How Organizations Can Eliminate Workplace Inequalities Experienced by Minority Groups

Posted on September 17, 2018

Introduction

Workplace inequality remains a serious challenge for organizations despite decades of anti-discrimination legislation, diversity policies, and public commitments to equal opportunity. Employees may experience unequal treatment because of race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sex, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic background, migration status, or the interaction of several identities. These inequalities can appear during recruitment, salary negotiation, work allocation, performance evaluation, promotion, disciplinary action, access to professional development, and decisions about dismissal.

The term *minority group* does not always refer to a group that is numerically smaller. It can also describe people who possess less institutional power, representation, influence, or access to organizational resources. In some workplaces, women or a particular ethnic group may represent a large proportion of employees but remain concentrated in junior positions and largely absent from leadership.

Discrimination may be direct, such as refusing to hire someone because of their ethnicity or disability. It may also be indirect, occurring when an apparently neutral policy disadvantages a particular group without a legitimate job-related justification. Inequality can persist even when managers believe that they are treating everyone fairly because informal networks, subjective standards, unequal access to influential assignments, and historical disadvantages can shape employment outcomes.

The International Labour Organization states that workers and job seekers should be assessed according to their ability to perform the job rather than characteristics unrelated to its inherent requirements. Discrimination can occur before employment, during employment, or when employment ends (International Labour Organization [ILO], 2024).

Organizations cannot eliminate inequality merely by publishing a diversity statement or conducting an annual training session. Meaningful change requires them to redesign the systems through which people are recruited, evaluated, compensated, developed, promoted, heard, and protected. Leadership accountability, workforce data, transparent procedures, safe reporting channels, equitable career development, and continuous evaluation are all necessary.

Understanding Workplace Inequality

Workplace inequality refers to systematic differences in opportunities, treatment, resources, rewards, or influence between groups of employees. These differences may result from intentional prejudice, but they can also arise from organizational procedures that appear neutral.

For example, a company may promote employees who have completed high-profile international assignments. If managers repeatedly give those assignments to employees who resemble existing leaders or belong to influential networks, the promotion system may reproduce inequality even when the formal promotion policy does not mention race, gender, or nationality.

Workplace inequality can operate at several stages of employment:

Employment stage	Examples of potential inequality
Recruitment	Biased job descriptions, limited advertising, unequal interview treatment, inaccessible application systems.
Hiring	Subjective selection criteria, inconsistent questions, preference for culturally familiar candidates.
Work allocation	Minority employees receiving less visible, less profitable, or more administrative work.
Performance evaluation	Vague standards, personality-based criticism, unequal recognition for comparable work.
Compensation	Unequal starting salaries, bonuses, allowances, and access to overtime.
Career development	Unequal access to mentors, sponsors, training, leadership projects, and professional networks.
Promotion	Informal selection, unclear requirements, reliance on manager discretion.
Workplace culture	Harassment, exclusion, stereotyping, isolation, and pressure to hide aspects of identity.
Discipline and dismissal	Similar conduct being punished differently across groups.

Employment stage	Examples of potential inequality
Reporting misconduct	Retaliation, disbelief, confidentiality failures, or reputational harm.

A large meta-analysis of correspondence studies found continuing hiring discrimination across several protected or socially disadvantaged groups. Candidates with racial or ethnic minority identities, disabilities, older age, and other stigmatized characteristics continued to receive unequal treatment despite formal commitments to equal opportunity (Lippens et al., 2023).

This evidence indicates that inequality cannot be addressed only by encouraging minority employees to become more confident or adaptable. Organizations must examine the processes that create unequal outcomes.

Establish Clear Leadership Responsibility

Senior leaders must accept responsibility for workplace equality rather than assigning the entire issue to the human resources department. Human resources professionals can design policies, monitor data, and advise managers, but they cannot create an inclusive workplace without the active participation of executives, line managers, supervisors, and team leaders.

Leadership accountability should begin with clearly defined objectives. Instead of making a general promise to “value diversity,” an organization might commit to reducing unexplained pay differences, improving the representation of minority employees in management, making recruitment processes accessible, or ensuring that all complaints are investigated within a specified period.

Managers should be evaluated partly on how fairly they recruit, allocate work, develop employees, and respond to concerns. However, incentives must be designed carefully. A manager should not be encouraged to hire or promote someone merely to satisfy a numerical target. The purpose is to ensure that qualified people from underrepresented groups receive fair consideration and are not excluded by biased systems.

Research has shown that managerial discretion can significantly influence workplace inequality. Castilla (2011) found that managers play an important role in translating organizational procedures into employment outcomes. Policies may be formally equal, but individual managers determine how employees are evaluated, rewarded, and promoted.

Leadership responsibility should therefore include:

- Reviewing equality data regularly
- Explaining unequal outcomes rather than dismissing them.
- Correcting inconsistent decisions

- Providing resources for inclusion initiatives
- Responding promptly to harassment and discrimination
- Protecting employees who report concerns
- Demonstrating inclusive conduct personally

Leaders must also avoid assuming that declaring the organization a meritocracy guarantees fair decisions. Castilla and Benard (2010) found that environments emphasizing meritocracy could sometim produce greater bias because decision-makers felt confident that their judgments were objective. This finding is known as the *paradox of meritocracy*. Fairness requires evidence, accountability, and transparent procedures rather than confidence in good intentions alone.

Collect and Analyze Workforce Data

Organizations cannot correct inequalities that they do not measure. Workforce data should be examined across recruitment, pay, performance ratings, promotion, training, disciplinary action, retention, and employee experience.

A company may appear diverse overall while remaining highly unequal internally. Minority employees may be concentrated in temporary, low-paid, or junior positions while senior management remains homogeneous. Aggregated statistics can conceal these patterns.

Data should therefore be separated by job level, department, contract type, location, and relevant demographic characteristics. Where legally and ethically permitted, organizations should also use an intersectional approach. Intersectionality recognizes that people may experience overlapping forms of disadvantage. The experiences of a Black woman, for example, may not be fully explained by examining race and gender separately.

Important organizational questions include:

- Which groups apply for available positions?
- Who reaches the interview stage?
- Who receives job offers?
- Are starting salaries consistent for comparable candidates?
- Which employees receive the highest performance ratings?
- Who is assigned to leadership projects?
- Who receives promotions and bonuses?
- Which groups leave the organization most frequently?
- Are disciplinary actions distributed unevenly?
- Do employees from different groups report different levels of belonging or psychological safety?

Statistical differences do not automatically prove discrimination. They identify areas that require investigation. A promotion gap may reflect differences in job type, experience, or qualifications, but it

may also reveal biased nominations, unequal access to development, or vague criteria.

Organizations should establish privacy protections for demographic data. Employees need to understand why information is being collected, how it will be used, who can acces it, and how confidentiality will be maintained.

Make Recruitment and Hiring More Objective

Recruitment is one of the first points at which inequality enters an organization. Employers frequently claim that they hire the “best fit,” but the meaning of fit may be unclear. Managers may prefer candidates who share their communication style, education, interests, accent, or cultural background, even when these characteristics are unrelated to job performance.

Review Job Descriptions

Job descriptions should contain only requirements that are genuinely necessary. Inflated requirements can exclude capable applicants. A role may be advertised as requiring ten years of experience when five would be sufficient, or a university degree may be required for work that could be performed by someone with relevant vocational training.

Organizations should also examine whether descriptions use language that may discourage particular groups. Terms such as “aggressive,” “young,” “digital native,” or “native English speaker” may create unnecessary barriers or signal that certain applicants are preferred.

Essential and desirable criteria should be separated clearly. Organizations should provide information about reasonable accommodations and accessible application procedures.

Broaden Recruitment Channels

Recruiting repeatedly from the same universities, professional networks, employee referrals, or social circles will often reproduce the existing workforce. Organizations should advertise through varied channels and build relationships with professional associations, disability-employment services, minority-serving institutions, community organizations, and broader educational networks.

Broadening the applicant pool is not the same as lowering standards. It ensures that qualified people who lack access to established networks have an opportunity to compete.

Use Structured Interviews

Unstructured interviews allow interviewers to ask different questions, rely on personal impressions,

and evaluate candidates according to shifting standards. They can create opportunities for similarity bias, confirmation bias, and stereotyping.

Structured interviews ask all candidates the same job-related questions and assess answers according to a predetermined scoring guide. Research indicates that structured interviews are more reliable and generally less affected by irrelevant personal characteristics than unstructured conversations, although they do not remove every form of bias (Aamodt et al., 2006).

Interview panels should record independent scores before discussing candidates. This prevents the opinion of the most senior or forceful panel member from influencing everyone else.

Use Work Samples and Job-Related Assessments

Where possible, organizations should evaluate candidates through realistic tasks connected to the position. A writing role might include a short editing exercise, while an analytical position might involve interpreting a relevant dataset.

Assessments should be validated, accessible, and consistently administered. Employers should not use tests that create unequal outcomes unless those tests genuinely measure abilities necessary for the job.

Review Automated Hiring Systems

Artificial intelligence and algorithmic screening should not be assumed to be neutral. Automated systems may reproduce bias contained in historical employment data or disadvantage people because of disability, language, age, location, or other characteristics.

Organizations should test hiring technologies for adverse effects, understand what data the systems use, provide human review, allow reasonable accommodations, and establish a process through which applicants can challenge errors.

Establish Transparent Pay Systems

Pay inequality often begins with starting salaries and becomes larger over time through percentage-based raises, bonuses, and promotion decisions. Employees from minority groups may receive lower offers because they possess less bargaining power, have less access to salary information, or are evaluated through stereotypes.

Organizations should establish salary ranges based on the responsibilities, skills, and working conditions associated with each role. Managers should be required to explain offers that fall outside the normal range.

Pay-equity audits should compare employees performing the same or substantially similar work while considering legitimate factors such as experience, qualifications, location, performance, and responsibility. Unexplained gaps should be investigated and corrected rather than carried forward indefinitely.

Transparency does not necessarily require publishing every employee's salary. It can include:

- Including realistic salary ranges in job advertisements.
- Explaining how starting pay is determined
- Publishing the criteria used for bonuses and raises.
- Giving employees information about pay grades
- Reviewing differences by demographic group
- Preventing managers from making undocumented exceptions

Research suggests that accountability and transparency can reduce inequality in pay decisions. In a firm-level study, Castilla (2015) found that making decision-makers accountable and providing greater transparency improved the fairness of compensation decisions.

Pay transparency measures are most effective when they are accompanied by clear job evaluation, meaningful reporting, corrective action, and enforcement rather than disclosure alone. Recent OECD research emphasizes that countries and organizations use different forms of pay reporting and auditing, with effectiveness depending greatly on how the measures are designed and implemented.

Standardize Performance Evaluations

Subjective performance evaluations can reproduce inequality. Employees may be assessed according to whether they appear confident, committed, leadership-oriented, or culturally compatible, even when such descriptions are not supported by observable evidence.

Minority employees may also be judged according to different standards. Behavior interpreted as confident in one employee may be described as aggressive in another. An employee with caregiving responsibilities may be viewed as less committed, while someone who remains in the office for long hours may receive credit regardless of actual productivity.

Organizations should define performance standards before the evaluation period begins. Criteria should be related to the employee's role and supported by evidence. Managers should provide examples rather than relying on personality-based descriptions.

Calibration meetings can help identify inconsistencies across teams, but they must be conducted carefully. The purpose should be to compare the application of standards, not to force employees into a predetermined ranking.

Employees should have an opportunity to respond to evaluations, request clarification, and appeal

decisions through a fair procedure. Organizations should also examine whether ratings differ systematically by demographic group.

Make Promotion and Career Opportunities Visible

Many organizations advertise entry-level positions but fill senior roles informally. Managers may nominate employees whom they already know, trust, or socialize with. This allows informal networks to determine who advances.

Promotion opportunities should be advertised internally whenever possible. Required skills, experience, and performance expectations should be stated in advance. Selection panels should use documented criteria and explain their decisions.

Organizations should also examine who receives the assignments that prepare employees for promotion. Leadership potential cannot be demonstrated without opportunities to lead. Minority employees may be overlooked for important clients, international assignments, revenue-generating projects, or acting-management roles and later be judged as lacking experience.

Career-enhancing assignments should be tracked and distributed equitably. Managers should discuss development goals with every employee rather than waiting for individuals to request opportunities. Employees who are unfamiliar with organizational politics may not know which assignments are most valuable.

Provide Mentoring and Sponsorship

Mentoring can provide employees with advice, feedback, encouragement, and knowledge about organizational expectations. However, mentoring alone may not address unequal access to influence.

Sponsorship involves a senior person actively advocating for an employee, recommending them for assignments, introducing them to influential networks, and supporting their advancement. Minority employees are often over-mentored but under-sponsored. They may receive advice about improving themselves without receiving access to decision-makers or career-defining opportunities.

Formal programs can reduce dependence on informal similarity-based relationships. Nevertheless, organizations should evaluate whether mentoring and sponsorship programs produce meaningful outcomes. Pairing employees without giving mentors time, training, or responsibility may create a symbolic program with little effect.

Effective programs should:

- Establish clear purposes and expectations
- Train mentors and sponsors

- Match participants thoughtfully
- Protect employees from exploitative relationships
- Track access to assignments and promotions
- Recognize the work performed by mentors
- Evaluate whether different groups benefit equally

Development should not be limited to individuals already identified as “high potential” through opaque processes. If the method for selecting high-potential employees are biased, leadership programs will reproduce existing inequalities.

Build an Inclusive Organizational Culture

Representation and inclusion are related but distinct. A company may recruit employees from different backgrounds while expecting them to assimilate into a culture designed around the dominant group.

An inclusive workplace allows employees to contribute without hiding important aspects of their identity or constantly demonstrating that they belong. Inclusion requires access to information, influence, resources, respect, and decision-making.

Managers should create opportunities for employees to participate in meetings and ensure that a small number of voices do not dominate discussion. Ideas should be credited to the people who introduced them. Administrative and emotional tasks should not be repeatedly assigned to women or minority employees simply because they are considered more helpful.

Teamwork can support inclusion by increasing cooperation and reducing isolation. However, teamwork must not be used to suppress disagreement. Employees should be able to question decisions without being labeled uncooperative or disloyal.

An inclusive culture also recognizes religious practices, disability-related needs, different family structures, and varied communication styles. Reasonable flexibility can be provided without abandoning legitimate performance standards.

Prevent Harassment and Everyday Exclusion

Harassment is a form of workplace discrimination when unwelcome conduct is connected to a legally protected characteristic and becomes sufficiently serious under the applicable law. It may include insults, threats, racial or religious slurs, unwanted sexual conduct, degrading images, mockery of an accent, or interference with religious or disability-related practices. The precise legal standard differs by jurisdiction. In the United States, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission identifies harassment based on characteristics including race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability,

and genetic information as a form of employment discrimination.

Organizations should not wait until behavior reaches the legal threshold before responding. Repeated exclusion, stereotyping, offensive jokes, deliberate mispronunciation of names, and dismissive comments can damage employee well-being and create a climate in which more severe misconduct becomes normalized.

Anti-harassment policies should explain prohibited behavior, provide examples, establish several reporting channels, and apply to employees, managers, clients, contractors, and customers. Senior or high-performing employees should not receive protection from investigation.

Establish Safe Reporting and Complaint Procedures

Employees will not report inequality if they believe that speaking up will damage their careers. Reporting systems should therefore be accessible, confidential as far as possible, impartial, and protected from retaliation.

Employees should be able to raise concerns through more than one channel. Requiring a person to report only to their immediate supervisor is inadequate when that supervisor may be responsible for the problem.

Organizations should provide options such as:

- A designated human resources contact
- An ethics or compliance officer
- An independent hotline
- An ombudsperson
- A union representative
- A secure online reporting system
- A senior manager outside the employee's reporting line.

Complaints should be acknowledged promptly and investigated by trained, impartial personnel. The process should protect the rights of both the complainant and the person accused. Confidentiality should not be promised absolutely because an investigation may require disclosure of relevant information, but information should be shared only with people who need it.

Retaliation must be monitored after a complaint. It can include dismissal, demotion, exclusion, threats, undesirable assignments, reduced hours, hostile evaluations, or reputational damage. U.S. equal-employment laws prohibit punishing people for asserting rights connected to employment discrimination or participating in relevant proceedings.

Organizations should examine whether employees who report concerns leave soon afterward, receive lower ratings, lose opportunities, or experience changes in treatment.

Improve Accessibility and Reasonable Accommodation

Workplace equality requires more than treating everyone identically. Employees may need different forms of support to participate on equal terms.

People with disabilities may require accessible buildings, screen-reader-compatible software, adjusted working hours, modified equipment, sign-language interpretation, written instructions, or changes to recruitment procedures. Religious employees may require reasonable scheduling flexibility, dress accommodations, or time for observance.

Organizations should establish a clear and respectful accommodation process. Employees should not be required to reveal unnecessary medical or personal information. Requests should be evaluated individually rather than rejected because similar arrangements have not been used before.

Accessibility should be considered when purchasing technology, designing offices, planning events, selecting meeting platforms, and communicating information. Retrofitting inaccessible systems after an employee experiences exclusion is usually more difficult and expensive than designing access from the beginning.

Use Flexible Work Policies Fairly

Flexible working arrangements can improve access for caregivers, disabled employees, people with health needs, and employees who face long or unsafe commutes. However, flexibility can produce inequality if employees who use it are viewed as less committed or are excluded from promotion.

Eligibility requirements should be clear, and comparable requests should be handled consistently. Managers should evaluate performance according to results rather than physical visibility alone.

Organizations must also recognize that not every occupation can be performed remotely. Employees in manufacturing, retail, health care, transportation, and other location-dependent roles should not be ignored. Flexible scheduling, predictable shifts, leave, job sharing, and improved control over working hours may be more relevant for these workers.

A policy is not genuinely inclusive if it exists formally but employees fear using it.

Treat Diversity Training as One Part of a Larger Strategy

Training can improve knowledge, vocabulary, awareness, and interpersonal skills. It can help employees recognize stereotypes, understand reporting procedures, respond to harassment, and communicate across differences.

However, a single training session cannot correct unequal pay, subjective promotion systems, inaccessible workplaces, or retaliation. A systematic review of diversity, equity, inclusion, and antiracism training found considerable variation in program design, evaluation, and results. Training is more likely to be valuable when it is sustained, relevant to participants' work, supported by leadership, and connected to broader institutional change (Wang et al., 2023).

Training should avoid presenting bias as a permanent personal defect or suggesting that every member of a group thinks in the same way. It should focus on behaviors, decisions, organizational processes, and practical skills.

Managers require specialized training because they make decisions about hiring, pay, performance, discipline, accommodation, and promotion. They should learn how to document decisions, apply criteria consistently, handle complaints, and recognize when legal or specialist advice is needed.

Involve Employees in Organizational Change

Policies designed without input from affected employees may fail to address actual problems. Organizations should consult employees through surveys, focus groups, staff networks, unions, employee-resource groups, listening sessions, and confidential interviews.

Employee-resource groups can provide community, professional development, and information about organizational barriers. However, organizations should not expect minority employees to solve institutional inequality through unpaid labor.

Participation should influence decisions. Repeatedly asking employees to describe discrimination without implementing change can reduce trust and create consultation fatigue.

Organizations should communicate what they have learned, what actions they will take, who is responsible, and when progress will be reviewed. When a requested change cannot be implemented, leaders should explain why rather than remaining silent.

Evaluate Outcomes Instead of Activities

Organizations often report the number of training sessions delivered, events organized, or diversity statements published. These figures measure activity but not necessarily improvement.

A stronger evaluation system examines outcomes such as:

- Representation at different organizational levels
- Recruitment and selection rates
- Pay differences
- Promotion and performance-rating patterns
- Access to training and influential assignments
- Retention and turnover
- Employee experiences of belonging and fairness
- Complaint handling and retaliation
- Accessibility and accommodation outcomes
- Confidence in leadership and reporting systems

Organizations should establish a baseline before introducing interventions and review results regularly. Successful initiatives can be expanded, while ineffective approaches should be revised or discontinued.

Equality data should be interpreted carefully. An increase in complaints may initially indicate that conditions have worsened, but it may also mean that employees have become more confident in the reporting system. Quantitative evidence should therefore be considered alongside employee experiences and qualitative information.

An Organizational Framework for Reducing Inequality

Organizational problem	Recommended intervention	Evidence of progress
Biased recruitment	Structured interviews, job-related criteria, broader advertising	More equal shortlisting and selection rates
Unequal pay	Salary bands, pay audits, documented offers	Reduction in unexplained pay gaps

Organizational problem	Recommended intervention	Evidence of progress
Subjective promotion	Published criteria and open internal applications	More equitable promotion rates
Limited career access	Sponsorship, mentoring, transparent assignment allocation	Broader access to leadership roles
Harassment and exclusion	Clear policies, manager responsibility, prompt intervention	Improved employee climate and fewer repeated incidents.
Fear of reporting	Multiple channels and anti-retaliation monitoring	Greater trust and appropriate case resolution
Inaccessible work	Universal design and reasonable accommodations	Increased participation and retention
Weak accountability	Leadership objectives and regular data reviews	Corrective actions linked to identified disparities
Ineffective training	Practical, continuous, role-specific learning	Observable changes in decisions and behavior
Lack of employee voice	Staff consultation and meaningful participation	Policies reflect identified employee needs

The Benefits of Workplace Equality

Organizations should address inequality because fair treatment is a moral and legal responsibility. The business benefits of inclusion should support this principle rather than replace it.

Workplace inequality can reduce trust, increase turnover, discourage reporting, weaken cooperation, and cause organizations to lose talented employees. People who believe that advancement depends on identity or personal connections may stop contributing ideas or seeking leadership opportunities.

Inclusive organizations can draw upon a wider range of knowledge and experience. However, diversity does not automatically improve performance. The potential benefits emerge when employees can participate meaningfully, disagreement is managed constructively, and decisions do not remain

controlled by a narrow group.

Organizations should therefore move beyond the assumption that simply recruiting diverse employees will generate innovation. Without equitable systems and an inclusive culture, greater diversity may expose previously hidden conflicts without giving employees the power to resolve them.

Conclusion

Organizations can reduce workplace inequalities experienced by minority groups by changing the systems that determine access to employment, pay, development, influence, and advancement. General commitments to diversity are insufficient when hiring remains subjective, promotion opportunities are hidden, pay decisions are inconsistent, and employees fear retaliation.

Senior leaders must accept responsibility for equality and require managers to justify employment decisions. Organizations should collect and analyze workforce data, use structured recruitment procedures, establish transparent salary systems, standardize performance evaluations, and advertise promotion opportunities openly.

Minority employees must also receive equitable access to mentoring, sponsorship, training, influential assignments, and leadership networks. Accessible workplaces, fair flexible-work policies, effective accommodations, and meaningful consultation are necessary for employees with different needs and circumstances.

Training can support these reforms, but it cannot substitute for them. The most effective approach combines education with accountability, transparent procedures, employee participation, data analysis, and continuous evaluation.

The ultimate objective is not to give minority employees unfair preference. It is to remove barriers that prevent individuals from being assessed according to their abilities, performance, and relevant qualifications. A fair workplace does not assume that treating everyone identically will overcome historical and structural differences. It creates procedures through which every employee can access opportunities, raise concerns safely, and contribute without facing disadvantage because of an identity unrelated to their ability to perform the job.

References

Aamodt, M. G., Brecher, E. G., Kutcher, E. J., and Bragger, J. D. (2006). Do structured interviews eliminate bias? A meta-analytic comparison of structured and unstructured interviews. *Annual Convention of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.

Avery, D. R., Volpone, S. D., Stewart, R. W., Luksyte, A., Hernandez, M., McKay, P. F., and Hebl, M. R. (2023). Is justice colorblind? A review of workplace racioethnic differences through the lens of

organizational justice. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10*, 21–49. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-052627

Castilla, E. J. (2011). Bringing managers back in Managerial influences on workplace inequality. *American Sociological Review, 76*(5), 667–694. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122411420814

Castilla, E. J. (2015). Accounting for the gap A firm study manipulating organizational accountability and transparency in pay decisions. *Organization Science, 26*(2), 311–333. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0950

Castilla, E. J., and Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 55*(4), 543–576. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.4.543

Elliott, J. R., and Smith, R. A. (2004). Race, gender, and workplace power. *American Sociological Review, 69*(3), 365–386. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240406900303

International Labour Organization. (2024). *ILO helpdesk Business, non-discrimination and equality*. https://www.ilo.org/resource/other/ilo-helpdesk-business-non-discrimination-and-equality

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., and Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review, 71*(4), 589–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100404

Lippens, L., Vermeiren, S., and Baert, S. (2023). The state of hiring discrimination A meta-analysis of almost five decades of correspondence experiments. *European Economic Review, 151*, 104315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2022.104315

Nishii, L. H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(6), 1754–1774. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.0823

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Diversity at work Making the most out of increasingly diverse societies*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/789cc27f-en

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., and Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1262–1289. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943

Syed, J., and Özbilgin, M. (2009). A relational framework for international transfer of diversity management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 20*(12), 2435–2453. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190903363755

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2016). *Enforcement guidance on retaliation and related issues*. https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/enforcement-guidance-retaliation-and-related-issues

Wang, M. L., Gomes, A., Rosa, M., Copeland, P., and Santana, V. J. (2023). A systematic review of diversity, equity, and inclusion and antiracism training studies Findings and future directions. *Translational Behavioral Medicine, 14*(3), 156–171. https://doi.org/10.1093/tbm/ibad061