturing into "more complex and critical ways of theorising inclusion". We take up this challenge by investigating the effects, limits and potential of the efforts made to better include indigenous Kalaallit people in the Greenlandic Police Force. The Greenlandic Police Force is a particularly interesting case for studying and (re-)conceptualizing organizational inclusion as Greenland (Kalaallit Nunaat in Greenlandic) is officially classified as an autonomous constituent country within the Kingdom of Denmark, but at the same time highly affected by its colonial history and complex

relationship with Denmark to date. In 2008 the majority of the Greenlandic people voted for more autonomy from Denmark. Nonetheless, Denmark still contributes an annual block grant to Greenland, which amounts to approximately half of Greenland's national budget. Denmark also retains authority over foreign and defence policy as well as the military and police force. The continued Danish neocolonial presence in Greenland comes with a political and organisational responsibility for diversity and inclusion, where particularly leaders of the public organizations, such as the police force, have to think of ways to better include the indigenous Kalaalit in public office.

By looking at the 'extreme case' of the Greenlandic Police Force with its colonial history that manifests itself in the ongoing reproduction of highly dichotomous group differences of 'Greenlandic' and 'Danish' police officers, we not only introduce the 'postcolonial question' to the organizational inclusion literature, but also become equipped to challenge 'innocent' core assumptions underlying current conceptualizations of organizational inclusion. In particular, we build on Homi Bhabha's (1990, 1994, 1996) seminal work on stereotype, mimicry and hybridity in order to make sense of the current inclusion-exclusion configuration characteristic of the Greenlandic Police Force. Through Bhabha's notion of stereotype we investigate the neocolonial power dynamics and micro level politics of exclusion of Kalaalit in the Greenlandic Police Force. With the notion of mimicry, we explore how officers, through performing 'Danish' (Western) culture and professionalism, both confirm and resist colonial stereotypes. Subsequently, we illustrate how enactments of mimicry open a pathway towards experiences of fundamental hybridity, which complicate – disrupt? – the neocolonial hierarchy of binary identity constructions.

Inspired by the force of hybridity – in terms of challenging gridlocked and hierarchical minority/majority constructions – we were wondering whether it is possible to conceptualize and practice organizational inclusion efforts that not only allow for but even evoke subject

positions void of any kind of (assumed) essence and fixation. Thereby it could be avoided to perpetuate an asymmetrical includer-included relationship that in itself undermines organizational inclusion efforts from the start. However, this represents a tricky – if not impossible endeavour – as Bhabha's whole theoretical thinking questions any kind of single cultural authority, fixed identities and unambiguous meaning/stories, while organizational inclusion efforts tend to do the exact opposite: assign responsibility for activities labelled as 'inclusive', construct and measure groups 'to-be-included' as well as explicitly streamline their approach. As a consequence, we coined the term 'hybrid inclusion' – not with the purpose of reconciling organizational inclusion efforts and the Bhabhaian postcolonial framework, but rather with the motive of acknowledging the actual impossibility of a 'happy inclusion' story free of contradictions and conflicts.

Organizational inclusion studies: Deconstructing the 'innocence' of the unique individual

Initially driven by practitioners in US companies, a discursive shift from diversity (management) to inclusion is currently redefining practices and research regarding human differences and related inequalities at the workplace (Oswick and Noon, 2014). This shift acknowledges growing concerns that certain diversity management approaches do not actually promote a diverse workforce (Dobbin and Kalev, 2016; Nishii et al., 2018) and frequently lead to non-intended side effects such as stigmatization and exoticization of minority members as well as resistance among majority members (e.g. Dobusch, 2017; Friedman and Davidson, 2001; Zanoni and Janssens, 2004; Romani et al., 2019). Hence, it is rooted in the desire to "close the gap between the promise of diversity and the current ability (…) to leverage the advantages of diversity" (Nkomo, 2014: 584-585). The centring of inclusion raises the demands on what this notion is supposed to achieve: scholars define inclusion as a "general principle that permeates an organization's practices, norms, and operational function" (Nishii and Rich, 2014:

331), as the attempt to build "an organization environment that is experienced as inclusionary by all employees" (Shore et al., 2018: 181), and as the need for "creating a 'new normal'" (Nkomo 2014: 585) that breaks with taken for granted, most likely exclusionary, assumptions underlying everyday organizational practices.

However, empirical studies on organizational inclusion (for a recent overview, see Shore et al., 2018) reveal a discrepancy between aspiration and reality (of operationalization): Structural changes of the organization that might make it more inclusive of different needs, preferences and more receptive to experiences of discrimination and exclusion are neglected in favour of what Janssens and Steyaert (2019a) describe as an "individualist ontological stance". This implies that both the measurement of inclusion (and exclusion) in organizations and the design of connected 'inclusion initiatives' revolve around individual organizational members and their perceptions, mental structures and biases (Janssens and Steyaert, 2019a). Consequently, the individual becomes the locus for organizational change, neglecting the role of organizations, in their capacity as historically developed inequality regimes (Acker, 2006; Frenkel and Stenhav, 2006; Özkazanç-Pan, 2008; Srinivas, 2012).

The implicit privileging of the individualized subject is particularly apparent in Shore et al.'s (2011) inclusion framework, which has become the canonical basis for conceptualizing organizational inclusion. Shore and colleagues understand inclusion as the balance between the needs of belongingness and uniqueness, belongingness being defined as the "need to form and maintain strong, stable interpersonal relationships" (p. 1264) and uniqueness as the "need to maintain a distinctive and differentiated sense of self" (p. 1264). The assumption is that 'true inclusion' is possible when organizational members are both able to experience belongingness and to preserve their uniqueness. Further, Shore et al. (2011: 1265) connect the preservation of one's uniqueness explicitly to organizational benefits: "[U]niqueness will provide opportunities

for improved group performance when a unique individual is an accepted member of the group and the group values the particular unique characteristic".

The conjunction of a person's uniqueness with organizational benefits reveals the *conditional* character of this approach to inclusion: It "remains conditional upon (...) adding something deemed to be of value (…). Arguably, this means simply replicating rather than tackling hierarchies of recognition in the name of 'inclusion'" (Tyler, 2019: 63). Further, such a conceptualization of organizational inclusion is not only limited by its condition of (economic) exploitability, but more generally by its onto-epistemological assumptions. Building on optimal distinctiveness theory (ODT), Shore et al. (2011: 1266) describe the manifestation of one's uniqueness first and foremost as certain "perspectives, knowledge, or information". This does not exclude social identities, based on gender, or race/ethnicity, which are deemed relevant, for instance, when organizational members (need to) downplay or emphasize parts of their identity in view of threats towards their belongingness or uniqueness (Shore et al., 2011). However, social identity becomes subsumed under individual uniqueness as part of what constitutes the individual's unique offer to the organization.

It maintains the individual as the core unit of action, engaging rationally and self-sufficiently with their identity construction, and assumes that the benefits of collaboration between unique individuals can be objectively assessed as the accumulated and unambiguous benefits of their different perspectives and capacities. Consequently, such an understanding of uniqueness neglects gender or race/ethnicity in terms of historically developed, persistent inequality *relations*, which stems from the systematic preference for and simultaneous devaluation of certain group memberships and/or hierarchical minority/majority constructions (e.g. Kothiyal et al., 2018; Muhr and Salem, 2013; Siltaoja et al., 2019; Srinivas, 2012). However, these inequality relations infuse all forms of work organizing (Acker, 2006; Ashcraft, 2013),

underpinning hegemonic differentiations between desirable peculiarities that are to be valued as 'unique' and traits assessed as 'improperly deviant' that must be rejected (Dobusch, 2015).

In a nutshell, while the emergence of organizational inclusion research is framed as 'finally, really' engaging with structural forms of exclusion in the workplace and offering inclusion approaches that appropriately address these structures, the practice of such research paints a different picture. The reliance on uniqueness as a 'harmless' and universally applicable characteristic of every organizational member underestimates supraindividual, historically solidified inequality relations. By ignoring that the "Western concept of the person as a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational and integrated universe (…) [represents] a rather peculiar idea within the context of the world's cultures" (Geertz, 1984: 126), inclusion research risks perpetuating exclusionary notions of the 'ideal worker' (see e.g. Banerjee, 2011; Banerjee and Linstead, 2001; Jack et al., 2011). Therefore, we argue that the Western ideal of the 'unique organizational member', combined with the imperative of economic benefit embedded in organizational inclusion concepts, does not contain the potential to level the organizational playing field for historically disadvantaged or marginalized groups. In fact, their struggle for recognition and redistribution might be complicated, perhaps even obstructed, by an inclusion rhetoric that claims to be 'all-embracing', but is actually complicit with power relations already in place (Ahmed, 2012; Prasad, 2006).

Seeking to avoid the pitfalls of exclusion by universal individualism, we turn to the work of Homi K. Bhabha (1990, 1994, 1996), in particular his notions of stereotype, mimicry and hybridity. As we will see, Bhabha undermines any claims to pure or authentic cultural identities and instead emphasizes that subjectivities are both inextricably bound to and enabled through the Other (see also Kaasila-Pakanen, 2015). Thereby the individual actor, who is at the core of most current inclusion studies becomes decentred, and the relationship between the self and the Other, between minority and majority groups, gains importance.

On stereotype, mimicry, hybridity and the idea of third spaces

Bhabha begins from a break with essentialist and monolithic understandings of culture, in particular national culture, in which people's identities and behaviours are directly and causally associated with their country of origin. Instead, he emphasizes the performative element of culture: Colonial stereotypes and neocolonial power structures not only shape people's behaviours, but also their perception of (separate) cultures. That is, the essentialist and monolithic understanding of culture is upheld by its perpetual, often unconscious, performance. Consequently, as Bhabha shows, when inclusion attempts take place in an already established (colonial) inequality regime, the "cultural comparativism" often resembles "acts of assimilation" (Bhabha, 1994: 7). Thus, Bhabha's cultural critique exposes a flaw at the very foundation of much traditional normative inclusion theory: if the uniqueness that people need to keep/reclaim/enact in order to feel included is, in fact, rooted in a structural imbalance of power, inclusion attempts in terms of creating equal footing will inevitably fail.

Bhabha, however, not only exposes how colonial inequality regimes are constructed and maintained through stereotyping. With his concepts of mimicry and hybridity, he also demonstrates the disruptive potential inherent in these very constructions and indicates how cracks and openings in the colonial discourse can enable what he defines as a third space: a first and foremost *imaginative* place stripped of essentialist identity constructions and hierarchical includer-included relationships

Stereotype

In theorizing colonial stereotypes, Bhabha begins from Said's (1978) seminal analysis of colonial discourse in which the East is constructed as primitive, superstitious, mystic, sexual,

animalistic, etc., whereas the West is constructed as progressive, rational, professional, civilized, advanced etc. The foundational divisions of this colonial discourse, Bhabha (1994) suggests, lead to a form of governmentality that interpellates people into the subject positions of either colonizer or colonized.

The colonial stereotypes provide order and structure to otherwise complex experiences, assigning everyone a fixed position in a recognizable totality. Thus, stereotypes are central elements of a system of representation that comes to operate like a 'regime of truth'. As such, stereotypes are tools of power; they uphold the privileged position of the colonizer. Maintaining the colonial order, then, requires a continual and repetitive chain of stereotypical signification: "The (…) *same old* stories (…) *must* be told (compulsively) again and again, and are differently gratifying and terrifying each time" (Bhabha, 1994: 111; emphasis in original). Thus, stereotypes are fuelled by – and add fuel to – the human fascination with stories; stories that, when told and re-told over and over again, become lived as *the* Truth. That is, stereotypes are core aspects of the performative construction of culture.

However, while stereotypes are presumed to embody collectives, no actual human body performs them fully and perfectly. The relationship between the stereotype and that which it is assumed to represent, therefore, is complex and contingent:

> The stereotype is not a simplification because it is a false representation of a given reality. It is a simplification because it is an arrested, fixated form of *representation* that, in denying the play of difference (which the negation through the Other permits), constitutes a problem for the representation of the subject … (Bhabha, 1994: 75; emphasis in original)

The 'denial of the play of difference', the inability of stereotypes to capture variations within groups of people, is what makes them problematic. However, despite the omnipresence of these stereotypes, the subjects of both colonizer and colonized are never unitary and stable, but

always discursively constituted in and through "a repertoire of conflictual positions" (Bhabha, 1994: 111). Performing a position that (should) reflect(s) a historically produced stereotype is always contested, as it is "the site of both fixity and fantasy" (*ibid.*). On the one hand, the colonial stereotype of the primitive and irrational Other stabilizes the power hierarchy of colonizer-colonized; on the other hand, the contestation of the stereotype exposes it as a colonial fantasy, as the product of the very power hierarchy it serves to maintain.

In sum, 'knowing' a population in stereotypical terms based on essentialist and static notions of culture that 'lock' people into dichotomous positions allows for discriminatory and authoritarian forms of political control. However, it is the insistence on such – fantasmatic – stereotypes that, by their very simplification and misrecognition, opens up spaces for ridicule and resistance. As stereotypes are socio-historical constructions, they are necessarily open to subversion and transformation. That is, they are open to the creative force of mimicry.

Mimicry

Seeking to become part of more powerful groups of society by breaking with the stereotype of the inferior Other and living up to the fantasmatic Western ideal of professionalism and civilization, (former) colonized people have engaged more or less voluntarily in 'copying' Western ways of being (powerfully shown by Fanon, 1952/2008). However, as argued by Fanon (1952/2008), Césaire (1955/1972) and in subsequent organisation studies (Boussebaa et al., 2014; Frenkel, 2008; Kothiyal et al., 2018; Siltaoja et al., 2018; Yousfi, 2014), the colonial stereotype is tied to the racialized body, thus limiting the scope of imitation. Colonial stereotypes are tied to e.g. 'Indian', 'African' or, as is the topic of our empirical analysis, 'Greenlandic' racialized bodily markers, meaning that no matter how successfully (former) colonized subjects learn Western language, habits and culture, they are not fully accepted (included) into the group of (former) colonizers.

Bhabha coins his notion of mimicry around this 'similarity with a difference':

> (…) colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost same, but not quite*. Which is to say that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. (Bhabha, 1994: 86; emphasis in original)

The ambivalence of mimicry stems from the inherent contradiction between the persistence of the colonial stereotypes and the colonizer's desire for the Other to mimic the perceived superior behaviour; the colonized is at once locked in the inferior position and encouraged to supersede it. The attempt to mimic the colonizer implies that the colonized adopts the norms of what is perceived as rational and professional behaviour. At the same time, the power distance is reproduced by upholding dichotomous stereotypes: If the Other became the Same, the order that sustains hierarchies of power would collapse. Thus, stereotypes must be (implicitly) sustained even as one (explicitly) seeks to transgress them.

Bhabha's point is not only to criticize such 'failed mimicry' as a foil for the maintenance of 'Western supremacy', but also to emphasize the potential for resistance and change that emerges in the very cracks produced by this 'almost but not quite' imitation. The resistant potential of mimicry revolves around this very *ambivalence*: the impossibility of the exact mimic, wherefore it must continually re-produce the stereotype and its connected slippage, simultaneously exposing – maybe even reinforcing – the cracks between and within the Other and the Same.

Ultimately, mimicry results in exposing the *lack* of a foundational original underpinning colonial stereotypes. There is no 'real' or 'true' presence or identity behind cultural performance, there is neither a 'real' colonizer nor colonized before colonization. Both colonizers and colonized mimic the colonial 'ideal' in their performance of it, and there is no

fixity to either position. Rather, the positions are established and maintained in and through their relationality: "The menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (Bhabha, 1994: 126). That is, mimicry falsifies colonialism's dichotomous foundations, suggesting hybridity as an empirically more appropriate and also normatively desirable explanation, one that builds on the dynamic relationality of identity construction.

Hybridity and the possibility of third spaces

Bhabha uses the concept of hybridity to capture the fluid and emergent elements of culture, showing how the subject is always constructed through a variety of possible conflicting cultural influences:

> [T]he subject – is itself always ambivalent, because of the intervention of … otherness. But the importance of hybridity is that it bears the traces of those feelings and practices which inform it, just like a translation, so that hybridity puts together the traces of certain other meanings or discourses. (Bhabha, 1990: 211)

Importantly, Bhabha argues that cultures were not stable before colonization, but have always been unstable, fluid and becoming. In this view, colonial stereotypes represent but one contingent and temporary, albeit powerful, fixation of certain subject positions in asymmetrical relations of power and dominance vis-à-vis one another. Exposing relationality – the interconnectedness, rather than the separateness of cultural subject positions – is, therefore, a first step towards shifting those power imbalances. Colonial hybridity is not to be understood as a problematic relationship between two cultures nor as some form of 'happy merger' between them. Rather, it refers to an on-going and open-ended performance, not a closed or reified 'type of culture'. As a result, "hybridity is not something simply to be celebrated, in a magical

multiculturalist re-invention of tired national traditions, but is a difficult, agonistic process of negotiation" (Huddart, 2006: 113).

Colonial discourses, while seemingly locked in the dichotomy of colonizer and colonized, may be destabilized through practices of mimicry, thereby opening the possibility for – not necessarily conscious – negotiations of 'hybridization' and, in turn, enabling the emergence of third spaces. Bhabha defines third spaces as zones of "overlap and displacement of domains of difference" (Bhabha, 1994: 2). Third spaces provide alternatives to the dichotomous organization of colonial spaces of – necessarily failing – assimilation and offer opportunities for imaging different post- or de-colonial realities of hybridity:

> It is that Third Space, though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning, and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew (Bhabha, 1994: 55).

The process of enunciation that becomes possible within, and is itself constitutive of, the third space denies the binary reality and power of colonizer/colonized, setting up possibilities for different social spaces, discourses and forms of subjectivities (Shumar, 2010). In conclusion, rather than "exotici[sing] multiculturalism or the *diversity* of cultures", we need to forefront "culture's *hybridity*" as productive of third spaces. Thereby, "…we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves" (Bhabha, 1994: 56; emphasis in original).

In what follows we use Bhabha's framework as a lens to investigate the current post/neocolonial order underpinning everyday work at the Greenlandic Police Force. We seek to unravel the specific inclusion-exclusion configuration that currently serves to uphold this order, but also to identify the cracks through which alternatives might become conceivable. This analysis leads to our discussion of 'hybrid inclusion' as a contribution to current conceptualizations of organizational inclusion in which we acknowledge the actual impossibility of a 'happy

inclusion' story free of contradictions and conflicts. In preparing the ground for these two steps, we first present our methodology.

Methodology

Case Background

Even though there were early Viking settlements in Greenland, the year 1721 officially marks the beginning of Greenland's colonial era when the missionary Hans Egede founded a trading company and a Lutheran mission near present-day Nuuk. In 1953 Greenland's official colonial status was abolished, and in 1979 the Danish government granted home rule to Greenland. With home rule, Greenland remained part of the Kingdom of Denmark, and all Greenlanders hold Danish citizenship. Denmark maintained control of constitutional affairs, foreign relations and defence, while Greenland gained control over economic development, municipal regulations, taxes, education, the social welfare system, cultural affairs and healthcare. Greenland also retains the right to take over more civil responsibilities, such as the police force, or to seek complete independence. Although independence has been a hot political debate for a long time, the people of Greenland have not yet[2] agreed on the matter, resulting in continued Danish presence.

To understand the continued neocolonial dynamics, some demographic details are important. Greenland covers 2,175,600 km^2, but only has a population of approximately 56,000 people, of whom almost 20,000 live in the capital, Nuuk. Because most of the country consists of ice and the greener coastlines are full of fjords and mountains, no cities in Greenland are connected by roads (in fact the longest stretch of paved road in Greenland is about 7 km long). The only police academy is in Nuuk. Due to the limited mobility and the restricted educational and job

[2] In 2020 when this was written.

possibilities, many Greenlanders – who all hold Danish citizenship – have moved (or move temporarily) to Denmark in search of jobs or education.

In 2018, 16,470 people of Greenlandic descent were registered in Denmark. This represents a significant proportion of Greenland's population (56,000) but a very small proportion of the population of Denmark (5.8 million).[3] According to Statistics Denmark, 12 per cent of Greenlanders are of Danish or other European descent and 88 per cent are of Inuit descent. However, and as we shall detail later, such a division into 'Greenlandic/Danish' is an approximation. Further, it is both problematic and artificial due to the fact that an 'objective' measure of the difference between 'Danish' and 'Greenlandic' is impossible. The number in itself is thus an indication of the cultural complexities in question. Because of the country's long and close ties to Denmark, most Greenlanders have a mix of predominantly Inuit and North European backgrounds, but contrary to practices of, for example, Australia, this is not registered in any official manner.

With regard to the specific organizational context of our case study, the Greenlandic Chief of Police reports directly to the Danish Minister of Justice, and the governance of the Greenlandic legal system remains with the Danish Parliament as well. In 2016 the Greenlandic Police Force was composed of approximately one-third 'Danish' police officers and two-thirds 'Greenlandic' police officers[4]. This number is heavily influenced by the fact that everyone needs to pass a Danish language test in order to be accepted to the Greenlandic Police academy. The official working language of police officers in Greenland is Danish, but a large part of the population speaks no or very little Danish, while some (both the Danish expatriates and some Greenlanders brought up in mixed families) do not speak any Greenlandic. The vast majority of the Danish officers are in Greenland on shorter stays, either on two-year contracts or on four- to six-month summer assistance assignments. Nevertheless, most leadership positions are held

[3] See for example Statistics Denmark for more information: https://www.dst.dk/en

[4] Although, as noted above, such a division into 'Greenlandic/Danish' is both problematic and artificial, it is meant as giving the reader a rough estimate of neocolonial relations within the Greenlandic Police Force.

by Danish officers, a few of whom (including the Chief of Police) have lived in Greenland most of their lives and consider themselves more 'Greenlandic' than 'Danish'.

Data Collection

The data collection started in February 2015, when a full week's cross-cultural training programme arranged by the Danish police academy was observed. The participants of the course were the people going on summer assistance assignments in the summer of 2015. The course is given every year to the new summer assistants to prepare them for both the cultural, legal and practical differences between police work in Denmark compared to Greenland. In August 2015 two of the authors travelled to Greenland for 13 days to conduct interviews and observe police work in three different cities. We took part in the daily life at the stations: arriving at the same time as the officers in the morning, interviewing officers during quiet time and going on as many trips, patrols, house searches, arrests, etc. as possible. Generally, we experienced 100% open access to the stations, we even received our own key, and were invited to participate in everything that happened during that time. The trip resulted in approximately 60 pages of field notes and 13 interviews lasting between 1 and 2.5 hours. Before and after the trip, 12 additional interviews with officers all over Greenland were conducted via satellite link from the main police station in Copenhagen.

In November 2016, the same two authors were invited back to Greenland by the Chief of Police to facilitate a full day of leadership training on cross-cultural collaboration. The leadership seminar was designed as an intervention based on our ethnographic data and constitutes an important embodied and interactionist supplement to our more classic ethnographic interviews and observations conducted in Denmark and during the first trip to Greenland. At the leadership seminar, the 33 most senior officers of the Greenlandic Police Force were present for a week-long leadership meeting. We observed one day where the organizational culture of the police

(meaning, the culture of the Danish police, which includes Greenland as one district) was analysed, we facilitated one day of leadership training and we were present at two dinners/social events: 'burger night' and the 'gala dinner'. Detailed field notes were written during all this time including by a colleague from the Danish Police who shared their notes with us.

Since the official language of the Greenlandic Police is Danish and since Danish is the first language of the two authors who conducted the fieldwork, all interviews were conducted in Danish. The interviews were transcribed in full length, but only the quotes selected in the various coding processes were translated to English and shared and discussed with the non-Danish speaking author. None of the field researchers speak Greenlandic; thus, when the officers at times spoke Greenlandic together – for example, during lunch – we took notes about tone of voice and body language. This, however, only happened very rarely and mainly in private conversations that we would not have considered part of the data collection regardless of their language.

Bodies and positionality

Researchers and respondents work within an asymmetrical power relationship, which shapes both parties' identities and actions (Cunliffe and Karunanayake, 2013). This is particularly so in a (neo)colonial setting where historical power asymmetries are part of daily life. As will become apparent in the analysis, the racialization of bodies – both those perceived as 'Greenlandic' and those perceived as 'Danish' – is central to the way work and inclusion are constructed as well as the way they are studied. As we have discussed elsewhere (reference omitted due to anonymity), our white bodies – and the fact that Danish is our native language – mattered greatly to the access we got, the conversations we could have and the way the data was analysed. It is impossible to erase a – racialized – white researcher's body, which in itself is a marker of politics, privileges, and resources. Accepting this impossibility, we have, instead, tried to linger in the affective circulation around the ethnographic work. For example, when we

came home and looked at our field notes – particularly from the first trip – it was obvious that we had indeed 'suffered' from what Ahmed (e.g. 2004) describes as white people's yearning to make a difference. Our field notes contained several instances in which we quite clearly viewed ourselves as the sources of good praxis, believing in our ability to transcend the conditions of neocolonial order that we observed around us (see also Swan, 2017). Instead of trying to deny the existence of such feelings or try not to feel anything for the fieldwork, we have instead aimed at exploring those feelings. We sought to understand their potential of hybridity and thus engage with our data in a more embodied and affective way (see also Ashcraft, 2018).

The officers' embodiment and how we attempt to describe it is equally complex. When we refer to the officers in the analysis, we try as much as possible to not label them 'Greenlandic' or 'Danish' – although sometimes we cannot avoid it. In those cases, we explicitly use quotation marks in order to emphasize the artificiality of these distinct labels. This is also why we have chosen not to give the officers pseudonyms, as this could insinuate their cultural identification or our attempt at the same. Where relevant, we refer to how they themselves identify or provide other information such as how long they have lived in Greenland or what professional position they hold.

Analytical Strategy

A reflexive and thematic approach to data collection and analysis was adopted (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Silverman, 2000). The generation of the initial codes happened before the leadership seminar, when we selected quotes to present to the group of police leaders in Greenland. We deliberately chose quotes in which they spoke about each other in stereotypical terms, inviting reflection on these stereotypes and how their everyday use influences collaboration. Part of this initial coding was, therefore, conducted by the police officers themselves, as they discussed the quotes at the seminar. Upon our return from the second trip to Greenland, we conducted a second round of inductive open coding (Strauss and Corbin,

1998) of our field notes and transcripts in the light of the discussion at the seminar. This second round of coding was done independently by the two researchers involved in fieldwork generation.

This step confirmed what had been indicated during the leadership seminar, namely that the categories of 'being the same' or 'being different', which were dominant in our interviews, constantly broke down during the exercise, thus opening up for hybridity. Progressively, we could see how hybridity and related practical and social experiences became the main topics of our dialogue with the participants, and hence steered our focus in this paper. At the end of this second round of coding, the three analytical categories of 1) stereotype, 2) mimicry and 3) hybridity and third space had emerged, and the entire data set was re-coded accordingly. As a final step before writing up the analysis, the quotes selected in the last coding process were refined via axial coding, understanding progressively how the themes intermingled around ideas of exclusion and inclusion (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

Analysis

Police work in Greenland is heavily influenced by Greenland's and Denmark's neocolonial relationship and the continued Danish presence. As one senior officer on a long-term contract says:

> *We are all products of a colonial past, which we can't undo. We are in this together for better and worse and we need to make it work. That is why we need to work on inclusion and collaboration. It needs to be a leadership focus to make Danish and Greenlandic officers work well together.*

It is, of course, necessary to acknowledge the neocolonial relationship between the two countries and the challenges that it necessarily creates for the Greenlandic Police Force. However, this recognition often leads to reproduction of stereotypes as most inclusion efforts

are based on an essentialist cultural understanding of the differences between Danish and Greenlandic culture. As one senior officer, who has been in Greenland approximately 40 years, says as the first thing when he is asked about what characterizes his work life:

> *I came to Greenland from Denmark back in the late '70s and became a leader shortly after. The biggest revelation has been the prevalence of two different cultures in our organization: the Greenlandic and the Danish.*

What is particularly interesting about this officer's remark is that even after 40 years in the Greenlandic Police Force, the first thing he mentions is the idea of fixed cultural differences between Greenland and Denmark. And he is not alone. Most of the officers in the Greenlandic Police Force mention cultural differences between 'Danish' and 'Greenlandic' officers as one of the key challenges of collaboration. Inclusion and cross-cultural collaboration initiatives are therefore something, which necessarily is on the leadership agenda. The problem, however, is that they are implemented in an organisation, in which very fixed colonial stereotypes – about both (former) colonizer and colonized – tend to dominate the everyday understanding of each other as people and colleagues.

Colonial Stereotypes

Racialized stereotypes dominate the descriptions of the Greenlandic-Danish relationship: The 'Greenlandic' culture is thus most often described as basic and in touch with nature and the 'Danish' as efficient and professional. As one officer explains:

> *There are huge cultural differences. We are just different. I have grown up with fishing and hunting, that is a culture which is pretty basic. I still fish most of the fish I need, shoot birds and hunt seals after work. In a couple of weeks, we are going reindeer hunting. So, I still hunt most of the food for my family myself.*

He sees this as not only necessary in order to get food on the table in a country where the vast distances and lack of logistical links between cities makes fresh food a scarce resource, but also

as a way to keep in touch with his Greenlandic roots. It is something he prioritizes and spends most of his spare time doing. However, being in touch with nature and prioritizing hunting is often perceived as unprofessional by the 'Danes'. As an example, an officer on a short-term contract translates the desire for hunting after work into a lack of work ethic:

> *They just don't get things to work. Their efficiency is non-existent and that is culturally determined. That is my opinion at least. It's not like they are evil bastards towards us, it's just not in them to work more than 8-16. They just want to work and go home (…) or go hunting.*

Because the working language is Danish and because it is not the first language of most of the 'Greenlandic' officers, lack of language skills is also translated into lack of work ethic and lack of competencies. As another officer explains the problems with the 'Greenlandic' officers:

> *It is the way reports are written. They're just not detailed enough. It's about having pride in what you do. I mean, it's not like they are not proud of what they do, but it is really not good work, there is just a different perception of standard.*

Thus, not taking into consideration that many officers work in their second language – in their own country – lack of Danish skills is translated as not being professional.

The stereotypes not only fixate the officers into dichotomous colonial subject positions, they also expose the paradoxical colonial fantasy of both wanting to control and make the Other the Same:

> *They wouldn't be able to have a police force if we weren't here. So, we need to be here to train them and teach them the way of professional work. If they ever are to become independent, they need us here now. But it also seems impossible for them to learn. It's just not in their nature, it's not in their culture.*

On the one hand, the officer wants to teach the 'Greenlanders' what he perceives to be a necessary 'Western' work ethic. On the other hand, by essentialising their 'nature', he makes it impossible for 'Greenlanders' to ever be included into his in-group: the 'Danes'.

The stereotypes go both ways. The stereotype of 'Danish' efficiency often translates into being loud, arrogant and a control freak:

> *You can recognize a Dane by the fact that they talk loudly and a lot. We Greenlanders talk more quietly together. When two Danish colleagues greet each other, it all becomes very technical, 'where have you served' and such. They try to find something [professional] they have in common and then they have a point of departure*.

The perception is that many 'Danes' isolate themselves in order to maintain and reinforce their stereotypical perception of 'Greenlanders'. This makes organisational inclusion initiatives difficult on two fronts, as both 'Danes' and 'Greenlanders' are constructed as two different groups that don't mix or overlap. They are constructed as 'naturally' excluding each other:

> *When the Danes come up here, the first thing they do is to create Danish ghettoes: eat together, go out together, do everything together. And then they end up telling the same story over and over again, the story about how nothing works in Greenland, how we are lazy and afraid of conflicts. And after a while that story becomes the truth for them.*

Stereotypes about the 'Danes' also lead to their exclusion from the 'Greenlandic' in-group of people who are perceived to 'truly' belong in the country. No matter how long they have lived in Greenland, they are constructed as not fully understanding the culture and the nature. For example, an officer, who describes himself as half Greenlandic and half Danish – born in Greenland, but not speaking much Greenlandic – says about an officer from Denmark, who has lived permanently in Greenland for more than 20 years, was married twice to 'Greenlandic' women and has children with both of them:

> *He is part of the Danish police, but he is more Greenlander than I am. I mean he both owns a boat, shoots seals, and drives a dog sledge. The latter I don't even know how to do. (…) And he speaks quite a bit of Greenlandic. Every time people begin to translate, he says 'yeah, yeah, I did understand'.*

When the interviewer asks whether this is something people notice, he says:

Of course, people <u>have</u> to notice. I mean there is a Dane running around with a dog sledge, not many do that!

This quote shows that 'Danish' officers are also locked into a colonizer position, where their cultural background is essentialized. They may be expected to learn the 'Greenlandic way of life', be interested in the culture etc., but when they do so, they cannot live up to the inclusion criteria of the in-group. Their bodies are also racialized as white and 'Danish' and thus cast as odd on a dog sledge.

Mimicry

The problem with colonial stereotypes is not only that they lock people into colonizer/colonized subject positions, but that they enable a very distinct power hierarchy. Particularly in work situations, the values that are attached to bodies coded as 'Danish' – or white/Western – are those associated with professionalism and a strong work ethic, which automatically and unconsciously positions these bodies accordingly. This has distinct exclusionary organisational effects on bodies coded as 'Greenlandic' or non-white, as they are perceived as not professional. The stereotypes attached to bodies perceived as 'Greenlandic' are, therefore, contested and resisted to a much higher degree on an everyday basis. One way this is done is by what Bhabha identified as mimicry.

Although the Danish and Greenlandic languages linguistically are very different from each other, Danish is the official language in the Greenlandic Police Force and proficient Danish skills is a requirement to be accepted into the police academy. However, no Greenlandic language skills are required and there are many officers in the police force, who do not speak any Greenlandic. Most of the officers we talked to defend this. As a bilingual officer born and raised in Greenland explains:

A lot of people fail the admissions test to the academy because of lacking Danish skills. Their Danish is simply not good enough. As we write everything in Danish and are under the Danish Police, we damn well need to be able to speak Danish.

While everyone defends this practice, they all agree it is the number one reason that so many 'Greenlanders' fail the admissions test and one of the main reasons for the shortage of 'Greenlandic' officers and, thus, the necessity of receiving assistance from Danish officers on both short- and long-term contracts. Still, a bilingual leader, who strongly identifies as 'Greenlandic', explains that he prefers the working language to be Danish even though it would make it easier to recruit qualified officers and also make the officers he has employed perform better, if the demand for Danish language skills was abolished:

Yes, it is really too bad [that they don't speak fluent Danish]. Because it is people who are really good at the day-to-day police work, but they are really not that good at writing reports. But if you ask me… If the day comes that I am to write the reports in Greenlandic, I'll find myself another job. It is ten times easier to read a Danish text, as the words are shorter and the sentences more straight-forward.

The normalization of Danish as the professional and official language has deep historical roots. Between the 1960s and 1980s very young kids were sent to Denmark to learn the language, because it was seen as the only way to have a proper future. As one of the more senior officers recalls:

I was nine when I was sent to Denmark the first time. It was normal to send very young kids without their parents to Denmark to learn Danish. People were of the opinion that you would have much better chances in life, if you knew the language well. I lived with a family there for 10 months. When I came back, I had forgotten a lot of my Greenlandic and couldn't really communicate with my parents to begin with because they didn't speak Danish. It took me three months to re-learn Greenlandic.

Although this officer does say that it was a very tough experience and it was a horrible thing to do to kids, he still appreciates his parents' decision, as the Danish language helped him to get where he is today:

> *I hated it, but it gave me the language skills necessary to possess the position I have today. Most of my professional life is in Danish. I am a part of the Danish police because of this.*

Today, kids that young are not send to Denmark, and it is considered cruel and violating. However, the tradition still lives on, as most people in the police force – if not born in Denmark – have spent at least a year in high school or similar in Denmark.

The Danish language becomes so much of a habit that the officers even find themselves speaking Danish in work contexts where they all could talk in Greenlandic. As one officer jokingly remarks:

> *At our station everything is in Danish as we have so many Danish officers here. So, speaking Danish becomes part of our work culture. However, a couple of months ago, we were almost only Greenlanders [due to holiday schedule and education and other things that influenced staffing of the station], but we still only spoke Danish to each other. That was really funny.*

What is interesting here, is that mimicry is normalized for this respondent – as well as many of the others we talked to – in a way that is not connected to resistance or frustration (as shown by, for example, Thomson and Jones, 2015), but to humour. Speaking Danish has become a habit, not just an imposed copy, but a part of 'Greenlandic' culture too, which they find amusing. In this sense, the mimicry they perform reminds more of Thomson and Jones' (2015) category of 'consummate mimics' rather than 'reluctant mimics' or 'frustrated mimics'.

Mimicry, however, includes more than just language. As an officer, who identifies as 'Greenlandic', but only speaks Danish explains:

> *I might look Greenlandic, but I don't speak Greenlandic, I only speak Danish, as that was the language my parents thought was most important for me to learn. And they [the 'Danish' officers] might brand me as what they think is 'Greenlandic', but if you come to my house and live with us for two or three weeks and eat the same like us, live like us, I don't think you would feel a difference at all. We, of course, do eat some Greenlandic specialties once in a while, but besides that we eat the same.*

In this way mimicry facilitates and supports the falsification of the dichotomous foundations of available subject positions as it counters and resists the stereotype of 'Greenlandic' inferiority. Particularly through a normalization of behaviour, it is not a mere copying of so-called 'Western' way of working and living, but rather the behaviour has become as foundational to 'Greenlandic' culture as it is to the 'Danish' culture. In fact, cultural signifiers are fused so closely that it becomes difficult to distinguish them. Mimicry – rather than conscious copying – in this way exposes that there is no 'real' or 'true' cultural essence behind the behaviour of the police officers and thereby complicates simplistic inclusion assumptions of including one pre-existing and separate group into the other. No matter whether the included identity is group-based or individualized, either way that would mean to bind the person to a fixed set of cultural values. The mimicry practiced by all officers problematizes dichotomous foundations all together: it opens up for hybridity.

Hybridity

At the leadership seminar, we presented the officers with the colonial stereotypes in the form of anonymized quotes. Seeing the stereotypes come out so explicitly in statements within their own organisation made the officers engage in a very passionate and open discussion about the dichotomous categorization of people and the exclusion caused by that. As a reaction to the stereotypes, many began to disclose that they identified as 'hybrids' or 'bastards', as some called themselves. As one officer explains:

I am half Danish and half Greenlandic. I speak both Danish and Greenlandic almost fluently. I understand Danish and Greenlandic humour – and the Greenlandic mindset.

But he also describes this position as difficult to navigate:

We have several in our community [of hybrids] who do not speak Greenlandic; they definitely face a cultural dilemma, as they do not understand the everyday jokes in Greenlandic. You miss a lot when you are not 100% into the Greenlandic way of life and you have to be able to understand the Danish mindset.

The difficulty arises from understanding hybridity as 'both/and'. In fact, many officers express that they need to be able to perform both cultures 'perfectly' in order to perform 'successful hybridity'. Hybridity, here, is not understood in Bhabha's sense of transgressing cultural dichotomies, but is taken to be the ability to simultaneously navigate both cultures, perceived as essentially different. That the enactment of hybridity for the officers is still rooted in cultural essentialism is also clear in the following excerpt, where an officer explains how he engages in a sort of exaggerated mimicry in order to be able to be included as 'Greenlander':

I am what I call a bastard; I am mixed Greenlandic and Danish. And I have always all through my childhood been told: 'You have more light skin than us, so you are more Danish than us'. They tried to exclude me, push me out. But I have always felt: 'You know what, I am Greenlandic'. I still feel that, and when I speak Greenlandic, I make sure to have and use a broader vocabulary than others. I've made an effort to be better at speaking Greenlandic [than the other 'Greenlanders'].

The officer's mimicry here exposes the impossibility of hybridity in Bhabha's sense as long as the stereotypes are so deeply ingrained in the available subject positions for both: 'Greenlandic' and 'Danish' officers. When hybridity is performed through the lens of colonial stereotypes, the experience of inclusivity becomes difficult because the stereotypes reinforce the either/or. Thus, hybridity in the example above leads to exclusion – and even exclusion from being perceived as 'Greenlander', a group that the officer otherwise feels that he belongs to.

The enactment of hybridity in Bhabha's sense has to involve *the play of difference.* It needs to allow for – and endure – a certain level of ambivalence and fluidity. Otherwise it will end up in a frustration of not belonging to either of the sides – the troublesome state of 'in-betweenness' (Fanon 1952/2008). Because as the below quote implies, exclusion from the 'Greenlandic' in-group, does not grant inclusion in the 'Danish' in-group either:

> *I am so lucky – or unfortunate – to have a foot in each camp. So, Danish officers quite often say to me, 'You think Danish', and then they put me into the 'Danish box'. But I am not completely there, I have become their jester, and then, 'Presto!' – they have a Greenlandic friend.*

Because he has a 'foot in each camp', he is 'more easily' accessed as a friend. But he is exoticized as the 'Greenlandic friend'. His cultural roots are in that way still essentialized by 'both groups', which obstructs the inclusion in both. By one his 'Greenlandishness' is not enough, by the other his 'Danishness' is not sufficient. Another officer explains this failed hybridity very explicitly:

> *I don't know how many times I have heard 'but you are not really Danish' or another one 'wow, you really speak good Danish'. I never seem to belong on one or the other side no matter how well I speak the Danish language or no matter how much I have grown up here exactly like all the others.*

The difficulty the officers have with navigating hybridity without falling back into stereotypes shows how extremely internalized they are for both categorizing the Other and making sense of themselves. It, however, also becomes apparent how an understanding of hybridity in the Bhabhaian sense opens up for a profound problematization of the stereotypes and the closed spaces they create. Towards the end of the leadership seminar one officer said:

> *We have a role in many different subcultures, so they don't make sense as closed spaces. And they influence each other dynamically.*

And another added:

Subcultures and one's roles in them influence each other; they are more fluid than we think.

Thus, the seminar not only made the officers question the stereotypes and the necessary mimicry they provoked, but it also opened up a language of fundamental hybridity and created space for discussing the im-/possibility of organizational inclusion, in which symbols of culture have no (or at least much less) primordial unity or fixity. It became clear to the officers that if they are to strive for organizational inclusion in a way that does not automatically and unconsciously inscribe all people within an always-already (neo)colonial power relationship, they need to perceive culture as much more fluid and ambiguous. This would represent the basis of what Bhabha refers to as third space. A space where cultural significations are radically questioned and people develop the potential to "emerge as others than themselves" being less associated with the colonial stereotypes that make hybridity so difficult to navigate in the first place. What this space would look like, we do not know (and if we claimed to know, it wouldn't be a third space), but we do know that the intervention enabled the officers to radically question themselves and the way they cast each other. With the term 'hybrid inclusion' we want to emphasize the necessity of organizations that strive for inclusivity to engage with the im-/possibility of creating such third spaces.

Concluding discussion

The analysis shows how (neo)colonial stereotypes dominate and delimit the available subject positions of police officers in the Greenlandic Police Force. While all officers are influenced and restricted by these essentialist and static group categorizations, it is first and foremost those racialized as 'Greenlanders' that need to engage in mimicking attempts of 'being Danish' in order to be perceived as professional and competent officers. Not only because it is hegemonically constructed as the superior way of working and living, but also very practically because it is explicitly 'required' by the entry conditions to the Greenlandic Police Force:

speaking Danish is (still) mandatory for becoming a police officer in Greenland. However, exactly because the dominant subject positions of former colonizer and colonized are characterized by a highly dichotomous relationship that denies any identity construction in between, the 'Danish colonizer' and the 'Greenlandic colonized' also tend to have a highly *precarious* status – always on the verge of being exposed as simplistic constructs that do not, in fact, represent the actual lifeworld.

In the leadership seminar the officers explicitly recognized that these stereotypical subject positions are not able to capture all aspects and nuances of working in a simultaneously postcolonial and neocolonial context with decolonial potential, like the Greenlandic Police Force. This allowed the participants to articulate experiences and subject positions that do not conform with the binary logic of the colonial order and, hence, opened up paths that diverge from expected differentiation and (forced) assimilation. A number of officers started to describe themselves as 'hybrids' or 'bastards' and thereby dissolved the disciplining ideas of distinct cultures embedded in a stable hierarchical relationship. Building on these observed experiences, we coin the term *hybrid inclusion* to capture two interrelated dimensions necessary for advancing critical inclusion studies (see Table 1): first, a certain understanding of the to-be-included *subject* that acknowledges the "hierarchical force of (…) binaries" (Prasad, 2006: 135) lingering in any kind of orchestrated inclusion attempts; second, a certain practical signpost that emphasizes that organizing for inclusivity means to address and work *with* the actual impossibility of a 'happy inclusion story' free of contradictions and conflicts.

- -
INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE
- -

With respect to the *first dimension* of hybrid inclusion, we argue that the conventional imagination of the organizational member as both unique and striving for belongingness (e.g. Shore et al., 2011) is deeply rooted in Western-centric idea(l)s of the autonomous, individual

and self-sufficient subject (Geertz, 1984). Consequently, this imagination is neither as 'innocent' nor all-embracing as claimed in the organizational inclusion literature. Instead, it can be expected that it is the 'peculiarities' of Western majority group members that become intelligible as 'unique' – and appreciated by the organization – rather than those of historically disadvantaged or marginalized non-Western groups (e.g. Alcadipani et al., 2012; Khan and Khosul, 2011; Srinivas, 2012). Furthermore, by emphasizing the uniqueness of *every* organizational member, the context-specific significance of group memberships connected to power asymmetries and historical inequalities is neglected (Alcadipani et al., 2012; Nkomo, 2011; Siltaoja, 2019; Srinivas, 2012; Yousfi, H., 2014). For instance, as shown in our analysis, the availability of subject positions allowing for performing uniqueness are restricted by the aftermath of a dominant colonial discourse that disciplines 'Greenlandic' officers who act/appear inappropriately 'Danish' and vice versa.

At the same time, the case of the Greenlandic Police Force shows not only that highly dichotomous group differences are effectively fantasmatic and always threatened by collapsing, but also that the subject position of the colonizer is existentially bound to – depending on – that of the colonized (Said, 1978). We thus argue that it is not the individual actor that should be at the core of inclusion efforts but rather the form of *relationship* that leads to certain minority and majority constructions in the first place. In the case of the Greenlandic Police Force less exclusionary subject positions, such as 'hybrids' or 'bastards', can only emerge by challenging this dichotomous relationship between colonizers and colonized.

With the term of hybrid inclusion, we want to acknowledge the simultaneity of two countervailing dynamics: the fluidity and emergence of ontologically singular identity constructions and, on the other hand, their relational embeddedness in a collective colonial past and present. Inclusion efforts that seek to abandon binary, essentializing group relations need

to establish forms of distinctions that challenge "claims of fixed polarities and originary pasts" (Kaasila-Pakanen, 2015: 187).

This leads us to the *second dimension* of hybrid inclusion – the practical signpost to work *with* the actual impossibility of a 'happy inclusion story' free of contradictions and conflicts: in particular, this means to orientate the *practice* of organizing for inclusivity towards the idea that inclusion and exclusion are mutually constitutive instead of oppositional (Goodin, 1996). For instance, inclusion in a work organization is always depending on certain boundaries – and thus entrance barriers – such as qualification requirements (e.g. Danish language skills) for future employees. Organizing for inclusivity is then not about erasing exclusion, but rather about *how* and *which* boundaries are drawn between inclusion and exclusion (Ferdman, 2017; Kaasila-Pakanen, 2015). Here Bhabha's notions of hybridity and third space can function as landmarks for inclusion-exclusion configurations that do not perpetuate dichotomous, essentializing identity constructions. For instance, establishing a language policy in the police force that acknowledges and makes use of both the Danish and Greenlandic language skills – the second one currently lying dormant in the Greenlandic Police Force.

However, leaning on Bhabha's conceptual framework is also a tricky endeavour since his whole thinking is positioned in opposition to any kind of fixation or essence, which complicates fulfilling the desire for simple recommendations of 'how to undertake inclusion efforts' that do justice to a postcolonial perspective. It rather provokes the question whether it is even possible for organizations to strive for 'hybrid inclusion' whose core is not to be definitely fixed, not to be boxed into measurement units, not to be stripped of its ambivalent characteristics? Our answer would be that it is not possible – at least not in the sense of a positive definition of what 'hybrid inclusion' should look like. Instead, by following Bhabha's notion of the third space, which he describes as "unpresentable in itself" (1994: 55) and as relying on "discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that meaning, and symbols of culture have no primordial

unity or fixity" (ibid.), we argue that organizations need to strive for establishing inclusion-exclusion configurations allowing for hybridity by applying a 'negative lens' on inclusion efforts, asking an entirely different question: what kind of organizational structures, processes and practices need to be in place in order to ensure the *absence* of (demands for) unity and fixity?

This is where we see the potential for future research of critical inclusion studies: by empirically and theoretically investigating forms of organizing that systematically provide and secure opportunities for fluid and emergent identity constructions as well as encounters that are capable of enduring ambivalence, incompleteness and divergence (see Janssens and Steyaert, 2019b for a similar, practice-based argument). In this regard, critical inclusion studies could benefit from visiting feminist research such as Ashcraft's (2001) work on "organized dissonance" and organizational forms that seek for and work with dialectical tensions, or studies on the reoccurring need for closing certain organizational processes in order to secure certain forms of openness (e.g. Dobusch et al., 2019; Luedicke et al., 2017). Thereby critical inclusion studies can engage in conceptualizing self-reflective, systematic modes of boundary drawing that are preliminary and open for negotiations by default.

Hybrid inclusion

First dimension	Subject of inclusion efforts	- Identity constructions as fluid, emergent and ontologically singular *as well as* constitutively embedded in a collective, transcultural past and present - Focus on form of *relationship* between minority/majority instead of individual actor
Second dimension	Practice of organizing	- Organizing for inclusivity is about *how* and *which boundaries* are drawn between inclusion and exclusion

		- Enabling hybridity through inclusion efforts means to apply a *'negative lens'* and strive for the absence of unity and fixity

References

Acker, J. (2006) 'Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations', *Gender & Society* 20(4): 441-464.

Ahmed, S. (2004) 'Declarations of Whiteness: The Non-Performativity of Anti-Racism', *Borderlands E-Journal* 3(2): 1-13.

Ahmed, S. (2007) 'A Phenomenology of Whiteness', *Feminist Theory* 8(2): 149-168.

Ahmed, S. (2012) *On Being Included. Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Alcadipani, R., Khan F.R., Gantman, E. and Nkomo, S. (2012) 'Southern Voices in Management and Organization Knowledge', *Organization* 19(2): 131–43.

Ashcraft, K.L. (2001) 'Organized Dissonance: Feminist Bureaucracy as Hybrid Form', *Academy of Management Journal* 44(69): 1301-1322.

Ashcraft, K.L. (2013) 'The Glass Slipper: "Incorporating" Occupational Identity in Management Studies, *Academy of Management Review* 38(1): 6–31.

Ashcraft, K.L. (2018) 'Critical Complicity: The Feel of Difference at Work in Home and Field', *Management Learning* 49(5): 613-623.

Ashley, S.L.T. (2016) 'Re-Colonizing Spaces of Memorializing: The Case of the Chattri Indian Memorial, UK', *Organization* 23(1): 29-46.

Banerjee, S.B. (2003) 'Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature', *Organization Studies* 24(1): 143-180.

Banerjee, S.B. (2011) 'Voices of the Governed: Towards a Theory of the Translocal', *Organization* 18(3): 323-344.

Banerjee, S.B. and Linstead, S. (2001) 'Globalization, Multiculturalism and other Fictions: Colonialism for the New Millennium?', *Organization* 8(4): 683–722.

Bhabha, H. (1990) 'The Third Space. Interview with Homi Bhabha' in J. Rutherford (ed) *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, pp. 207-221. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Bhabha, H.K. (1994) *The Location of Culture* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (1996) *Black Male*. The Witney Museum of American Art, pp. 86, 87 & 110. [https://www.artforum.com/print/reviews/199502/focus-black-male-representations-of-masculinity-in-contemporary-american-art-33242].

Boussebaa, M, Sinha, A and Gabriel, Y (2014) 'Englishization in Offshore Call Centers: A Postcolonial Perspective', *Journal of International Business Studies* 45(9): 1152-1169.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3(2): 77-101.

Césaire, A. (1955/1972) *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Cunliffe, A.L. and Karunanayake, G. (2013). 'Working Within Hyphen-Spaces in Ethnographic Research: Implications for Rsearch Identities and Practice', *Organizational Research Methods* 16(3): 364-392.

Dar, S. (2018) 'De-Colonizing the Boundary-Object', *Organization Studies* 39(4): 565-584.

Dobbin, F. and Kalev, A. (2016) 'Why Diversity Programs Fail', *Harvard Business Review* 94: 52–60.

Dobusch, L. (2015) *Diversity Limited – Inklusion, Exklusion und Grenzziehungen mittels Praktiken des Diversity Management*. Wiesbaden, D: Springer VS.

Dobusch, L. (2017) 'Diversity Discourses and the Articulation of Discrimination: The Case of Public Organizations', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43(19): 1644–1661.

Dobusch, L., Dobusch, L., and Müller-Seitz, G. (2019) 'Closing for the Benefit of Openness? The Case of Wikimedia's Open Strategy Process', *Organization Studies* 40(3): 343-370.

Essers, C. and Benschop, Y. (2009) 'Muslim Businesswomen Doing Boundary Work: The Negotiation of Islam, Gender and Ethnicity Within Entrepreneurial Contexts', *Human Relations* 62(3): 403-423.

Fanon, F. (1952/2008) *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto Press.

Ferdman, B.M. (2017) 'Paradoxes of Inclusion: Understanding and Managing the Tensions of Diversity and Multiculturalism', *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 53(2): 235-263.

Ferdman, B.M. and Deane, B.R. (2014) *Diversity at Work: The Practice of Inclusion*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Friedman, R.A. and Davidson, M.N. (2001) 'Managing Diversity and Second-Order Conflict', *International Journal of Conflict Management* 12(2): 132-153.

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): 924–42.

Frenkel, M. and Shenhav, Y. (2006) 'From Binarism Back to Hybridity: A Postcolonial Reading of Management and Organization Studies', *Organization Studies* 27(6): 855-876.

Geertz, C. (1984) 'From the Native's Point of View', in R.A. Shweder and R.A. LeVine (eds) *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion*, pp. 55-70. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goodin, R.E. (1996) 'Inclusion and Exclusion', *European Journal of Sociology* 37(2): 343-371.

Harrison, D.A. and Klein, K.J. (2007) 'What's the Difference? Diversity Constructs as Separation, Variety, or Disparity in Organizations', *Academy of Management Review* 32(4): 1199–1228.

Holck, L. and Muhr, S.L. (2017) 'Unequal Solidarity? Towards a Norm-Critical Approach to Welfare Logics', *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 33(1): 1-11.

Holck, L. and Muhr, S.L. (2019) 'From Institutionalized Othering to Disruptive Collaboration: A Postcolonial Analysis of the Police Force in Greenland', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal* on-line before print.

Holvino, E. and Kamp, A. (2009) 'Diversity Management: Are We Moving in the Right Direction?', *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 25(4): 395-403.

Huddart, D. (2006) *Homi K. Bhabha*. London: Routledge.

Jack, G. (2015) 'Advancing Postcolonial Approaches in Critical Diversity Studies', in: R. Bendl, I. Bleijenbergh, E. Hentonnen and A.J. Mills (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity in Organizations*, pp 153-174. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jack, G., Westwood, R., Srinivas, N. and Sardar, Z. (2011) 'Deepening, Broadening and Re-Asserting a Postcolonial Interrogative Space in Organization Studies', *Organization* 18(3): 275-302.

Janssens, M. and Steyaert, C. (2019a) 'A Practice-Based Theory of Diversity: Respecifying (In)Equality in Organizations', *Academy of Management Review* 44(3): 518-537.

Janssens, M. and Steyaert, C. (2019b) 'The Site of Diversalizing: The Accomplishment of Inclusion in Intergenerational Dance', *Journal of Management Studies*, doi:10.1111/joms.12524

Kaasila-Pakanen, A.L. (2015) 'A Postcolonial Deconstruction of Diversity Management and Multiculturalism', in R. Bendl, I. Bleijenbergh, E. Hentonnen and A.J. Mills (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity in Organizations*, pp 175-194. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kalonaityte, V. (2010) 'The Case of Vanishing Borders: Theorizing Diversity Management as Internal Border Control', *Organization* 17(1): 31–52.

Khan, F.R. and Koshul, B.B. (2011) 'Lenin in Allah's Court: Iqbal's Critique of Western Capitalism and the Opening up of the Postcolonial Imagination in Critical Management Studies', *Organization* 18(3): 303–22.

Kothiyal, N., Bell, E. and Clarke, C. (2018) 'Moving Beyond Mimicry: Developing Hybrid Spaces in Indian Business Schools', *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 17(2): 137-154.

Lammers, C.J. (2003) 'Occupation regimes alike and Unlike: British, Dutch and French Patterns of Inter-Organizational Control of Foreign Territories', *Organization Studies* 24(9): 1379-1403.

Luedicke, M.K., Husemann, K.C., Furnari, S. and Ladstaetter, F. (2017). 'Radically Open Strategizing: How Premium Cola Collective Takes Open Strategy to the Extreme', *Long Range Planning* 50(3): 371-384.

McKenna, S. (2011) 'A Critical Analysis of North American Business Leaders' Neo-Colonial Discourse: Global Fears and Local Consequences', *Organization* 18(3): 387-406.

Mir, R. and Mir, A. (2012) 'The Colony Writes Back: Organization as an Early Champion on Non-Western Organizational Theory', *Organization* 20(1): 91-101.

Mohanty, C.T. (1984) 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', *Boundary* 12(3): 333-358.

Muhr, S.L. and Salem, A. (2013) 'Specters of Colonialism: Illusionary Equality and the Forgetting of History in a Swedish Organization', *Management and Organizational History* 8(1): 62-76.

Nishii, L.H. and Rich, R.E. (2014) 'Creating Inclusive Climates in Diverse Organizations', in B.M. Ferdman and B.R. Deane (eds) *Diversity at Work: The Practice of Inclusion,* pp. 330–363. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Nishii, L.H., Khattab, J., Shemla, M. and Paluch, R.M. (2018) 'A Multi-Level Process Model for Understanding Practice Effectiveness', *Academy of Management Annals* 12(1): 37-82.

Nkomo, S. (2011) 'A Postcolonial and Anti-Colonial Reading of 'African' Leadership and Management in Organization Studies: Tensions, Contradictions and Possibilities', *Organization* 18(3): 365-386.

Nkomo, S.M. (2014) ‘Inclusion: Old Wine in New Bottles?’, in B.M. Ferdman and B.R. Deane (eds) *Diversity at Work: The Practice of Inclusion*, pp. 580–592. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Oswick, C. and Noon, M. (2014) ‘Discourses of Diversity, Equality and Inclusion: Trenchant Formulations or Transient Fashions?’, *British Journal of Management* 25(1): 23–39.

Prasad, A. (2003) ‘The Gaze of the Other: Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis’, in A. Prasad (ed) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis*, pp. 3–43. New York: Palgrave.

Prasad, A. (2006) ‘The Jewel in the Crown: Postcolonial Theory and Workplace Diversity’, in A.M. Konrad, P. Prasad and J.K. Pringle (eds) *Handbook of Workplace Diversity*, pp. 21–44. London: Sage.

Romani, L., Holck, L. and Risberg, A. (2019) ‘Benevolent Discrimination: Explaining how Human Resources Professionals can be Blind to the Harm of Diversity Initiatives’, *Organization* 26(3): 371-390.

Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin.

Shore, L.M., Randel, A.E., Chung, B.G., Dean, M.A., Holcombe, K.E. and Singh, G. (2011) ‘Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research’, *Journal of Management*, 37(4): 1262-1289.

Shore, L.M., Cleveland, J.M. and Sanchez, D. (2018) ‘Inclusive Workplaces: A Review and Model’, *Human Resource Management Review* 28(2): 176–189.

Shumar, W. (2010) ‘Homi Bhabha’, *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 5(2):495-506.

Siltaoja, M., Juusola, K. and Kivijärvi, M. (2019) ‘”World-Class” Fantasies: A Neocolonial Analysis of International Branch Campuses’, *Organization* 26(1): 75-97.

Silverman, D. (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Spivak, G.C. (1985) ‘Can the Subaltern Speak? Speculations on Widow Sacrifice’, *Wedge* 7(8): 120–30.

Spivak. G.C. (1993) *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge.

Srinivas, N. (2012) 'Epistemic and Performative Quests for Authentic Management in India', *Organization* 19(2): 145–58.

Strauss, A.L. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research.* London: Sage.

Tatli, A. (2011) 'A Multi-Layered exploration of the Diversity Management Field: Diversity Discourses, Practices and Practitioners in the UK', *British Journal of Management 22*(2): 238-253.

Thomson, K. and Jones, J. (2015) 'Being and Becoming a Professional Accountant in Canada: Mimicry and Menace in the Transitions of Migrant Accountants', *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 11(2): 156-172.

Tyler, M. (2019) 'Reassembling Difference? Rethinking Inclusion Through/As Embodied Ethics', *Human Relations* 72(1): 48–68.

Van Laer, K. and Janssens, M. (2014) 'Between the devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Exploring the Hybrid Identity Narratives of Ethnic Minority Professionals', *Scandinavian Journal of Management 30*(2): 186-196.

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.

Zanoni, P. and Janssens, M. (2004) 'Deconstructing Difference: The Rhetoric of Human Resource Managers' Diversity Discourses', *Organization Studies* 25(1): 55–74.

Zanoni, P. and Janssens, M. (2007) 'Minority Employees Engaging with (Diversity) Management: An Analysis of Control, Agency, and Micro-Emancipation', *Journal of Management Studies* 44(8): 1371-1397.

Özbilgin, M. and Tatli, A. (2011) 'Mapping the Field of Equality and Diversity: Rise of Individualism and Voluntarism', *Human Relations* 64(9): 1229-1253.

Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2008) 'International Management Research Meets "The Rest of The World"', *Academy of Management Review* 33(4): 964-974.