the sociological quarterly
Official Journal of the Midwest Sociological Society

doi: 10.1111/tsq.12114 The Sociological Quarterly ISSN 0038-0253

DIVERSITY REGIMES IN WORKER COOPERATIVES: Workplace Inequality under Conditions of Worker Control

Joan S. M. Meyers*
University of the Pacific

Steven Peter Vallas
Northeastern University

Two major shifts in contemporary work organizations—"employee participation" and "diversity management"—have typically been studied in isolation from one another. Building on theoretical work by Acker (2006a,b), we ask how the interaction of these two constructs has affected the pursuit of workplace democracy at two worker cooperatives in Northern California. Using qualitative methods, we find that distinct "diversity regimes" have emerged at these establishments, substantially affecting the configurations of inequality that evolved. We distinguish two types of diversity regimes—"utilitarian" and "communitarian"—which operate either to obscure the workings of inequality or to foster attention to their presence. Our results suggest that how sociodemographic differences are managed has material consequences for the development of egalitarian structures at work.

Keywords: organizations, occupations, and work; sex and gender; race, gender, and class; economic sociology; labor and labor movements

INTRODUCTION

Worker cooperatives—private firms entirely owned and democratically operated by their workers—are in a period of rapid growth, seemingly in reaction to the recent economic crises and slack labor markets more generally (Abell 2014; Palmer 2014).[1] The worker cooperative essentially asks, "What do workers want?" and attempts to meet perceived worker needs and desires. Since the 18th century, waves of worker cooperative response were mainly framed in classed terms: as stable jobs that reward the labor of those who produce value, allow for the expression of human creativity, and extend respect and dignity (Leikin 2004; Curl 2009). The worker cooperatives of the 1970s and 1980s broadened this address by incorporating a substantial commitment to reducing inequality among cooperative members rather than simply between workers and their managers (Mellor, Hannah, and Stirling 1988; Berry and Schneider 2011). They also challenged the inevitability of hierarchical management, theorizing a connection between worker discontent and the organization of authority. Instead of managers,

*Direct all correspondence to Joan S. M. Meyers, Department of Sociology, Wendell Philip Center Room 204, University of the Pacific, 3611 Pacific Avenue, Stockton, CA 95211; e-mail: jmeyers@pacific.edu

Authors are listed in alphabetical order.

"collectivist-democratic" participatory practices emerged as a liberatory alternative to workplace alienation (Rothschild-Whitt 1979).

Despite their relative transience, worker cooperatives of the 1970s also raised broader questions about how work is organized within existing capitalist economies. An obvious legacy is the popularity of "shared capitalism" (Kruse, Blasi, and Park 2010), or the variety of ways nearly half of all private-sector U.S. employees have come to have some level of capital ownership or profit-sharing in their workplaces (Blasi, Freeman, and Kruse 2013). But worker cooperatives also contributed to conversations about two of the biggest managerial trends of the last two decades: "diversity" and employee "participation."

Although social scientists have written much about each of these managerial initiatives, they have generally approached them in isolation from one another. Consequently, we know little about how efforts to expand worker control might shape the work experience of different sociodemographic groups (see Kalev 2009). Nor do we know how gender or racial differences might affect the success or failure of worker participation initiatives. In this article, we seek to fill this gap, focusing in particular on two worker cooperatives as the site for our research. We focus our study on worker cooperatives because worker participation and challenges to workplace inequality are especially important concerns within worker-owned firms. Since the reversal of workplace inequality is the raison d'être of worker cooperatives—particularly the current generation (Rothschild 2009; Witherell 2013; Palmer 2014)—and yet worker-owned firms are also constrained by the need to survive financially within markets arguably organized around such inequalities, worker cooperatives allow analysis of the problems and potential of firm-level attempts to create egalitarian relations within production.[2] We focus on two cases, both situated in Northern California, that provide a logical contrast, in that they exhibited distinctly different inequality outcomes in spite of the similarities that marked these sites at their point of origin. We are thus able to explore the organizational processes that account for the divergent paths these two work establishments showed with respect to the work experience of historically excluded groups.

We ask two intertwined questions. First, what meanings get attached to class, race and gender under conditions of expanded worker control? Second, how do these meanings seem to affect the success or failure of organizational efforts aimed at transcending social inequality generally? These questions seem all the more important in the wake of the Occupy movement, which was riddled with subtle forms of exclusion that seemed to limit activists' ability to achieve their oppositional goals (see Leach 2013 and Chen 2016 in this issue for similar comparisons). They also bear importantly on the growth of cooperatives among low-income and minority populations. In addressing these questions, we modify and build on Acker's theory of "inequality regimes" (see Acker 2006a,b; Meyers 2011; Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012), an effort to grasp the varying configurations of inequality, whether by class, race, or gender, that come to be established within work organizations of various sorts. We find Acker's approach to be a highly suggestive means of disentangling empirical variations in the forms that "diversity" assumes, the regimes that firms adopt to govern social difference, and the ways these regimes shape the work experience of varying classes and status groups.

The article proceeds in the following manner. In the section immediately following, we critically examine the development of scholarship on diversity management, showing its relevance for both the corporate workplace and worker cooperatives. We then assess the way in which employee participation has been studied in both settings. After this we develop a theoretical framework, drawing on Acker's theory of inequality regimes, which we then use to interpret the empirical substance on which our study is based. The thrust of the article is based on intensive fieldwork at two Northern California worker cooperatives that shared several important similarities but then sharply diverged, yielding distinct outcomes whose nature we seek to unpack. The article develops a comparative analysis of these two cooperatives, paying particular attention to the structural and cultural influences that shaped their ability to establish egalitarian relations at work. The article closes by drawing several implications from the analysis, focusing on the ways in which the governance of the firm shapes, and is in turn shaped by, efforts to manage social difference by race and gender.

DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

The emergence of diversity management as a major concern is often traced to the publication of *Workforce 2000* (Johnston and Packer 1987), a provocative report published in a period of heightened ambiguity concerning the future of civil rights law (see Edelman, Fuller, and Mara-Drita 2001). The report forecast a dramatic change in the social and demographic composition of the U.S. workforce and predicted that correlative shifts would be needed in firms' human resource practices. Management theorists began to emphasize the strategic importance of diversity management given an anticipated influx of employees who differed from the existing workforce by gender, race, and nationality. That the term "diversity" gained currency across the corporate world can be attributed to several factors, but particularly its ability to signal compliance with antidiscrimination principles while firmly adhering to corporate goals. Where the civil rights movement had viewed antidiscrimination practices in social justice terms, the concept of "diversity" reframed racial and gender difference, now construing it as a strategically important source of competitive advantage on which firms could rely. This, the "business case" for diversity, argued that firms that relied on heterogeneous groups of employees would be able to achieve higher levels of creativity and innovation than would otherwise be the case. Diversity was assumed to open up broader forms of deliberation, more creative forms of decision making, and less parochial approaches to problems and challenges facing any given firm. Much of the ensuing debate therefore revolved around the social and organizational factors that mediate the diversity/performance link (Ancona and Caldwell 1992; Milliken and Martins 1996; Lichtenstein et al. 1997).

Much of this literature has been driven by narrowly managerial concerns that have taken the business case for diversity for granted, rather than viewing it as a phenomenon that needs to be explained. Moreover, the very concept of diversity has itself been given highly ambiguous meanings that attach equal significance to employees' occupational background, cultural style, and ascribed statuses, which is perhaps why Bell and Hartman (2007) view diversity rhetoric as little more than "happy talk." Only recently have sociologists begun to bring a more critical lens to bear on diversity management, developing more analytically cogent approaches toward organizational inequality and the diversity management phenomenon.

To date, much of the most important sociological work has been pitched at the macro-structural level of analysis. A prominent example is Dobbin's influential *Inventing Equal Opportunity* (2009), which viewed the emergence of diversity management as a response to the legal ambiguities that arose in the wake of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In a rapidly shifting landscape, Dobbin argued, U.S. courts needed to establish operational definitions of nondiscriminatory personnel practices, yet they were loathe to play so active a role themselves. This enabled human resource managers to fashion strategic organizational schemas—formal anti-discrimination policies, training programs, recruitment strategies, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) statements—that filled the void, providing firms with an outwardly focused shield against litigation, reputational damage, and judicial intervention (see also Kelly and Dobbin 1998; Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly 2006; Kalev 2009).

Similarly macro-social is the work of Tomaskovic-Devey and his colleagues (Tomaskovic-Devey et al. 2006; McTague, Stainback, and Tomaskovic-Devey 2009; Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012), which examines post–Civil Rights era political struggles in the United States. The 2012 *Documenting Desegregation* is a comprehensive analysis of the ways in which social movements, legal pressures, and the balance of political power combined to shape the trajectory of job desegregation. Using EEO data to capture trends in job desegregation by race and gender, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) find significant gains by African-American men and white women especially that then plateaued, largely owing to the timing of social movements and legal reforms. They also find that while "diversity" efforts created more employment opportunity for white women and men of color, overall these programs have coexisted with continuing employment privileges enjoyed by white men. Diversity programs, finally, have apparently done little to enhance the opportunities enjoyed by African-American women, although the reasons are not readily apparent.

An important similarity between the Dobbin (2009) and Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) studies is their focus on the legal and political environments in which organizations are embedded. This emphasis, while a vital contribution, has come at a certain cost: there has been little exploration of internal firm dynamics that shape various groups' outcomes (Reskin 2003; Vallas 2003a; Castilla and Benard 2010). Equally important is a point of difference between these two studies. Like much work informed by neo-institutional theory, Dobbin (2009) stresses organizational isomorphism and mimesis, highlighting the macro- or meso-level of homogeneity produced by large corporations' legitimacy-seeking behavior. Breaking with this emphasis, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) instead argue that the contemporary era produces an ever more *heterogeneous* array of diversity practices across sectors and branches of the economy. In this latter view, the pattern of racial and gender segregation that preceded the Civil Rights Act (in which white women and African Americans had limited options at work) has now given way to a multiplicity of outcomes that differ in both kind and degree.[3] We agree with this latter point, and argue that accounting for such varying outcomes requires closer analysis of within-firm processes than existing studies provide.

While worker cooperatives are not part of the corporate ecology and have generally positioned themselves in opposition to it, diversity management ideas and practices have affected them as well. The 1970s wave of worker cooperatives emerged from the same groups of young people who had populated gender- and ethnoracially focused social justice movements (Jackall and Crain 1984), and tended to have a nonspecific rhetoric of inclusion and egalitarian relations among workers. But in practice they were largely homogeneous along lines of race and social class. Indeed, studies of worker cooperatives often claimed that this homogeneity—framed in terms of "shared values" but almost entirely corresponding to similar (middle) class and (white) ethnoracial backgrounds—was essential to worker cooperatives' successful democratic management (Bernstein 1982; Russell 1984; Rothschild and Whitt 1986; Hacker 1989; Pencavel 2001). Indeed, where clusters of researchers and worker cooperatives facilitated easy and frequent exchanges, this claim began to be articulated by some worker cooperative members themselves (Ferguson 1991).

Yet the current wave of worker cooperative development has emerged most energetically in the low-wage sector among heterogeneous populations that are disproportionately composed of white women and men and women of color (Hoover, Harris, and Johnson 2012; Abell 2014; Palmer 2014), indicating a pressing need to understand how demographically diverse cooperatives can be democratic and successful. It's even possible that "shared values" created organizational discourses that, as some studies suggest, implicitly excluded or disenfranchised members of subordinated groups (Kasmir 1996; Kleinman 1996; Scott 2005). Other scholarship views active address of difference and even conflict as a necessary (if not sufficient) condition for the success of demographically heterogeneous worker cooperatives (Hoffmann 2005; Meyers 2006; Miller 2011; Berry 2013; Sobering, Thomas, and Williams 2014)—a finding echoed in studies of social justice nonprofit organizations (Sirianni 1993; Ostrander 1999; Scott 2005). Key to these studies is an understanding of how democratic control operates within a population that self-defines as diverse.

WORKER PARTICIPATION IN DEMOCRATIC AND NONDEMOCRATIC FIRMS

As might be expected where participants overlap, the participatory "collectivist-democratic" structure of 1970s worker cooperatives (Rothschild-Whitt 1979) borrowed heavily from feminist movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s, and was most clearly articulated in the early 1980s by *The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy* (Ferguson 1984). Ferguson's claim that organizational structure is consequential for inequality rested on her premise that bureaucratic features such as impersonality, formalization, and hierarchy are inherently gendered, that bureaucratic logic first encodes and then naturalizes male experience as the norm of organizational life, and subordinates the value of feminine experience. Worker cooperatives were less pointedly feminist, but similarly advanced participatory democracy as a necessary tool to reduce the alienation they saw as inherent in commodified labor and capitalist bureaucracies. In "prefiguring" a more socially just society (Breines 1989), these organizations replaced formalized rules and policies with intensive social interaction and obligation, certified expertise and fixed tasks with tacit knowledge developed through job rotation, and positional authority with decentralized and participatory decision making (Rothschild and Whitt 1986). Such practices seemed to hold out the promise of shared power, information, and skill development across groups historically denied access to firm managerial and leadership roles.

The deployment of decentralized and participatory decision making was not confined to democratic organizations. During the 1980s and particularly the 1990s, private sector work organizations also adopted participatory structures, often in the form of "post-bureaucratic" team systems (Heckscher and Donnellon 1994), on the assumption that enhanced worker autonomy and participation would generate a heightened commitment to the firm, in turn fostering improved performance (Zuboff 1988; Adler 1993; Appelbaum et al. 2000). Skeptics contended that team structures confined worker participation within managerial coordinates, subordinated worker goals to managerial hegemony, and transferred stress and anxiety but not financial compensation from managers to workers (Dohse, Jürgens, and Malsch 1985; Parker and Slaughter 1988; Kunda [1992] 2006; Graham 1995). Empirical studies found mixed results: workers enjoyed increased autonomy no matter how small its reach (Smith 2001), but since managers' interests and corporate imperatives drove much of the emphasis on team systems and worker participation, these initiatives seldom produced the productivity gains firms eagerly sought (Rothschild and Ollilainen 1999). Often, team systems proved short-lived, and even led to heightened suspicion and distrust among workers (Vallas 2003a). Equally important, demographic divisions along racial and gender lines frequently tended to undermine the changes that team systems presupposed (Vallas 2003b,c).

Just as the post-bureaucratic corporate team structure seemed unable to fulfill the promise its advocates envisioned, the cooperative version of worker participation also encountered challenges of its own. While the often-cited "inefficiency" of distributed decision making seems not to have actually harmed worker cooperatives' finances (Jones 1979; Olsen 2013), some have argued that democratic organizations' egalitarian aims were undermined by their "structurelessness" (Freeman [1970] 1984), by the lack of identifiable authority positions and formal policies to visibly assign or remove organizational power, and the persistence of informal power networks and operations (in contrast, Leach 2016 makes an argument in this volume for why this is not the problem it seems). Empirical studies found such organizations offered members of dominant groups more opportunity and reward by concealing their cultural capital advantages and routing power through circuits of social capital favoring privileged groups (Jackall and Crain 1984; Ferguson 1991; Sirianni 1993; Kleinman 1996; Polletta 2002).

The reproduction of inequality in the absence of formalized hierarchical power is documented on the corporate side as well. Despite flatter workplace authority (Handel and Levine 2004), gender and ethnoracial inequalities have not receded in equal measure (Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman 2004; DiTomaso 2013). Indeed, although participatory management promises more individual autonomy that may, to some degree, increase job control and creativity for white women and men and women of color (Smith 2001), the informality and redistribution of power that team systems often imply may implicitly work to intensify gender and ethnoracial inequality. The hierarchical career ladders that once offered some protections to historically excluded workers have been replaced by lateral team mobility shaped by friendship-driven informal reward systems (Williams, Muller, and Kilanski 2012); the discrete job descriptions that held out the possibility of separating job role from normative gender role are subordinated to gendered norms of team responsibility (Ollilainen and Calasanti 2007); and managers' deployment of racial exclusion may be reinvested in racially dominant members of work teams (Vallas 2003b). That is, a broader distribution of power to workers does not uniformly ensure more equality (for a different view, see Kalev 2009).

DIVERSITY REGIMES: DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES OF INEQUALITY AND EGALITARIANISM

The last few decades of managerial interest in workplace diversity and worker participation addressed different concerns of corporate managers as well as those of worker cooperatives. Both types of managerial and cooperative interventions in traditional work arrangements have affected workplace inequalities, engaging with what Joan Acker has called "inequality regimes," which she defines in terms of ". . .interrelated practices, processes, actions, and meanings that result in and maintain class, gender and racial inequalities within particular organizations" (Acker 2006b:443; cf. Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). As in her earlier influential conceptualization of "gendered organizations" (1990), Acker proposes that organizational structures embed and enact beliefs about who workers are not only in workplace characteristics like the division of labor, but also less obvious ones like scheduling, separation of childcare from job sites, ways of doing deference to organizational superiors, and dress codes (Acker 2006a). Here, however, she highlights the interpenetration of different forms of inequality with each other: that, for instance, we may note the gender inequality in asking a female corporate VP to provide snacks for a meeting, but fail to recognize how such a request is predicated on built-in organizational class inequality that allows managers to require waged workers to perform service labor. Indeed, these interpenetrated processes have been noted in empirical studies of discrimination (Ortiz and Roscigno 2009). Although inequality regimes typically function to naturalize inequalities, their success in this regard depends on two important characteristics: their visibility and legitimacy. In Acker's view, where inequality regimes have grown more visible (rather than being taken for granted by employees), and where the legitimacy of regimes has come into dispute, the prospects of change are proportionally increased.

Interestingly, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) use Acker's term as a conceptual tool with which to grasp variations in diversity practices arising after the Civil Rights Act. We believe they are right to rely on the inequality regime concept as an analytic device, but that they have made only partial use of the concept's value. Owing to their emphasis on macro-level, national processes that shaped the trajectory of desegregation, their analysis is unable to capture the *meanings* that particular inequality regimes acquire. Nor can they characterize the organizational processes that give rise to various *types* of regimes, as McCall (2005) has sought to do in her work on regional variations in the "configurations of inequality" in the United States. In short, their use of Acker's term cannot easily reveal how and why particular regimes emerge, nor how they work to reproduce inequalities among particular groups.

We argue for retaining the regime concept but modifying it in ways that specify the interrelations between its constitutive elements. First, we find it useful to speak more specifically of "diversity regimes," by which we mean the formal provisions that firms develop in order to regulate social differences among different categories of employees. We see diversity regimes as one of three elements that jointly constitute the structure of inequality within the firm. The first element, or what we have called *governance systems*, essentially involves the exercise of power and authority over labor. Governance systems may be more or less hierarchical, and rely on any of various types of control (e.g., simple, technical, normative, "concertive") and legitimation.

The second element is what Polletta (2004) has called the *institutional schemas* that workers establish among themselves—that is, the meanings and identities they develop as they make sense of their work and themselves. Here we envision the institutionalized norms shared among employees—the establishment's subculture, or, in Fine's (1979) terms, the firm's "idioculture"—which shapes the ways in which workers experience and respond to their work situations.

The third element—that of *diversity regimes*—is composed of the formal diversity management concepts and practices that firms invoke as they define and regulate status group behavior within the firm. Diversity regimes typically seek to legitimate the firm's treatment of employee rights and obligations in the eyes of multiple audiences (not only actors in the environment but also employees). Ironically, diversity regimes can be expected to perpetuate the advantages of dominant groups, however implicitly (Berrey 2014), not least because they differentially position workers to make claims to such scarce job rewards as promotions, pay, and autonomy. Our analysis will trace the interrelations among these three elements, paying particular attention to the ways diversity regimes shape and are in turn shaped by their firms' governance systems and institutional schemas.

The question then emerges: What types of diversity regimes have emerged within the contemporary workplace? Some preliminary efforts can be found in micro-structurally oriented scholarship that identifies the internal workings of particular regimes, such as the influential work of Ely and Thomas (2001; see also Benschop 2001; Berrey 2014). The Ely and Thomas study, although limited to analysis of race, contrasts the "diversity perspectives" found within three different organizational settings: (1) an "integration and learning" perspective, based on a deep commitment to mutual understanding at work; (2) an "access and legitimacy" perspective, in which firms hired employees of color in an effort to gain access to minority clients or customers; and (3) a "discrimination and fairness" perspective where diversity was conceived purely in terms of numerical inclusion, which implied that racial inequality no longer had any bearing on social interactions within the workplace itself. Ely and Thomas' key finding is that the meanings diversity assumed varied sharply, with important implications for the distribution of opportunity among dominant and minority groups within each firm (cf. Padavic and Ely 2013; Berrey 2014).

Similar patterns are reported in an important study by Benschop (2001), who compared an insurance and a telecommunications firm in the Netherlands. The insurance company's "numerical inclusion" model of diversity stressed recruitment as the sole practice with which to address social difference. Group relations and dynamics were left unmanaged, resulting in sharp boundaries and status distinctions among employees that powerfully impeded workplace communication. The telecom firm, by contrast, viewed diversity as a fundamental part of its high-performance work organization, and thus fostered a more explicit emphasis on group differences and cultural pluralism as essential parts of the firm's culture and operations. Although this approach generated some cynicism, it did provide an organizational vocabulary that allowed for and even encouraged employee discussion and learning across ethnic, national, gender, and linguistic lines.

The foregoing discussion calls attention to important areas warranting further research. If the studies by Ely and Thomas and Benschop are any guide, it may be useful to think of diversity regimes as spanning a continuum from more instrumental or *utilitarian* conceptions of diversity at one end—as in Ely and Thomas' "discrimination and fairness" and "access and legitimacy," or Benschop's "numerical inclusion"—to the more moral or *communitarian* conceptions at the other, as seen in both Ely and Thomas' "integration and learning" and Benschop's "pluralist" models. While diversity regimes at the latter, communitarian end of the continuum encourage employees to learn from and positively value the various differences found among their ranks, regimes at the other, utilitarian end view diversity in purely numerical terms, and then only as a means to the generation of revenues. Utilitarian diversity regimes may therefore close off discussion of social differences entirely, or else view such differences as business assets whose value is defined entirely in monetary terms. Similarly, organizational power in such regimes is assigned on the basis of its "businesslike" ability to generate value for the firm rather than its "social" ability to reduce alienation and increase joy (Taylor 1994), as it would be in a more communitarian firm.

Approaching diversity regimes in this way enables us to address a number of questions empirically. First, how do various types of diversity regimes seem to operate? What conditions govern their emergence, and how do they shape the inequalities that come to be established within work organizations more generally? Second, and of particular importance here, how do diversity regimes affect the ability of worker cooperatives to implement alternative, nonhierarchical or democratic forms of work organization? Finally, where regimes implicitly elide or silence discourse about diversity, how does the informal culture established among employees respond to this suppression of discourse about social difference?

METHODS

To address these questions, we compare two entirely worker-owned companies in the "Golden Valley" region of Northern California, a big box–sized natural foods retailer we call "One World Natural Grocery" and a nationally distributed producer of organic sourdough baked goods we call "People's Daily Bread Bakery."[4] Each was founded in the 1970s as a participatory-democratic collective by a handful of all or mostly all white, middle-class countercultural youth, and each now has 100–250 multiracial and primarily working-class employees.

Our analysis is based on a mixture of qualitative and archival research performed by the first author. Qualitative research included a total of 63 semistructured interviews, 47 of which were conducted on-site; approximately 600 hours of on-site observation at the two workplaces; approximately 100 hours of observation of members of both cooperatives at local and regional conferences; and approximately 20 hours of off-site observation of official and informal social gatherings of both companies' employees. In total, this constituted approximately 800 hours engaged with members of the two companies.

The research also included analysis of several comparable documents at both sites: employee manuals, financial and cultural orientation handouts, advertising materials, meeting minutes and agendas, promotional materials, training and policy manuals, and redacted internal financial documents for all members during the 2003–2004 fiscal year specifying individual earnings, ethnicity/race, gender, work group, and tenure. Additional analysis was also made of available historical documents, including mission statements and meeting agendas and minutes (dating back to 1982 for the bakery and 1986 for the grocery, but with missing months and years in both cases) for each site, bakery photo albums, and videos of grocery parties from 1991.

Both the research and the analytic coding were conducted in three stages. In the first stage, from November 2001 to October 2002, Meyers conducted 12 formal interviews, made 2–4 visits to the sites, observed 1–3 meetings at each site, and attended a West Coast worker cooperative conference with participants of both sites, making field "jottings" (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995:20) throughout. During this time, she began to "ask questions of field notes" (Emerson et al. 1995:146) as she transcribed her interviews, and developed initial codes that sensitized her to issues of participatory and managerial control, the salience of working-class involvement in the two co-ops, and the increasing importance of gender in organizing work relations in the bakery.

During the second stage, from July through October 2003, Meyers spent 12 weeks at the two sites, averaging nine hours per day, five days per week, and six weeks at each site, primarily engaged in nonparticipant but occasionally in participant observation. Each day she shadowed at least one worker from the beginning to the end of their shift, and conducted a semistructured informal interview with them. The bakery's mandatory eight-hour workdays meant that she only shadowed and surveyed one worker per day there (for a total of 19 interviews), but grocery workers' more flexible shifts meant that she often covered two workers' shifts on a given day (for a total of 26 interviews). In both cases, she accepted invitations to social gatherings of workers after or between work shifts, which seemed to happen (and/or be inclusive toward her) roughly twice as often at the grocery. At all times Meyers wrote jottings, and spent one to two hours after each observation transforming them into typed or handwritten field notes and memos (Emerson et al. 1995:49, 100). Both inductive and deductive analysis of her writings helped her generate further and more specific codes relating to organizational bureaucracy, organizational culture, and the interrelations between social class, gender, and ethnicity/race, and begin to reframe questions as the centrality of these issues emerged. This was still a period of "open coding," of identifying themes derived from review of field notes (Emerson et al. 1995:150–51).

The third stage of the research, from October 2003 until September 2006, involved less intensive field engagement (four meeting observations, three orientations, three interviews, and two days of archival research at the bakery; eight meeting observations, two days of archival research, and two social gatherings at the grocery; and observation of and participation in two local worker cooperative network meetings and two West Coast worker cooperative conferences), and more analysis of historical and contemporary documents, including financial documents provided by both firms that covered the 2003 period of intensive observation. During this final stage, every field note and reproduced archival note was transcribed and coded. Meyers used HyperRESEARCH to conduct a fine-grained analysis of all transcribed material, and developed a list of eight "focused codes" (Emerson et al. 1995:160–61) that included several subcodes (i.e., the master code "Social Differences" was subdivided into "age and ability," "social class," "ethnicity and race," "language," "gender," "sexuality," and "diversity/antioppression training").

The combination of recollective interviews, observation, and documents helps us triangulate the histories presented by members. By following organizational members and their narratives over more than four years, and by moving back and forth between observational and analytical modes, we have identified significant practices that reproduced and diminished diversity regimes.

FINDINGS

The two establishments we discuss below both reflect a social justice approach to work, a belief that capitalist workplaces can be reformed to reduce the injuries they inflict on their workers. "People's Daily Bread Bakery" began in the mid-1970s as a spin-off from a Left-leaning worker-cooperative general store in a suburban part of the Golden Valley that was financed by family donations to the five founders. "One World Natural Grocery" was the formalization of a produce-buying club created by an urban ashram (spiritual community) devoted to the teachings of a then-popular Indian guru who had captured the interest of many from the New Left (Kelley 1974). Through similar fortuitous circumstances, both were able to broaden membership to 20–30 worker-owners by the beginning of the 1980s.

Initially, both embodied the "collectivist-democratic" practices described by Joyce Rothschild (Rothschild-Whitt 1979): decentralized and nonhierarchical experience typically independent of recruitment and tasks and roles thereafter rotated; recruitment facilitated and social control achieved by a sense of personal and moral connection and obligation within the membership; decisions made through deliberation and consensus of all members; rules and policies minimized in favor of individual and specific cases; and size intentionally limited to permit face-to-face deliberation and meaningful social bonds. At both cooperatives, new workers were expected to "buy in," or make a financial investment, and thus become member-owners holding a single voting share. As was typical of such organizations, both the bakery and the grocery were fairly gender balanced, all or almost all white, and primarily composed of college-educated young people from middle-class families.

By the time of our study in the early years of the new century (and persisting as of this writing), People's Daily Bread Bakery and One World Natural Grocery were still entirely worker-owned cooperatives, with the majority of new workers becoming member-owners once they achieved a minimum tenure (roughly a year), completed a series of orientation sessions, and received approval from their work group.[5] In spite of their apparent similarities, however, the two worker cooperatives had metamorphosed in several important ways over time. Some of these structural shifts were equivalent. Each company now offered relatively strong earnings, security, and benefits for typically working-class jobs, and—in contrast to many cooperatives founded in the 1970s—their members were now ethnoracially diverse and primarily from working-class families. Such stability and financial success were at least partly because of the significant growth of both firms: the bakery had over 100 workers in 2003, and the grocery twice that.

But the development of the two organizations also diverged from one another. This divergence first manifested itself during a period of financial crises in the 1980s that threatened the very survival of each establishment. Their different responses to these threats initiated processes at each cooperative that had structural and cultural consequences that differed across the two firms.

In the early 1990s, the bakery encountered a series of organizational and financial crises that followed hard upon local economic downturns of the mid- and late 1980s, posing a major threat that generated far-reaching discussion and debate among its members. One crisis, identified as a turning point by the three senior members who were present at the time, stemmed from the discovery of deceptive financial reporting by one of the founding members, a charismatic man whom they described as having a history of using his own money to start projects when his ideas were voted down by the others, and then recouping his investment when the project paid off. Described as "our Jim Jones" by the bakery's current CEO, referencing the leader of the Northern California People's Temple, the miscreant chose to leave the cooperative rather than capitulate to its will. But "we didn't have enough Kool-Aid to go around, so we had to try to make it work for us all," said the CEO. By using this reference to an infamous cult, the CEO meant to capture the cooperative's shift away from the principles of collectivist democracy that had inspired its inception. Adopting a system of formalized, hierarchical governance and management was, as described by all those present at the time, essential to the bakery's very survival. After bitter debate, members voted to hire consultants to aid in their restructuring: to create a distinct category of managers, and then to attach wage and later salary differentials to managerial positions. Although the bakery recruited some managers internally (thus favoring the local knowledge of members over formally credentialed MBAs), these changes signified the firm's partial retreat from the principles of social justice through a partial restoration of the very governance structure which the cooperative had initially sought to transcend.

A very different set of developments unfolded as the grocery sought to cope with its own crisis, largely borne of highly turbulent relations with its sponsoring spiritual community. As members sought to cope with such shifts, which had financial, organizational and ideological consequences, they adopted an increasingly formalized approach toward internal operations, and thus also moved away from the antirationalizing aspects of its initial collectivist-democratic ethos. Yet the grocery's members elected to retain a good proportion of day-to-day and long-term power in decentralized work groups through a hybrid direct/representative governance structure. Most decisions were divided between participatory democratic work groups, representative democratic committees, and the monthly direct-democratic membership meeting with some intentional overlap built in to require regular interaction between representative and direct sites of power. Day-to-day decisions were made autonomously by the fourteen work groups; long-term financial decision-making power was held by a nine-member board of directors elected from among the grocery's workers; an elected coordinating committee oversaw the physical plant as a whole and adjudicated disputes between work groups; and the monthly membership meeting held the power to make changes to bylaws or other policy, direct the elected committees to act, or recall elected committee members.

To understand the consequences of these and other transformations at these two establishments, we develop a fuller account of each organization's internal arrangements.

People's Daily Bread Bakery

The bakery adopted a traditional, vertical form of management as a strategy to meet workers' needs for safe, stable, and reasonably remunerative jobs, albeit one that was nominally overseen by a board of directors elected from the workforce. Reflecting its indifference to MBAs as managerial prerequisite, only three of the bakery's 14 managers and administrators had degrees beyond the high school diploma in 2003, and only those three came from middle-class families. At the bakery, social differences other than economic class were given little importance or value. Individual workers and managers commonly defined the bakery's mission as that of advancing the interests of working people. This narrow conception of class interest as solely financial (rather than encompassing worker control and economic democracy) was at times explicitly expressed, as when the CEO explained that "working-class people don't have time for endless meetings," by which he meant that broader concerns were a luxury for which bakery members had little taste. The bakery's emphasis on class-based schemas and identities marginalized questions about race, ethnicity, or gender. Indeed, the latter differences were often posited as distinct from the performance of production and were given little attention except when conflict explicitly surfaced.

By the time of our study, bakery employment had become much more racially inclusive than at its inception. But it had also become much more segregated by both gender and race (see Table 1). Although its founding workforce had been roughly gender-balanced, by the time of our study it had become 85 percent male. Women were now largely concentrated in two categories: office jobs and route sales. Men, by contrast, were found in all job categories, comprised the majority of management, and were especially concentrated in manual occupations. Fully 50 of 51 manual or production workers were men. Equally important was the implicitly racialized nature of the latter job categories, which were disproportionately (69 percent) filled by Latinos. While the bakery workforce was only 56 percent white, its management was 80 percent white. Eighty-five percent of the bakery's workers of color were concentrated in the hardest, most tightly controlled, and lowest paid labor of production. Overall the bakery's division of labor had developed a clearly gendered and racialized cast.

Job segregation by gender and race/ethnicity was not intentional at the bakery. Reflecting their desire to preserve their egalitarian commitments, bakery members supported a policy requiring at least two women and two nonmanagers to sit on the board of directors, the body that nominally supervises the managers. Despite regular disparagement by managers, this policy remained on the books long after the transition. But it did not preserve or extend egalitarianism.

Half the women at the bakery were clustered in the all-women and white-majority office (four white, two Latina), whose manager, Pam, was a white woman. Office workers—whose desk labor entailed managing the books, accepting and tracking orders, and processing purchasing—were ensconced in the upper floor and sat in a small air-conditioned room partitioned into cubicles. Their working schedules were far more certain than those of production workers, and women office workers were never expected to rotate into jobs on the production floor. Such differences in working conditions were accompanied by sharp status differences as well. When moving about the establishment, women office workers took care to avoid walking through the production floor. There were good practical reasons for such aversive behavior—walking through production meant wearing closed-toed shoes and donning the mandatory hairnets and earplugs—but there were symbolic forms of social distance operating in both directions. Manual workers had in effect colonized the women's bathroom on the lower floor, for example, often storing bicycles in it and otherwise repurposing that restroom in ways that several women found off-putting. Office women were the first to warn the researcher about the "salty" language used by production workers—a sharp contrast to their own substitutions of "darn" and "shoot" for curse words. Overall, the office was a tidy, reserved group tucked carefully away from the louder and messier parts of the bakery.

TABLE 1. Bakery and Grocery Workforce and Occupational Demographics

	People's Daily Bread Bakery			One World Natural Grocery		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
All	82 (85 percent)	14 (15 percent)	96	84 (46 percent)	100 (54 percent)	184
Whites	42 (44 percent)	12 (13 percent)	54 (56 percent)	58 (31 percent)	55 (30 percent)	113 (61 percent)
People of color	40 (42 percent)	2 (2 percent)	42 (44 percent)	27 (15 percent)	44 (24 percent)	71 (39 percent)
Administrative and clerical	9 (60 percent)	6 (40 percent)	15	9 (50 percent)	9 (50 percent)	18
Whites	7 (47 percent)	5 (33 percent)	12 (80 percent)	7 (39 percent)	6 (33 percent)	13 (72 percent)
People of color	2 (13 percent)	1 (7 percent)	3 (20 percent)	2 (11 percent)	3 (17 percent)	5 (28 percent)
Manual	50 (98 percent)	1 (2 percent)	51	19 (40 percent)	28 (60 percent)	47
Whites	15 (29 percent)	1 (2 percent)	16 (31 percent)	15 (32 percent)	15 (32 percent)	30 (64 percent)
People of color	35 (69 percent)	0 (0 percent)	35 (69 percent)	7 (percent)	10 (21 percent)	17 (36 percent)
Service	23 (77 percent)	7 (23 percent)	30	54 (45 percent)	65 (55 percent)	119
Whites	20 (67 percent)	6 (20 percent)	26 (87 percent)	36 (30 percent)	34 (29 percent)	70 (59 percent)
People of color	3 (10 percent)	1 (3 percent)	4 (13 percent)	18 (15 percent)	31 (26 percent)	49 (41 percent)

Notes: Administrative and clerical workers included members of the administrative, marketing, and office work groups (except two direct-service workers), and all managers at the bakery; all members of the office work group at the grocery. Manual workers included all members of the maintenance, production, shipping, and transit work groups at the bakery; all members of maintenance, bulk, refrigerated, and produce work groups at the grocery. Service workers included two members of the office work group who did direct sales to the public and all members of the route sales and delivery work group; all members of the cashier, customer service, and seven additional sales category work groups at the grocery.

In contrast, the Latino-majority production work group was composed entirely of men, with a Mexican-American man, Charlie, as its manager. Production work—tending the sourdough starter in rolling vats, mixing the various recipes in a 12-foot high mechanical bowl reminiscent of an industrial cement mixer, panning and depanning hundreds of racks of baked goods into and out of the horse trailer—sized ovens, feeding them through a slicing machine, and packing them into stacks of boxes to be whisked away on forklifted pallets—was not only louder, dirtier, and more physically taxing, but also the most regulated and surveilled work at the bakery. Workers were expected to be available for on-call shifts on at least one of their days off. Timecard accuracy was carefully checked by assistant managers, workers needed permission to take scheduled and bathroom breaks, and missing three shifts typically resulted in termination. Production workers' hours—scheduled around the clock in three overlapping production shifts and one cleaning shift—were also the most unpredictable: managers presented workers with biweekly schedules in which start times could vary by as much as four hours on a given day. Start times and days off could change each biweekly period, and days off were not guaranteed to be consecutive. Posted schedules were kept under managerial lock, and informal shift trades between workers resulted in disciplinary action. Moreover, the bakery's members had voted to adopt a policy of mandatory full-time work—a scheduling imperative that of course guaranteed workers higher annual earnings, but at the expense of flexibility or family caretaking. Such factors surely underlay at least part of the gender erosion that had occurred in the bakery's workforce.

Scheduling practices were not the only factor that helped produce job segregation at the bakery. Although the majority of bakery managers were white men (6 of 10), the proportion of women managers was twice as high (30 percent) as the bakery's overall workforce (15 percent). Yet women's higher proportion of managerial positions did not translate into greater job opportunities for women. This was partly because of a tendency to engage in homosocial hiring by managers, and partly because of widely held stereotypes concerning ideal or optimal workers for given positions. For example, Pam, the office manager, voiced a commonly held belief when she observed that "men simply don't like working around women"—ignoring Keith, the personnel officer seated 10 feet away but reporting directly to the CEO rather than to her. When asked why so few women were employed in the bakery's production jobs, almost all interviewees voiced the belief that "women don't like hot and dirty work." Indeed, Charlie, the production manager, was one of only three bakery members who acknowledged that this belief—a virtual mantra in the bakery—couldn't easily be squared with the long history of women's employment in bakery production jobs. In Charlie's view, however, women were more likely to be injured on the job, which made him wary of hiring them. Yet this claim also turned out to be false: it was bakery *men* who were more likely to be injured, and their injuries were more likely to result in lost days of productivity and greater medical claims.

Interviews across the organization (and particularly with Charlie, his assistant managers, and all but two of the production workers that were interviewed) revealed that men—particularly Latinos—were commonly viewed as the ideal production workers.

When the researcher probed further and asked why, Charlie observed that most women simply lacked the work experience necessary to succeed in food production. Yet many of the Latino men who were hired into production jobs *also* lacked experience in food production; their work histories (largely in landscaping jobs) were reframed as evidence that they could work under hot and dirty conditions. Such a flexible reading of applicants' work histories was not extended to Latinas, however, whose experience in housecleaning—arguably involving no shortage of strenuous and dirty work, and certainly more intensely time-constrained—was viewed as having little relevance for their job applications.

Ethnicity, too, seemed to hinge on stereotypes and discursive constructs. When bakery workers were asked to account for the clustering of Latinos in production, they gave several reasons. One was that the Latino workers had mainly emigrated from the same region in Jalisco, Mexico, and shared similar backgrounds and network ties (a fact which might have accounted for half the Latino workers, but not those from other regions or the nonimmigrants). A second reason given was that the Latinos were members of the same church, and thus shared job information along community lines (this relationship was not supported by researcher inquiry). A third account pointed to the "*jefe* mentality" Latinos presumably held, which made them more willing to defer to managerial authority (a claim that could not be squared with the constancy of production worker complaint and noncompliance, as well as their impressive self-management skills during frequent long stretches when assistant managers were upstairs doing paperwork). Despite the weak empirical evidence to support such claims, the regularity with which they were offered shifted attention from organizational practices to the preferences of individual job applicants. The result was that factors accounting for the bakery's job segregation by race-ethnicity and gender were exogenized, or relegated to the social world beyond the organization's boundaries and thus its responsibility.

The notion that women preferred clean or sanitized work, or that Latinos preferred managerial supervision, had little apparent relevance for jobs in the sales and delivery work group. Although managed by a white man, this work group was relatively integrated by race/ethnicity and gender: its 18 members included five white women and a Latino assistant manager, and an African-American man. The job required both the physical stamina to rapidly transfer and stock product and the "soft" or interpersonal skills to negotiate shelf space with store managers (the bakery's customers). Despite the presence of handheld units that tracked deliveries and time, the job was among the most autonomous of all positions in the bakery: drivers loaded their trucks together at the depot, and then took off in different directions on routes of varying length and store density, with little actual discipline or surveillance by the depot manager.

Yet, across race and gender, drivers did not describe the pleasures of their jobs in terms of this autonomy. Indeed, like other bakery workers outside the office, self-presentations in response to prompts to tell the researcher "a bit about yourself" tended to minimize personal aspects that did not reflect a traditional class narrative. For instance, Leslie, a white woman, described herself as a route sales driver whose good job allowed her to support her family despite having only a high school diploma. It only emerged later that Leslie's family included her coworker lesbian partner, that three of the five women in this work group were out lesbians, and Leslie deeply enjoyed the freedom from managerial oversight as she drove her route. Despite her personal feelings, her appreciation for autonomy and her non-normative sexuality were both excluded from widely shared institutional schemas that defined and identified her as a worker. Instead, as in most other parts of the bakery, the valorized institutional schema centered on notions of earnings and job security, the typically working-class—and white, masculine—patterns reported by Goldthorpe et al. (1968), Halle (1984), and Collinson (1992).

In adapting to the bakery's hierarchical governance system, workers had developed institutional schemas that were so densely populated with traditionally white and masculine "working class" meanings and identities that they obscured the operation of gender and race/ethnicity at work and marginalized the interests of working-class white women and men and women of color. Indeed, at the bakery, questions of race and gender were seen as distractions or as extrinsic influences that ought to have no relevance for the performance of bakery work.

Perhaps the clearest indication of this point can be found in the bakery's response to ethnoracial and gender conflicts that arose in the early 1990s. Faced with sharp conflicts (shouting matches between members, racialized and gender-based insults, even death threats to sexual minorities) upper management responded by hiring diversity trainers to come in and work with the entire staff over the course of a week. These consultants engaged bakery employees in a series of workshops that successfully promoted better interactions. They "just [let] people be who they are. You know, 'cause that doesn't have anything to do with business," explained Keith, the middle-class Latino personnel manager. This approach posited ethnoracial, religious, and sexual concerns as external struggles that had unfortunately and illegitimately leaked into the organization, could be managed with the psychotherapeutic techniques of identifying common humanity, and could be organizationally dealt with in an intensive intervention. In this way, the bakery effectively delimited these social inequalities as external, interpersonal, and irregular. This articulation was wholly different from the internal and structural class inequality that their policies attempted to remedy through such ongoing practices as promotion without educational credentials, or profit sharing among member-owner and non-member cooperative employees alike. That is, the bakery's institutional schemas constructed workers as classed, with other social features viewed as external to their "workerness" and hence comprising distractions that should not be allowed to interfere with the performance of the worker cooperative. In this respect, we begin to see a diversity regime that lies closer to the utilitarian than to the communitarian end of the diversity continuum, even in a worker-owned cooperative. Discourse about gender and race were assigned little or no value; troubling forms of segregation were obscured amid institutional schemas emphasizing the bakery's relatively egalitarian address of class inequality. Once this discourse was formalized via fixed rules and practices (organizational charts, codified hiring criteria, and managerial systems for the scheduling of work shifts), such gender- and race-"blind" practices took firm root in the bakery.

One World Natural Grocery

For its part, the grocery pursued a distinctly different form of organization. As alluded to above, the grocery adopted a hybrid governance system that combined direct and representative governance, placing power and decision-making authority in a robust system of self-managed work groups and committees elected from the workforce. This system distributed power along a horizontal axis to the decentralized, direct-democratic work groups on the one hand, and along a vertical axis to representatives who were elected to serve on governance and management committees. The effect of this governance system was to lend voice to groups that might elsewhere have been denied access to resources, power, autonomy, and other job rewards, and to create solid (if temporary) clusters of power that could act on behalf of the cooperative as a whole.

This is not to say that grocery workers seamlessly adapted to this unique organizational structure. Indeed, workers criticized their hybrid-democratic practice in work group and membership meetings fairly regularly, either as agenda items aimed at changing practices to create more representative power or as muttered (and occasionally shouted) complaints. Grocery workers frequently complained about the length of meetings and committee "inefficiency" as insufficiently "businesslike." At the same time, no bakery workers spoke with any great excitement about their system of governance and management, while many grocery workers did so. Indeed, more than half of all grocery workers cited self-management practices as one of the things they liked most about their job.

Yet this is not to say that the grocery was a collective either. Despite its rejection of managerial hierarchy in favor of elected and distributed authority, the grocery had become at least partially bureaucratized, as evident in the adoption of formal practices governing hiring and firing, training, job descriptions, pay, benefits, and scheduling; in the valuation of externally certified expertise; and in the intense level of documentation that suffused the organization. The degree to which the grocery formalized its hybrid distribution of power distinguished it from the earlier collectivist-democracy cooperatives and from the exclusion and domination of members of marginalized communities endemic to the 1970s "structureless" organizations (Rothschild-Whitt 1979; Mansbridge 1980; Freeman [1970] 1984; Jackall and Crain 1984; Rothschild and Whitt 1986; Ferguson 1991). At the same time, its degree of horizontal governance system distinguished it from the bakery—and from investor-owned and -managed businesses in which managers tend to exclude and dominate their hourly employees.

The grocery's organizational structure could hardly get inside people's heads to erase individual-level race, gender, and class biases in workers' hiring decisions. But it could more widely distribute hiring authority and devise methods to minimize personal biases. Efforts in this direction were evident in the fact that each of the 14 work groups was required to elect a three-member hiring committee, whose members were charged with using formalized hiring criteria in an effort to block individual bias from becoming organizational practice. For instance, all of the older white women in the housewares work group interviewed expressed highly personal preferences and beliefs about candidate suitability. Thus, one older white woman advocated hiring young men who might block what she characterized as a pattern of "naggy old woman" infighting. In much the same vein, a second older woman opined that there had been too many "ethnic" hires of Latino/as and Asian/Pacific Islanders. These beliefs and preferences were not reflected in actual hires, however, owing to the grocery's insistence on using formalized hiring criteria to equalize applicants' chances.

Similar to the bakery's overall demographic composition, the grocery was 61 percent white and 39 percent people of color (see Table 1). However, there was considerably more gender and ethnic diversity throughout the grocery's job structure than was found in the bakery. Latino/as comprised only half of the nonwhite group, and there were more women than men in each ethnoracial group. Beyond job access, socio-demographic characteristics such as race, gender, and class also had very little effect on power, wealth, or position: Although one of the two most powerful governing committees was dominated by white men and secondarily populated by white women, the other committee was largely comprised of women of color and white women. While this created some advantages for whites in determining the long-range direction of the cooperative, it did provide for a balanced distribution of power by race and gender. It also ensured a more equitable distribution of income: all committee work, like membership and work group meetings, was paid at workers' hourly rate. Indeed, women's average hourly earnings were the highest of any group (both as a whole and compared to men within racial designation).

That women's average *annual* earnings were not the highest reflected voluntarily shorter hours: many women organized work schedules around family care responsibilities, reducing pay but allowing them to retain their jobs. As long as the work group could fill the formal schedule of hours they created in their meetings, workers had autonomy over shift scheduling and could even apply for shifts in other work groups. This cross-training resulted in many workers shifting their base or "home" work group as interests and scheduling needs evolved over time. Between initial hiring practices and internal transfers, conventional patterns of gender and ethnoracial job segregation had evaporated. Women across race performed the typically masculinized manual labor of receiving and warehousing, and were members of the maintenance work group. White men and men of color likewise performed typically "feminized" labor as cashiers or salespeople selling personal care products in the bath and body work group.

In addition to scheduling and distribution of position, unusual versions of childcare support policies appeared to aid the recruitment and retention of women at the grocery, and particularly women of color. Apart from conventional policies allowing workers to set aside pre-tax income to spend on childcare, grocery workers also voted to provide wage increases of $1 an hour for each dependent child, explicitly intended to help workers who wanted to hire childcare from among the undocumented members of their Mexican and Central American immigrant communities.

It was not only surprising that the grocery should have a policy of "child pay" to facilitate extra-legal childcare arrangements, but also that workers could make and win an argument for this policy simultaneously as workers and as members of communities with many undocumented members. But these kinds of multiple identifications were common in grocery worker self-presentations. For instance, Jennifer, a white, working-class, high-school credentialed woman working the floor of the refrigerated section, differed from Leslie, the route sales driver in the bakery, in that she was initially silent about her earnings (later described as "excellent" when directly asked). Instead, she framed her job choice in terms of her appreciation of a workplace where people were free to express all facets of themselves, including their interpretation of gender and position in a continuum of sexuality, all within a context of cultural autonomy. Both narrative contours were unexpected, as Jennifer herself was in a heterosexual relationship with a cis-gendered man, and it seemed that she was at the mercy of her customers and their often obsessive natural-food demands. But over time it became clear that autonomy and pleasure in diversity were very common narrative frames at the grocery, creating institutional schemas that minimized a traditional conception of class and highlighted ethnoracial, gender, and sexuality characteristics as legitimate elements of what it meant to be a worker and member of the cooperative.

Especially revealing here is the way in which the grocery responded to racial and gender conflicts when they arose. Rejecting the diversity training model of external guidance but still seeking to learn from others with experience in such matters, the grocery searched for appropriate consultants and rejected one after another until it found some willing to train an internal group as an ongoing "Antioppression Task Force." This task force not only came to conduct annual, week-long workshops for small groups of grocery workers, but also to meet weekly to investigate and address instances of organizational inequality. Sally Helms, a white, middle-class member, explained that they tried to keep their work from becoming "more of a sensitivity training than an antioppression training," and did so by focusing more on structural and cultural organizational factors that fostered unequal outcomes than on members' emotional reactions or individual conflicts. The task force's language was incorporated into worker interactions and proposals for policy change: a working-class white woman described removing herself for re-election to the public relations committee as a way of "stepping back" to allow people of color to be the grocery's public face; a white working-class man felt that he could challenge coworkers' claims of "color blindness" with task force concepts of "power evasiveness." As with all committee work, task force members and trainees were paid for the hours they spent in these activities, legitimating this as integral to the grocery's function. By incorporating these activities into paid work, by rejecting individualizing psychotherapeutic frameworks, and by institutionalizing challenge to inequality, the grocery posited gender and ethnoracial inequalities as *internal, structural*, and *ongoing* workplace issues that were the legitimate terrain of workplace intervention. In this way, they defined mutual understanding across gender and race as co-equal criteria for organizational success. In this respect, members of the grocery exhibited a diversity regime that resembles Ely and Thomas's "integration and learning" regime, along with Benschop's pluralist one. Their diversity regime can be located toward the "communitarian" end of the continuum.

It's important to note that, relative to traditional corporations, both the grocery and the bakery achieved real gains for workers. Jobs in both companies were relatively

TABLE 2. Elements of Two Diversity Regimes: The Bakery and Grocery Compared

	People's Daily Bread Bakery	One World Natural Grocery
Governance structure	Hierarchical control via sharp vertical divisions	Hybrid distributed/representative control, based on robust system of self-directed work groups and elected committees
Institutional schemas	Class-based identities, stressing job security and earnings	Multicultural orientation stressing multiple identities
Level of gender and ethnoracial segregation	High	Low
View of racial and gender difference	Extraneous influences to be minimized at work	Endogenous influences to be discussed and appreciated
Diversity regime	Utilitarian: race and gender viewed as exogenous forces to be eliminated from work relations	Communitarian: race and gender viewed as endogenous forces warranting discussion and debate

secure, as neither the bakery nor the grocery could easily outsource or off-shore their jobs. Neither could their cooperatives be involuntarily purchased by a larger corporation. Despite the reduced autonomy bakery workers encountered, their annual earnings were nearly twice that of county average individual earnings in 2003, and worker compensation insurance reports showed the bakery to be among the physically safest of its size in the country. Grocery workers' earnings were significantly lower (Meyers 2011), but this was by choice: grocery workers elected to work many fewer hours per week, devoting more of their time to their personal lives. In these respects, the two establishments studied here provided unusually favorable employment opportunities.

Yet, despite these shared virtues and their similar origins, these two worker cooperatives developed in sharply distinct ways (see Table 2). The advantages of employment at the bakery were far more selectively distributed, privileging white men in multiple ways that were not found in the grocery. In the bakery, a governance system arose that required members to sacrifice much of their autonomy in the name of economic security, a choice that was rationalized in highly traditional and classed terms. What resulted were institutional schemas and identities that, by emphasizing class, marginalized the interests of historically excluded groups. Questions of race and gender came to be seen as irrelevant to work performance. Put differently, the bakery's members discursively constructed race and gender as incidental demographic statuses that should have no bearing on the performance of work. Indeed, posing rival sources of affiliation to class, race/ethnicity and gender were defined as extraneous affiliations that were best left outside the workplace. By contrast, this assumption of class primacy was constantly refused in the grocery, where class-based discourse was seamlessly woven into a wider fabric of concern for equality. Gender and racial influences were seen as warranting active and open discussion, fostering organizational policies and practices designed to minimize inequalities that could arise from these differences. While the diversity regime that took root in the bakery effectively silenced discourse about race and gender, the grocery's diversity regime instead invited members to engage in discourse about precisely these dimensions of social inequality.

CONCLUSIONS

Two of the major organizational shifts evident during the last quarter century—the effort to achieve more participatory structures, and the widespread adoption of diversity management—have typically been studied in isolation from one another, yielding one literature on team systems and worker participation, and a second one on diversity management. In this article, we have sought to connect these two themes, exploring in particular the meanings that come to be attached to "diversity" under conditions of expanded worker participation. Studying two worker-owned cooperatives, we have sought to unpack the varying ways in which diversity can be defined and the relation between such meanings and other features of the work organization. The results have been instructive, generating several implications for research in this field.

As we have shown, these two worker cooperatives exhibited dramatically different organizational configurations. Comparison of these sites provides at least two insights. First, it helps us better understand the *varied* meanings that diversity can assume even within the same organizational field and among establishments located within the same geographic area. Indeed, these two establishments were merely 50 miles apart, the grocery was the bakery's biggest local account, and at least one bakery worker had left for grocery employment during the time of our study. Second, the analysis enables us to identify and analyze interrelations among key elements of these work organizations, yielding a richer understanding of the stratifying processes that can impede workers' chances of successfully democratizing their own work organizations.

As we have noted, the two cooperatives in this study began in highly similar ways but eventually adopted distinct paths and modes of operation. In interpreting the ways these divergences unfolded, we attach especially strong importance to the governance structures that emerged in these two sites. We argue that the hierarchical structure of governance that arose in the bakery, for example, fostered a willingness among workers to embrace vertical divisions not only between managers and workers, but also among workers themselves. That is, the class binary that arose vertically was gradually generalized to the other, *non*-class statuses that workers held, conditioning workers to regard inequalities as legitimate. A parallel process unfolded with respect to the institutional schemas that arose in the bakery, where a class-based schema emerged in which the identities and meanings that workers adopted drew on their shared positions and interests *as* members of the working class. Over time, this schema narrowed into a singular wage-oriented form that highlighted the need for members to hold secure, good paying jobs that could provide for their families. This orientation, which implicitly aligned with traditional notions of the breadwinner norm and favored rigid job requirements (such as the mandatory 40-hour work week), unequally affected opportunities for men and women. The masculinized cast of this class schema further spilled over into the construction of authority. Because race, like gender, was marginalized as internally consequential, this proved highly favorable to white males in particular.

By contrast, the governance structure that developed in the grocery made relatively little use of any hierarchical logic. For one thing, its division of labor was not characterized by a distinct managerial category. Rather, its elaborate system of work groups and committees embodied a more horizontally oriented system of authority relations that distributed control more fully among workers themselves, empowering them to contest decisions made by elected, cross-work group committees. This governance structure also left substantial room for historically excluded groups (e.g., women, people of color, members of the working class, sexual nonconformists) to express their voice and represent their own needs. This governance structure, in turn, fostered institutional schemas that recognized and valued the multiple identities workers could embrace (e.g., committee member, parent, Latina, lesbian). Drawing on varied social justice concerns, a communitarian diversity regime arose that defined women, workers of color, and sexual minorities as fully equal members, and that found expression in the grocery's childcare practices, hiring policies, and worker self-presentations. Interestingly, this overall pattern—in which nonhierarchical governance structures help to erode job segregation—echoes an important study by Kalev (2009), who also found that nontraditional work structures greatly increased women's mobility prospects. Our analysis suggests that governance structures shape the schemas and identities that unfold at the workplace, with powerful effects on the way diversity is conceptualized and put into practice.

A second point that emerges in our analysis involves the forms that diversity regimes assumed at these two work establishments. As noted, the bakery exhibited sharp patterns of job segregation by gender and ethnoracial status. White men came to hold the least-surveilled positions within the bakery; white women were largely confined to clerical and "people" positions; Latinos were disproportionately clustered in dirty work; and Latinas could barely get in the door. On only three occasions did any members show an awareness of this pattern as a socially constructed arrangement, and then only when questioned on their initial interpretation. Instead almost all bakery members favored narratives that invoked workers' own individual preferences as the sources of such job disparities. Under these circumstances, when ethnic and gender conflict arose, the response was to implement a utilitarian diversity regime that aimed merely to eliminate explicit bias. Such an approach, however, left untouched the subtle schemas and narratives through which workers "did" race and gender on the shop floor itself. Because the diversity regime defined race and gender as exogenous to the performance of production, it also prevented workers from developing the discursive resources needed to perceive the social processes that underlay the segregated patterns that surrounded them at work. In short, the bakery's diversity regime served to obscure the structural and cultural sources of inequality among workers, implicitly reaffirming the individualistic account of job segregation that predominated at this firm (Berrey 2014).

In this respect, the contrast with the grocery could not be sharper. The communitarian diversity regime developed here sought to achieve much more than the mere elimination of individual bias. Rather, it actively defined the workplace as an arena in which antioppression tactics were to be energetically pursued. This fostered discourse about race and gender difference. It viewed the performance of race and gender as endogenous to the workplace itself. And it adopted a structurally oriented approach toward gender and ethnoracial segregation that called for constant vigilance regarding inequalities, particularly by tempering a desirable level of rationalized effectiveness and representative democratic governance with an equally desirable level of value-oriented egalitarianism realized through direct democratic worker control. Put simply, while the diversity regime at the bakery served to reproduce the racialized and gendered division of labor, the grocery's diversity regime instead enabled workers of all groups to establish and defend an egalitarian and democratic distribution of power and resources.

A further set of points arise from the sheer fact of the divergence we find across these two worker cooperatives. As briefly noted above, much of the extant sociological literature operates with an expectation of institutional isomorphism as a domain assumption. The notion here is that organizations, viewed as legitimacy-seeking entities, are compelled to signal their compliance with socially dominant norms, and as such tend to emulate the practices established in any given organizational field (Edelman et al. 2001; Dobbin 2009). In contrast, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) have suggested that the corporate landscape is increasingly marked by variations in inequality regimes across particular industries, regions, labor markets, and firms. Our findings clearly align with this latter view, underscoring how even highly similar, geographically proximate producer cooperatives can and do develop sharply disparate configurations of inequality and diversity regimes. More research is needed to grasp the range of variations that exist, both within the corporate sector and in the domain of worker cooperatives, as we have studied here.

One important question concerns the reasons for the structural and cultural divergences we observed in the trajectory of these two worker cooperatives. That is, how can we account for the sharply varying organizational patterns that developed across these two establishments? The evidence on this point is somewhat incomplete, but archival data and retrospective interviews with senior and former members were highly informative, and lead us to identify two sets of influences that underlay the divergent forms these two sites assumed. One stemmed from the ways in which the authority relations at these cooperatives were constituted and disrupted by the financial crises each encountered. As all interviews with senior members revealed, both the bakery and the grocery had relied on charismatic authority—of a founding member in the case of the bakery, and of a global spiritual leader in the case of the grocery—as a source of inspiration for their social justice mission. In the case of the bakery, an organizational crisis in an already constricted economy severely undermined the charismatic leader's own authority. These combined crises weakened the bakery membership's normative commitment to its collectivist-democracy. In the case of the grocery, the erosion of their leader's authority affected a more distant figure, leaving intact the commitment of local members, which gradually evolved into a more earthly, countercultural set of values and beliefs.

The second set of influences was the immediate local labor market surrounding the bakery and the grocery, which had some notable differences despite their relative proximity. The bakery workers faced greater labor market uncertainty, because of their location in a less densely countercultural and less densely industrialized region of the Golden Valley—differences that held a prominent place in countercultural memoirs and studies of alternative organizations in this region. According to two of three senior workers, these conditions made preserving countercultural jobs highly valuable, and a more traditional form of management appear as the more prudent course of action. At the grocery, by contrast, the somewhat greater labor market security workers perceived—including multiple local opportunities for employment in countercultural collectivist-democratic organizations—gave them more latitude in their commitment to the social justice framework that had informed their jobs from the beginning. They therefore felt more free to experiment with other models of democratic worker control. These different organizational conditions suggest that future research on workplace democracy should pay careful attention to the formative events that shape authority relations, for such influences can affect the path down which cooperatives and other worker-owned enterprises unfold for years to come.

A final observation is normative in nature, and concerns the lessons implied in the case of the grocery, which we believe illustrates many of the conditions that are necessary for the democratic ideal of worker empowerment at levels beyond the purely financial to be fulfilled. Key, we contend, is this workplace's ability to overcome the limits traditionally imposed on white women and men and women of color. Overcoming such limits, embracing a broadly multicultural conception of worker identity, and embracing a diversity regime that actively encouraged learning across demographic lines all contributed to the cultural strengths on which this workplace could rely. The handling of intergroup differences, then, is not a peripheral concern, but an issue that may well cut to the heart of the participatory ideal itself.

NOTES

[1]The authors wish to thank the NSF/FAD program, the University of California Labor and Education Research Fund, and the Rutgers School of Management and Labor Relations for intellectual and material support. We are indebted to Betty A. Dobratz, Martha Foschi, Sarah Jenkins, Jelle Mampaey, Joyce Rothschild, Lisa K. Waldner, and Patricia Zanoni for their helpful comments on previous drafts.

[2]We distinguish our focus on relations in production from a focus on those between producer and consumer (see Loe 1999).

[3]For kindred works that point toward interorganizational variation in the configuration of inequality, see Bank Muñoz (2008), Lee (1998), McKay (2006), and Salzinger (2003).

[4]Names of the companies and people observed and interviewed, identifying details, and names of locations within, and descriptions of the geographic area in which the worker cooperatives are situated have been altered to protect personal and organizational confidentiality.

[5]At the grocery, new workers were required to become members or be terminated; at the bakery, membership was voluntary and approximately 70 percent of eligible workers were members.

REFERENCES

Abell, Hilary. 2014. *Worker Cooperatives: Pathways to Scale*. Tacoma Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative.

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4(2):139–58.

——. 2006a. *Class Questions: Feminist Answers*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

——. 2006b. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations." *Gender & Society* 20(4):441–64.

Adler, Paul S. 1993. "The Learning Bureaucracy: New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc." Pp. 111–194 in *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 15, edited by B. L. Staw and L. L. Cummings. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ancona, Deborah G. and David F. Caldwell. 1992. "Demography and Design: Predictors of New Product Team Performance." *Organization Science* 3(3):321–41.

Appelbaum, Eileen, Thomas Bailey, Peter Berg, and Arne L. Kalleberg. 2000. *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High-Performance Work Systems Pay Off*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Bank Muñoz, Carolina. 2008. *Transnational Tortillas: Race, Gender, and Shop-Floor Politics in Mexico and the United States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Bell, Joyce M. and Douglas Hartmann. 2007. "Diversity in Everyday Discourse: The Cultural Ambiguities and Consequences of "'Happy Talk.'" *American Sociological Review* 72(6):895–914.

Benschop, Yvonne. 2001. "Pride, Prejudice and Performance: Relations between HRM, Diversity and Performance." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 12(7):1166–81.

Bernstein, Paul. 1982. "Necessary Elements for Effective Worker Participation in Decision-Making." Pp. 51–81 in *Workplace Democracy and Social Change*, edited by F. Lindenfeld and J. Rothschild-Whitt. Boston, MA: Porter Sargeant Publishers.

Berrey, Ellen. 2014. "Breaking Glass Ceilings, Ignoring Dirty Floors: The Culture and Class Bias of Diversity Management." *American Behavioral Scientist* 58(2):347–70.

Berry, Daphne P. 2013. "Effects of Cooperative Membership and Participation in Decision Making on Job Satisfaction of Home Health Aides." Pp. 3–25 in *Sharing Ownership, Profits, and Decision-Making in the 21st Century, Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory & Labor-Managed Firms*, edited by D. Kruse. Cambridge, MA: Emerald Group Publishing.

Berry, Daphne P. and Stu Schneider. 2011. "Improving the Quality of Home Health Aide Jobs: A Collaboration between Organized Labor and a Worker Cooperative." Pp. 59–89 in *Employee Ownership and Shared Capitalism: New Directions in Research*, edited by E. J. Carberry. Champaign, IL: Labor and Employement Relations Association.

Blasi, Joseph R., Richard B. Freeman, and Douglas L. Kruse. 2013. *The Citizen's Share: Putting Ownership Back into Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Breines, Wini. 1989. *Community and Organization in the New Left, 1962–1968: The Great Refusal*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Castilla, Emilio J. and Stephen Benard. 2010. "The Paradox of Meritocracy in Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55(4):543–676.

Chen, Katherine K. 2016. ""Plan Your Burn, Burn Your Plan": How Decentralization, Storytelling and Communification Can Support Participatory Practices." *The Sociological Quarterly* 57(1):71–97.

Collinson, David L. 1992. *Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity, and Workplace Culture*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Cotter, David A., Joan M. Hermsen, and Reeve Vanneman. 2004. *Gender and Work: The Continuity of Change*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Curl, John. 2009. *For All the People: Uncovering the Hidden History of Cooperation, Cooperative Movements, and Communalism in America*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

DiTomaso, Nancy. 2013. *The American Non-Dilemma: Racial Inequality without Racism*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dobbin, Frank. 2009. *Inventing Equal Opportunity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Dohse, Knuth, Ulrich Jürgens, and Thomas Malsch. 1985. "From 'Fordism' to 'Toyotaism'? The Social Organization of the Labor Process in the Japanese Automobile Industry." *Politics and Society* 14(2):115–46.

Edelman, Lauren B., Sally Riggs Fuller, and Iona Mara-Drita. 2001. "Diversity Rhetoric and the Managerialization of Law." *American Journal of Sociology* 106(6):1589–641.

Ely, Robin J. and David A. Thomas. 2001. "Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 46(2):229–73.

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ferguson, Ann Arnett. 1991. "Managing without Managers: Crisis and Resolution in a Collective Bakery." Pp. 108–32 in *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*, edited by M. Burawoy, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ferguson, Kathy E. 1984. *The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fine, Gary Alan. 1979. "Small Groups and Culture Creation: The Idioculture of Little League Baseball Teams." *American Sociological Review* 44(5):733–45.

Freeman, Jo. [1970] 1984. "The Tyranny of Structurelessness." Pp. 5–16 in *Untying the Knot: Feminism, Anarchism, and Organization*. London, England: Dark Star/Rebel Press.

Goldthorpe, John, David Lockwood, Frank Bechofer, and Jennifer Platt. 1968. *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviors*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, Laurie. 1995. *On the Line at Subaru-Isuzu: The Japanese Model and the American Worker*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Hacker, Sally. 1989. *Pleasure, Power and Technology*. London, England: Unwin Hyman.

Halle, David. 1984. *American's Working Man: Work, Home, and Politics among Blue Collar Property Owners*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Handel, Michael J. and David I. Levine. 2004. "Editor's Introduction: The Effects of New Work Practices on Workers." *Industrial Relations* 43(1):1–43.

Heckscher, Charles C. and Anne Donnellon. 1994. *The Post-Bureaucratic Organization: New Perspectives on Organizational Change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hoffmann, Elizabeth A. 2005. "Dispute Resolution in a Worker Cooperative: Formal Procedures and Procedural Justice." *Law & Society Review* 39(1):51–82.

Hoover, Melissa, Logan Harris, and Amy Johnson. 2012. *Preliminary Census of Worker Cooperatives in the United States*. San Francisco, CA: Democracy at Work Institute.

Jackall, Robert and Joyce Crain. 1984. "The Shape of the Small Worker Cooperative Movement." Pp. 88–104 in *Worker Cooperatives in America*, edited by R. Jackall. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Johnston, William B. and Arnold E. Packer. 1987. *Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Jones, Derek. 1979. "U.S. Producer Cooperatives: The Record to Date." *Industrial Relations* 18(3): 342–57.

Kalev, Alexandra. 2009. "Cracking the Glass Cages? Restructuring and Ascriptive Inequality at Work." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(6):1591–643.

Kalev, Alexandra, Frank Dobbin, and Erin Kelly. 2006. "Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Programs." *American Sociological Review* 71:589–617.

Kasmir, Sharryn. 1996. *The Myth of Mondragón: Cooperatives, Politics, and Working-Class Life in a Basque Town*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kelley, Ken. 1974. "Guru Maharaj Ji: Over the Hill at 16? 15?" *Ramparts Magazine*, Vol. 12 February: 40–44.

Kelly, Erin and Frank Dobbin. 1998. "Employer Response to Antidiscrimination Law, 1961 to 1996." *American Behavioral Scientist* 41(7):960–84.

Kleinman, Sherryl. 1996. *Opposing Ambitions: Gender and Identity in an Alternative Organization*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kruse, Douglas, Joseph R. Blasi, and Rhokeun Park. 2010. "Shared Capitalism in the U.S. Economy: Prevalence, Characteristics, and Employee Views of Financial Participation in Enterprises." Pp. 41–75 in *Shared Capitalism at Work: Employee Ownership, Profit and Gain Sharing, and Broad-Based Stock Options*, edited by D. Kruse, R. Freeman, and J. R. Blasi. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kunda, Gideon. [1992] 2006. *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Culture, Revised Edition*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Leach, Darcy K. 2013. "Culture and the Structure of Tyrannylessness." *The Sociological Quarterly* 54:159–228.

——. 2016. "When Freedom Is *Not* an Endless Meeting: A New Look at Efficiency in Consensus-Based Decision Making." *The Sociological Quarterly* 57(1):36–70.

Lee, Ching Kwan. 1998. *Gender and the South China Miracle: Two Worlds of Factory Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Leikin, Steven Bernard. 2004. *The Practical Utopians: American Workers and the Cooperative Movement in the Gilded Age*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Lichtenstein, Richard, Jeffrey A. Alexander, Kimberly Jinnett, and Esther Ullman. 1997. "Embedded Intergroup Relations in Interdisciplinary Teams: Effects on Perceptions of Level of Team Integration." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 33(4):413–34.

Loe, Meika. 1999. "Feminism for Sale: Case Study of a Pro-Sex Feminist Business." *Gender & Society* 13(6):705–32.

Mansbridge, Jane J. 1980. *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. New York: Basic Books.

McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30(3):1771–800.

McKay, Steven C. 2006. *Satanic Mills or Silicon Islands?: The Politics of High-Tech Production in the Philippines*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

McTague, Tricia, Kevin Stainback, and Donald Tomaskovic Devey. 2009. "An Organizational Approach to Understanding Sex and Race Segregation in U.S. Workplaces." *Social Forces* 87(3):1499–527.

Mellor, Mary, Janet Hannah, and John Stirling. 1988. *Worker Cooperatives in Theory and Practice.* Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Meyers, Joan S. M. 2006. "Workplace Democracy Comes of Age: Economic Stability, Growth, and Workforce Diversity." Pp. 205–37 in *Worker Participation: Current Research and Future Trends*, vol. 16, *Research in the Sociology of Work*, edited by V. Smith. San Diego, CA: Elsevier/JAI Press.

——. 2011. "Employee Ownership, Democratic Control, and Working-Class Empowerment." Pp. 113–45 in *Employee Ownership and Shared Capitalism: New Directions in Research, Lera Research Volumes*, edited by E. J. Carberry. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Miller, Genna R. 2011. "Gender and Participation in Decision-Making in Labor-Managed Firms: The Context of the USA." *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 32(1):87–113.

Milliken, Frances J. and Luis L. Martins. 1996. "Searching for Common Threads: Understanding the Multiple Effects of Diversity in Organizational Groups." *Academy of Management Review* 21(2):402–33.

Ollilainen, Marjukka and Toni Calasanti. 2007. "Metaphors at Work: Maintaining the Salience of Gender in Self-Managing Teams." *Gender & Society* 21(1):5–27.

Olsen, Erik K. 2013. "The Relative Survival of Worker Cooperatives and Barriers to Their Creation." Pp. 83–107 in *Sharing Ownership, Profits, and Decision-Making in the 21st Century*, vol. 14, *Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory & Labor-Managed Firms*, edited by D. Kruse. Cambridge, MA: Emerald Group Publishing.

Ortiz, Susan Y. and Vincent J. Roscigno. 2009. "Discrimination, Women, and Work: Processes and Variations by Race and Class." *The Sociological Quarterly* 50:336–59.

Ostrander, Susan A. 1999. "Gender and Race in a Pro-Feminist, Progressive, Mixed-Gender, Mixed-Race Organization." *Gender & Society* 13(5):628–42.

Padavic, Irene and Robin J. Ely. 2013. "The Work-Family Narrative as a Social Defense." Paper presented at the "Gender and Work: Challenging Conventional Wisdom" Research Symposium, March 1, Harvard Business School, Cambridge, MA.

Palmer, Timothy C. 2014. *Democratic Workplace Ownership after the Great Recession: An Economic Overview of US Worker Cooperatives in 2013.* San Francisco, CA: Democracy at Work Institute.

Parker, Mike and Jane Slaughter. 1988. *Choosing Sides: Unions and the Team Concept.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Pencavel, John. 2001. *Worker Participation: Lessons from the Worker Co-Ops of the Pacific Northwest.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Polletta, Francesca. 2002. *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

——. 2004. "Culture in and Outside Institutions." Pp. 161–83 in *Authority in Contention*, vol. 25, *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change.*, edited by Daniel J. Myers and Daniel M. Cress. Cambridge, MA: Emerald Group Publishing.

Reskin, Barbara F. 2003. "Modeling Ascriptive Inequality—From Motives to Mechanisms." *American Sociological Review* 68:1–21.

Rothschild, Joyce. 2009. "Workers' Cooperatives and Social Enterprise: A Forgotten Route to Social Equity and Democracy." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52(7):1023–41.

Rothschild, Joyce and Allen J. Whitt. 1986. *The Cooperative Workplace: Potentials and Dilemmas of Organizational Democracy and Participation.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rothschild, Joyce and Marjukka Ollilainen. 1999. "Obscuring but Not Reducing Managerial Control: Does TQM Measure up to Democracy Standards?" *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 20(4):583–623.

Rothschild-Whitt, Joyce. 1979. "The Collectivist Organization: An Alternative to Rational-Bureaucratic Models." *American Sociological Review* 44(4):509–27.

Russell, Raymond. 1984. "The Role of Culture and Ethnicity in the Degeneration of Democratic Firms." *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 5:73–96.

Salzinger, Leslie. 2003. *Genders in Production: Making Workers in Mexico's Global Factories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Scott, Ellen K. 2005. "Beyond Tokenism: The Making of Racially Diverse Feminist Organizations." *Social Problems* 52(2):232–54.

Sirianni, Carmen. 1993. "Learning Pluralism: Democracy and Diversity in Feminist Organizations." Pp. 554–76 in *Critical Studies in Organization and Bureaucracy*, edited by F. Fischer and C. Sirianni. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Smith, Vicki. 2001. *Crossing the Great Divide: Worker Risk and Opportunity in the New Economy*. Ithaca, NY: ILR/Cornell University Press.

Sobering, Katherine, Jessica Thomas, and Christine L. Williams. 2014. "Gender In/Equality in Worker-Owned Businesses." *Sociology Compass* 8(11):1242–55.

Stainback, Kevin and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2012. *Documenting Desegregation: Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Taylor, Peter Leigh. 1994. "The Rhetorical Construction of Efficiency: Restructuring and Industrial Democracy in Mondragón, Spain." *Sociological Forum* 9(3):459–89.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, Catherine Zimmer, Kevin Stainback, Corre Robinson, Tiffany Taylor, and Tricia McTague. 2006. "Documenting Desegregation: Segregation in American Workplaces by Race, Ethnicity, and Sex, 1966–2003." *American Sociological Review* 71(4):565–88.

Vallas, Steven P. 2003a. "Rediscovering the Color Line within Work Organizations: The 'Knitting of Racial Groups' Revisited." *Work and Occupations* 30(4):379–400.

——. 2003b. "The Adventures of Managerial Hegemony: Teamwork, Ideology, and Worker Resistance." *Social Problems* 50(2):204–25.

——. 2003c. "Why Teamwork Fails: Obstacles to Workplace Change in Four Manufacturing Plants." *American Sociological Review* 68(2):223–50.

Williams, Christine L., Chandra Muller, and Kristine Kilanski. 2012. "Gendered Organizations in the New Economy." *Gender & Society* 26(4):549–73.

Witherell, Rob. 2013. "An Emerging Solidarity: Worker Cooperatives, Unions, and the New Union Cooperative Model in the United States." Pp. 251–68 in *Trade Unions and Worker Cooperatives: Where Are We At?*, vol. 5, *International Journal of Labour Research*. Cambridge, MA: International Labor Organization.

Zuboff, Shoshana. 1988. *In the Age of the Smart Machine: The Future of Work and Power*. New York: Basic Books.