Business & Society 360

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION (DEI) MANAGEMENT

Edited by

DAVID WASIELESKI

JAMES WEBER

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION (DEI) MANAGEMENT

This page intentionally left blank

DEI is not a luxury; it is a necessity. Women and minorities are rapidly becoming the majority in many business settings. Effectively managing and harnessing the proven benefits associated with a diverse workforce require being fluent in all aspects of DEI. The businesses that not only gain this DEI fluency, but also center it in all aspects of their work, will be the most successful and profitable businesses.

—***William Generett Jr, J.D.***
Senior Vice President and Executive in Residence Palumbo-Donahue School of Business
Duquesne University

Addressing barriers to gainful employment and financial security is vital to preserving the natural environment and building sustainable economies. Thoughtfully curated, the scholarship presented in this book provides a nuanced and sophisticated understanding of the factors that inhibit or facilitate the inclusive workspaces we aspire to.

—***Vanessa Hill***,
James and Elizabeth Freeman Chair in Management,
Professor of Management and Organizations
Bucknell University

I fully endorse the Business and Society 360, 6th volume on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. In this day of political and economic challenges, a section that outlines diversity, equity, and inclusion must be included in a publication to promote a very important component of a business or organization's success. Without diversity, equity, and inclusion, companies are bound to fail or exist in a dysfunctional manner. The original model for most businesses is to be profitable. However, without DEI, profitability cannot be achieved if all voices are not heard and valued.

—***Crystal R. McCormick***, **M.S.Ed., G-CDF**
Chief Diversity Officer,
Senior Advisor to the President on DEI President's Office
Duquesne University

For American scholars, this book comes at a time when it could not be more needed, as a backlash against DEI efforts threatens set-backs and academic freedom. Wasieleski and Weber's thoughtful editing has resulted in an insightful group of contributions.

—***Professor W. E. Douglas Creed***
College of Business Administration
University of Rhode Island

BUSINESS AND SOCIETY 360

Series Editors: David Wasieleski and James Weber

Recent Volumes:

Volume 1:	Stakeholder Management, 2017
Volume 2:	Corporate Social Responsibility, 2018
Volume 3:	Business Ethics, 2019
Volume 4:	Sustainability, 2020
Volume 5:	Social Entrepreneurship, 2022

The *Business and Society (BAS) 360* book series is an annual publication targeting cutting-edge developments in the broad business and society field, such as stakeholder management, corporate social responsibility and citizenship, business ethics, sustainability, corporate governance, and others. Each volume will feature a comprehensive discussion and review of the current "state" of the research and theoretical developments in a specific business and society area. As business and society is an inherently multidisciplinary scholarly area, the book series will draw from work in areas outside of business and management, such as psychology, sociology, philosophy, religious studies, economics, and other related fields, as well as the natural sciences, education, and other professional areas of study.

BUSINESS AND SOCIETY 360 VOLUME 6

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION (DEI) MANAGEMENT

EDITED BY

DAVID WASIELESKI
Duquesne University, USA

AND

JAMES WEBER
Duquesne University, USA

United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Emerald Publishing, Floor 5, Northspring, 21-23 Wellington Street, Leeds LS1 4DL

First edition 2024

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-83549-259-8 (Print)
ISBN: 978-1-83549-258-1 (Online)
ISBN: 978-1-83549-260-4 (Epub)

ISSN: 2514-1759 (Series)

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Oscar Holmes IV and David Wasieleski

BUSINESS AND SOCIETY 360 BOOK SERIES OVERVIEW

Where are we? How did we get here? Which way should we go now?

Sound familiar? Have you ever considered the answers to these questions related to the work you do? Existential moments are common in the maturation of any academic discipline. They are the product of a passionate, caring constituency that is driven to make meaningful contributions that can propel future research and provide illusory discoveries that are conceptually powerful, empirically sound, and practically useful.

It is in the desire for academic progress that we proudly continue the *Business and Society 360 (BAS 360)* annual book series. *BAS 360* is an annual book series targeting cutting-edge developments in the broad business and society field. Each volume features a comprehensive 360-degree discussion and review of the current state of the research and theoretical developments in a specific area of business and society scholarship. Our series began 5 years ago with Volume 1 on "Stakeholder Management." Volume 2 was published a year later on "Corporate Social Responsibility." In 2019, we focused Volume 3 on "Business Ethics" and in 2021 we assembled Volume 4 focusing on "Sustainability." Last year, we completed our fifth volume on "Social Entrepreneurship," a continually growing subarea in our field. The goal of this series is to shape future work in the field around our many disciplines and topics of interest, to enlighten scholars in the area about the most productive roads forward. Essentially, at this crossroad, which way do we proceed?

The 360-degree view is intended to reflect on a theory's cross-discipline research, empirical explorations, cross-cultural studies, literature critiques, and meta-analysis projects. Given our multidisciplinary identity, each volume draws from work in areas both inside and outside of business and management.

Volume 6: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Management: Origins, Trends, and Future Directions

Management researchers play a critical role in not only seeking to answer important unresolved questions about organizations, but we also seek to answer those questions about our society. This is perhaps most evident within the DEI literature, which has universal relevance and ties to every academic discipline. Because of the interdisciplinary nature and expansive topical areas that

encompass DEI, it is impossible to provide a concise, yet exhaustive summary of the origins, trends, and future directions of the DEI literature. As such, we will only focus on DEI management, which is mainly grounded in the organizational behavior and psychology disciplines.

As individual terms, diversity, equity, and inclusion have long been a part of the English lexicon, each one having numerous definitions. However, the term diversity management was born out of the 1960s US Civil Rights Movement which focused on gaining societal equal rights and economic and educational opportunities for racioethnic minorities mainly advocating for tolerance (Beavers, 2018). As a result of this movement organizing, Affirmative Action laws and guidelines were enacted and became one of the most successful interventions to disrupt the government-sanctioned discrimination and oppression in employment and the educational system that persisted for hundreds of years in the United States (Avery et al., 2018; Kendi, 2017; Ray, 2023). Notwithstanding the gains from Affirmative Action, scholars and activists began to recognize the limitations of the tolerance framing, which was sometimes paired with colorblindness ideology that argued racial identities should not matter, and thus be muted (e.g., I do not see color) (Norton et al., 2006; Offermann et al., 2014). In contrast, supporters began advocating for multiculturalism, which argued that racioethnic minorities should not just be tolerated, but rather everyone's culture and identities should be respected, celebrated, honored, and normalized and that people's social identities do matter (Cox, 1991; Plaut et al., 2009; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Todd & Galinsky, 2012). Indeed, research has found that colorblindness ideology is negatively related to important outcomes like well-being, intergroup interactions, and job and educational performance for racial minorities, whereas multiculturalism ideology is positively related to those outcomes concluding that colorblindness should be abandoned (Apfelbaum et al., 2012; Norton et al., 2006; Plaut et al., 2009).

Harrison and Klein (2007) significantly advanced diversity management research with their conceptualization of the three facets of diversity (variety, separation, and disparity) and explanation of how they should be properly measured (e.g., standard deviation, Blau's index, Gini coefficient, etc.). Variety diversity defines differences in type, kind, or category (e.g., race, sex, religion, etc.). Separation diversity defines differences in values, attitudes, or beliefs (e.g., prejudices, ideologies, etc.). Disparity diversity defines differences in valued resources (e.g., prestige, status, wealth, etc.). They argued that researchers should appropriately align theory, diversity facet, and measurement explaining that separation diversity should be measured with interval scales (e.g., standard deviation), variety diversity should be measured with categorical scales (e.g., Blau's index), and disparity diversity should be measured with ratio scales (e.g., Gini coefficient) (Harrison & Klein, 2007). Prior to this conceptualization, at times, the DEI literature suffered from a misalignment of theory, diversity definitions, and measurement that made it difficult to synthesize the literature and draw accurate inferences from DEI findings (Harrison & Klein, 2007; Roberson, Holmes, et al., 2017).

As businesses often focus on returns to stakeholders, it is unsurprising that the business case for diversity management proliferated in the 1990s and to this day still remains the most dominant frame scholars and practitioners use to advocate for DEI. The business case for diversity argues that organizations should care about and invest in DEI because it can increase the organization's competitiveness, performance, longevity, innovation, or some other valued organizational outcome (Cox, 1991; Cox & Blake, 1991). The Interactional Model of Cultural Diversity was the first comprehensive theoretical framework to explain why and how DEI, specifically the diversity climate within organizations, realize these positive outcomes (Cox, 1994, 2001; Holmes et al., 2021). Though research findings have certainly provided support for the positive relationship between DEI and organizational outcomes, it is important to note that research findings have also found neutral or negative effects of DEI with some organizational outcomes (Roberson, Holmes, et al., 2017; Sacco & Schmitt, 2005; Webber & Donahue, 2001; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). For example, Sacco and Schmitt found that racial demography and community demography alignment was not related to profitability, and demographic dissimilarity on the basis of age, race, and sex of the workgroup was positively related to employee turnover in the restaurants in their sample.

Notwithstanding the mixed results in the literature, there has always been a contingent of scholars and practitioners who have criticized the business case framing in favor of the moral case for diversity framing (Ely & Thomas, 2020; Holmes, 2019; Roberts, 2020). The moral case for diversity argues that organizations should care about and invest in DEI because it is the right and fair thing to do, not simply to obtain positive returns on investments. The moral case does not deny the positive, neutral, or negative DEI research findings but rather insists that organizations should focus instead on the role they have played and currently play in maintaining systemic discrimination and oppression, their historical and operational context, and how they can be good societal and organization citizens to disrupt the inequitable status quo (Ely & Thomas, 2020; Holmes, 2020; Roberts, 2020).

While there are merits and limitations to both the business and moral case for diversity, research has found that historically excluded group members typically respond more favorably to the moral case, whereas historically included group members typically respond more favorably to the business case for diversity (Georgeac & Rattan, 2022). Moving past the binary business case versus moral case framing, Ely and Thomas (2001) found that organizations can adopt three different diversity perspectives (integration-and-learning, access-and-legitimacy, and discrimination-and-fairness) with some integrating aspects from all three perspectives. Briefly, the integration-and-learning perspective recognizes DEI as valuable resources that organizations can learn from to redefine how they operate. The access-and-legitimacy perspective recognizes that demographic diversity can facilitate entry, trust, and success in different markets. The discrimination-and-fairness perspective recognizes that it is important for organizations to enact justice, equity, and eliminate bias and discrimination within

organizations (Ely & Thomas, 2001). Ely and Thomas found that the integration-and-learning perspective was most beneficial to organizations.

Not only has DEI research in management progressed substantially, more scholars and practitioners are calling for more attention to be paid to DEI in our research, practice, and organizations (Avery et al., 2021; Holmes et al., 2022; Roberson, Ryan, et al., 2017). Despite this progress, there are numerous areas for future research. First, the DEI literature would advance significantly if scholars take intersectionality into account within their research questions and designs. The MOSAIC model of stereotyping provides an important theoretical framework to assist in this respect (Hall et al., 2018). Second, our understanding of modern prejudice would meaningfully advance if scholars create better modern prejudice measures that do not suffer from the limitations of the implicit association tests (Avery et al., 2018). Third, there are still understudied areas within DEI research that scholars should address in future research such as research on disability and accessibility, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) people, DEI and technology (e.g., artificial intelligence, etc.), non-Western focus management theory and research findings, and the experiences of people in vulnerable populations and precarious work arrangements (e.g., immigrants, undocumented people, gig workers, child laborers, etc.) to name a few. Finally, scholars should evaluate and create more evidence-based DEI interventions to mitigate or eliminate bias and discrimination. Certainly, there are some real challenges to conducting some of this research (e.g., access to large enough sample sizes, high research costs, research design challenges, etc.); however, the advancement of DEI management is dependent upon answering these important questions.

Contributions to Volume 6

Our volume on diversity, equity, and inclusion is organized around four main themes within this important area of research. The first two chapters focus on gender issues at work regarding inequality for women. The second section includes two chapters on discrimination in the workplace. The next section is comprised of four chapters examining diversity issues in business and society. The final section examines inclusivity in teaching and practice. This volume provides contributions that complement each other nicely to offer a broad overview of DEI issues and research.

Chapter 1, "EDI and Women's Inequality at Work: A Scoping Review" by Maureen Kilgour, proffers a valuable overview of gender inequality at work. Starting with the purpose of understanding the lack of progress on gender equality, Dr Kilgour positions the emergence of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) against the lack of progress across regions of the world. She provides critiques to explain the phenomenon and describes the actual harm that is done to women around the world who suffer from discrimination and violation of their rights. After this analysis, the chapter highlights possible EDI processes and practices that should be considered to alleviate the problem as well as offers forward-looking research avenues to determine the best paths for the future.

Patricia Guerrero, David Arena Jr., and Kristen Jones coauthor the second chapter entitled, "An Exploration of the Stereotypes at the Intersection of Motherhood Status and Race." This chapter addresses bias against maternal women and racial minority employees in organizations. The authors explore how identity characteristics affect work experiences across these two groups. Using stigma theory, the chapter's purpose is to show the possible interaction of maternity stereotypes and racial stereotypes for understanding working women's experiences. Particular biases of maternal women could be made worse against certain racial biases. In an effort to mitigate these negative experiences, the authors explain the resulting work and health outcomes emanating from these stigmatic interactions. Future research is suggested to identify the identity characteristics that contribute to these experiences.

Section 2 on Discrimination begins with Mingang Geiger and Lily Morse's work, "When English is not Your Mother Tongue: Navigating Language-Based Stigma at Work." Integrating research across disciplines, three main themes associated with language-based stigmas at work are identified. Gaps across these research streams are also identified as a means for encouraging future work on the topic. When employees' first language is not English, certain stigma are empirically found to result. This chapter calls for more research in the area to address the harms that manifest against nonnative English speakers. This form of discrimination is underresearched, and this chapter takes grand steps toward mitigating the experience.

Chapter 4, "The Choice to Confront: The Antecedents, Outcomes, and Moderators of Confronting Discrimination in the Workplace" by Kristen Jaramillo, Isaac Sabat, and Kelly Dray, examines when confronting discrimination is appropriate for avoiding negative outcomes of discrimination. The authors demonstrate the necessary factors for making the decision to confront discrimination and the steps that need to be taken to reach such a decision. Personal and situational factors are also identified for understanding confrontation decisions. Once these are all outlined, the chapter discusses the likely outcomes of a confrontation decision. Their article offers the antecedents, moderators, and outcomes related to confrontation. Finally, future work is suggested for advancing the area.

Nicholas Salter, Jenna-Lyn Roman, and Ngoc Duong coauthor Chapter 5, "Diversity at Work: Different Groups, Similar but Unique Experiences." As a start to our third section on Diversity, these authors examine shared minority workplace experiences. They discuss the impact of social identities on individuals' work life in different ways. The overall experiences of minorities are identified in the workplace, and the separate research silos in the field are identified and critically examined. The authors provide a thorough review of the topics of discrimination, identity management, and strength through adversity to showcase the common experiences across groups of people. As a forward-looking measure, this chapter calls for intra-minority solidarity as a goal for these groups to have more positive experiences at work.

The sixth chapter entitled, "Categorical and Informational Diversity and Diversity of Thought" by Marina McCarthy, Nancy DiTomaso, and Corinne

Post, looks at an underexamined area of work in the diversity literature. The authors explore variety in demographic characteristics and how that affects broader ways of thinking and perspectives on diversity. Their empirical study uses data across 11 industries that value variation in thinking. Diversity of thought varies across cognitive and learning styles as well as cultural orientations and preferences for types of communication. Culture and communication are found to be related to large differences in ways of thinking which has implications for individuals and practice.

Lourdes Susaeta, Esperanza Suarez, and Frank Babinger coauthor Chapter 7, "Managing Diversity in the Cruise Industry: Exploring Practices and Metrics." This specialized chapter focusing only on the cruise industry looks at the best practices and metrics for success in this sector. This chapter reviews the cruise industry's DEI challenges and approaches. In their review of this subset of the hospitality sector, the authors identify main common themes surrounding diversity across cruise companies. This exploratory study reveals that there are no theoretical models specific to the cruise industry, opening the door for possible paths forward. Despite a seemingly deep commitment to diversity and inclusion within this industry, cruise businesses are challenged by a highly multicultural environment and a dearth of women represented in senior management positions. Future directions are offered based on their analysis.

The final chapter in this Diversity section is written by Ozlem Araci. Her work, "Ethical Values in the Shade of Business Case Approach to Diversity Management: A Review and Insights for Further Research," explains the pushing effect of ethics on diversity and inclusion issues and shows how it is not as strong as the business pushing effect. Dr Araci argues that managing diversity falls short in its ability to address DEI challenges in the workforce. This unique position to DEI calls for a more ethical approach to diversity management. She offers an approach crossing law, ethics, and free choice to help us understand the paucity of ethical approaches to diversity in organizations. The chapter presents the business case approach to DEI as well as an ethical approach before explaining how the pushing effect of ethics can be strengthened in the future. Justifications of intersecting law, ethics, and business for managing diversity are proffered.

The next section on "Learning to Include" starts with "Come Walk with Me: Facilitating a Learning Journey in DEIJ" by Donna Maria Blancero and Erin Kelley. Focusing on business school curricula and how topics of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice are integrated in business education, the authors start with a call to action by AACSB to embrace diversity. They present a call to action for business schools to encourage inspirational learning environments that promote and respect DEISJ. The chapter addresses how to establish best practices for teaching diversity in business curricula. After their review of how curricular changes are facilitated, they offer nine recommendations on how a foundational course in DEISJ can be developed and implemented in accordance with accreditation requirements.

Chapter 10, "Toward the Creation of Shared Value in an Inclusive Business: An Empirical Investigation" by Yanina Rashkova, Maryia Zaitsava, and

Ludovica Moi, provides a strategy for building inclusive businesses that generate shared value. With the goal of promoting principles of DEI in society, the authors focus on creating shared value among inclusive businesses. Through a qualitative research method, their case study examines a company, IntendMe, and how they create shared value for DEI. Their chapter recommends three phases companies should implement in order to create shared value in inclusive businesses. Recognizing that business and society values are perceived differently, they suggest aligning the environment with inclusion and that business enacts inclusive operations in their strategic vision. These first two phases then facilitate value construction. The authors show that inclusive practices can serve society but also lead to a greater value for business. The two are not mutually exclusive but rather are quite compatible.

Our final submission to this volume offers a very forward-looking, broad vision of DEI's role in social sustainability. Audrey J. Murrell, Ray Jones, Logan Kauffman, Joseph Bute, and John C. Welch present, "Addressing Food Insecurity as Social Sustainability: Co-Creating the Built Environment Within the Pittsburgh Larimer Community." Given that social sustainability relates to systems and structures that affect the overall well-being of individuals and societies, it becomes an appropriate lens through which to examine how DEI can be addressed. These two lines of research are expertly integrated in this chapter, and it is argued that DEI research should be part and parcel of discussions surrounding social sustainability. The two are intimately linked. Their concept of the built environment provides a forum for future research and implications for practice to accomplish social sustainability and DEI simultaneously.

In the spirit of this book series, this ensemble of chapters captures the essence of some of the most important and cutting-edge research in DEI. Our distinguished group of authors gives a critical examination of the work done in this area, identifies gaps in the extant literature, elucidates pathways for future research, and offers practical and theoretical implications for the field.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The *BAS 360* book series is supported by the International Association for Business and Society (IABS). IABS is the premier international professional association of more than 300 educators from over 20 countries researching and teaching on the relationships between business, government and society, sustainability, and business ethics. In addition, there is support from the Palumbo-Donahue School of Business at Duquesne University, which has been recognized by Corporate Knights in its 2022 Better World MBA Ranking. Among the 40 schools listed, the University's MBA Sustainable Business Practices program is ranked No. 1 nationally and No. 6 internationally. Duquesne is also one of the first 100 signatories of the United Nation's Global Compact Principles for Responsible Management education. Finally, the coeditors of *BAS 360* acknowledge and thank Mr Gene Beard for his financial support provided through the Eugene P. Beard Faculty Resource Fund in Ethics at Duquesne

University. We also express our gratitude to the Albert P. Viragh donors to Duquesne's Institute for Ethics in Business for their financial and moral support for this endeavor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial color blindness: Emergence, practice, and implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *21*(3), 205–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411434980

Avery, D. R., Brown, D. K., Dumas, T. L., George, E., Joshi, A., Loyd, D. L., van Knippenberg, D., Wang, M., & Xu, H. (2021). Racial biases in the publication process: Exploring expressions and solutions. *Journal of Management*. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063211030561

Avery, D. R., Volpone, S. D., & Holmes IV, O. (2018). Racial discrimination in organizations. In A. J. Colella & E. B. King (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of workplace discrimination* (pp. 89–109). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199363643.013.8

Bacq, S., & Aguilera, R. V. (2021). Stakeholder governance for responsible innovation: A theory of value creation, appropriation, and distribution. *Journal of Management Studies*. Forthcoming. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12746

Bacq, S., & Janssen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *23*(5–6), 373–403.

Bacq, S., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2021). Social entrepreneurship and COVID-19. *Journal of Management Studies*, *58*(1), 285–288.

Bansal, P., Grewatsch, S., & Sharma, G. (2021). How COVID-19 informs business sustainability research: It's time for a systems perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, *58*(2), 602–606.

Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing – Insights from the study of social enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *8*(1), 397–441.

Beavers, D. (2018). *Diversity, equity, and inclusion framework: Reclaiming diversity, equity, and inclusion for racial justice*. http://greenlining.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Racial-Equity-Framework.pdf

Bridoux, F., & Stoelhorst, J. W. (2020). Stakeholder governance: Solving the collective action problems in joint value creation. *Academy of Management Review*. Forthcoming. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2019.0441

Cox, T., Jr. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, *5*(2), 34–47.

Cox, T., Jr. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. Berrett-Koehler.

Cox, T., Jr. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. Jossey-Bass.

Cox, T., Jr., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive*, *5*(3), 45–56.

Dees, J. G. (1998). *The meaning of social entrepreneurship*. Palgrave Encyclopedia of Strategic Management. http://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-94848-2_373-1

Desa, G., & Koch, J. L. (2014). Scaling social impact: Building sustainable social ventures at the base-of-the-pyramid. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *5*(2), 146–174.

Dutta, S. (2017). Creating in the crucibles of nature's fury: Associational diversity and local social entrepreneurship after natural disasters in California, 1991–2010. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *62*(3), 443–483.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*(2), 229–273.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2020). Getting serious about diversity: Enough already with the business case. *Harvard Business Review*, *98*(6), 114–122.

Georgeac, O. A. M., & Rattan, A. (2022). The business case for diversity backfires: Detrimental effects of organizations' instrumental diversity rhetoric for underrepresented group members' sense of belonging. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *124*(1), 69–108. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000394

Gordon, K., Wilson, J., Tonner, A., & Shaw, E. (2018). How can social enterprises impact health and well-being?. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *24*(3), 697–713.

Gray, B. J., Duncan, S., Kirkwood, J., & Walton, S. (2014). Encouraging sustainable entrepreneurship in climate-threatened communities: A Samoan case study. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *26*(5–6), 401–430.

Hall, E., Hall, A. V., Galinsky, A., & Phillips, K. W. (2018). MOSAIC: A model of stereotyping through associated and intersectional categories. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*(3), 643–672. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0109

Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 1199–1228.

Haugh, H. (2007). Community–led social venture creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, *31*(2), 161–182.

Hertel, C., Bacq, S., & Lumpkin, G. T. (Forthcoming). Social performance and social impact in the context of social enterprises—A holistic perspective. In A. Vaccaro & T. Ramus (Eds.), *Social innovation and social enterprises: Toward a holistic perspective*. Springer.

Holmes IV, O. (2019). For diversity scholars who have considered activism when scholarship isn't enough. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *38*(6), 668–675. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-08-2017-0170

Holmes IV, O. (2020). Police brutality and four other ways racism kills Black people. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *39*(7), 803–809. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-06-2020-0151

Holmes IV, O., Jiang, K., Avery, D. R., McKay, P., Oh, I., & Tillman, C. J. (2021). A meta-analysis integrating 25 years of diversity climate research. *Journal of Management*, *47*(6), 1357–1382. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320934547

Holmes IV, O., Smith, A. N., Loyd, D. L., & Gutiérrez, A. S. (2022). Scholars of color explore bias in academe: Calling in allies and sharing affirmations for us by us. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *173*, 104204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2022.104204

IssueLab. (2021). https://www.issuelab.org

Jain, S., & Koch, J. (2020). Crafting markets and fostering entrepreneurship within underserved communities: Social ventures and clean energy provision in Asia. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *32*(1–2), 176–196.

Kendi, I. X. (2017). *Stamped from the beginning: The definitive history of racist ideas in America*. Bold Type Books.

Klein, P. G., Mahoney, J. T., McGahan, A. M., & Pitelis, C. N. (2019). Organizational governance adaptation: Who is in, who is out, and who gets what. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*(1), 6–27.

Lumpkin, G. T., & Bacq, S. (2019). Civic wealth creation: A new view of stakeholder engagement and societal impact. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *33*(4), 383–404.

Lumpkin, G. T., Bacq, S., & Pidduck, R. J. (2018). Where change happens: Community-level phenomena in social entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *56*(1), 24–50.

Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 36–44.

Norton, M. I., Sommers, S. R., Apfelbaum, E. P., Pura, N., & Ariely, D. (2006). Color blindness and interracial interaction. *Psychological Science*, *17*(11), 949–953.

Offermann, L. R., Basford, T. E., Graebner, R., Jaffer, S., Graaf, S. B. De, & Kaminsky, S. E. (2014). See no evil: Color blindness and perceptions of subtle racial discrimination in the workplace. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *20*(4), 499–507.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Papi-Thornton, D. (2019). *Teaching guide to map the system*. Saïd Business School, University of Oxford.

Peredo, A. M., Haugh, H. M., Hudon, M., & Meyer, C. (2020). Mapping concepts and issues in the ethics of the commons: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *166*(4), 659–672.

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, *20*(4), 444–446. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02318.x

Ray, V. (2023). *On critical race theory: Why it matters and why you should care*. Random House.

Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(3), 417–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2003.09.002

Roberson, Q. M., Holmes IV, O., & Perry, J. (2017). Transforming research on diversity and firm performance: A dynamic capabilities perspective. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *11*(1), 189–216. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0019

Roberson, Q. M., Ryan, A. M., & Ragins, B. R. (2017). The evolution and future of diversity at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(3), 483–499. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000161

Roberts, L. M. (2020). *Move beyond the business case for diversity*. Bloomberg.Com. https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2020-06-28/business-case-for-diversity-isn-t-enough-to-end-corporate-racism#xj4y7vzkg

Sacco, J. M., & Schmitt, N. (2005). A dynamic multilevel model of demographic diversity and misfit effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(2), 203–231.

Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. *Journal of Management*, *45*(1), 70–95.

Todd, A. R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2012). The reciprocal link between multiculturalism and perspective-taking: How ideological and self-regulatory approaches to managing diversity reinforce each other. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(6), 1394–1398. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.07.007

Vestrum, I. (2014). The embedding process of community ventures: Creating a music festival in a rural community. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *26*(7–8), 619–644.

Webber, S. S., & Donahue, L. M. (2001). Impact of highly and less job-related diversity on work group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, *27*(2), 141–162. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630102700202

Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *20*, 77–140.

Williams, T. A., & Shepherd, D. A. (2016). Building resilience or providing sustenance: Different paths of emergent ventures in the aftermath of the Haiti earthquake. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(6), 2069–2102.

This page intentionally left blank

SECTION 1

This page intentionally left blank

EDI AND WOMEN'S INEQUALITY AT WORK: A SCOPING REVIEW

Maureen A. Kilgour

The University of Winnipeg, Canada

ABSTRACT

There has been an explosion of interest in "Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion" (EDI) – also referred to as DEI among other acronyms. On the one hand, this management trend has the potential to draw attention to the ways in which organizational practices and climates can be transformed to have a positive impact on the underrepresentation of women and other marginalized and excluded groups in the workplace. On the other hand, there may be real consequences for women as EDI replaces other concepts such as women's rights, gender equality, affirmative action, employment equity, gender discrimination, etc. This chapter applies a gender lens to the EDI concept and management policy and practice. It juxtaposes EDI's emergence with the lack of progress on gender equality that is observed and measured in many regions of the world and highlights several critiques that may explain this lack of progress. It also identifies what EDI policies and practices need to take into consideration to better address gender inequality in the workplace. Legal approaches are discussed along with a list of potential areas of research on EDI and gender equality to determine the best path forward for making concrete progress on true equality for women in the workplace.

Keywords: Equity; inclusion; intersectionality; workplace inequality; gender discrimination; equality; diversity; private sphere; work-life balance; motherhood

INTRODUCTION

There has been an explosion of interest in Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI), and policies to address EDI have become ubiquitous (Dover et al., 2020). Investment newswires report on the EDI industry – "Global Diversity and

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Management
Business and Society 360, Volume 6, 3–30

ISSN: 2514-1759/doi:10.1108/S2514-175920240000006001

Inclusion (D&I) Market to Reach $15.4 Billion by 2026" – and observers in the popular media write about the "EDI/DEI Industrial Complex" (Chen, 2020; PRN Newswire, 2020; Zheng, 2022). Gregoratti observes, not without concern, "that corporations, which would not be immediately associated with progressive struggles for gender justice, have now become some of the most vocal champions of gender equality and women's empowerment" (Gregoratti, 2016, p. 1). At the same time, gender inequality is persistent and pervasive, and women continue to experience discrimination and exclusion in the workplace. Given that gender inequality in the workplace is endemic, it is time to evaluate the potential of EDI to work toward combatting this gender inequality. The slow progress (or even retreat, as is the case for women and girls in Afghanistan, for example) requires continued interrogation of the EDI concept and scrutiny of employers' activities in gender and EDI. Engeli and Mazur ask some key questions which motivate this chapter: "How and why are the current public policies in action across the globe not up to the task?" and "What can be done to make policy action more resilient on the ground?" (Engeli & Mazur, 2022, p. 2). Given that "we already know what needs to be done" to address women's inequality in the workplace (Work-Related Gender Gaps Persist but Solutions Are Clear – New ILO Report, 2019), it is even more important than ever that organizations ensure their commitments to gender equality bear fruit.

The goal of the chapter is to provide a scoping review of EDI as it relates to the persistence of gender inequality in the formal sector workplace. It applies a gender lens to the EDI concept, management policy and practice, identifies key issues, and gleans insights from critiques of EDI. There are many reasons why it is important to interrogate the phenomenon of EDI from a gender perspective, including trying to understand whether they hold promise of addressing persistent workplace gender inequality, trying to explain the lack of progress on gender equality and addressing or responding to concerns from critics.

The chapter juxtaposes EDI's emergence with the lack of progress on gender equality that is observed and measured in many regions of the world. It identifies some of the outstanding and persistent gender equality issues that affect women in the workplace, summarizes pertinent critiques of EDI from a gender equality perspective, suggests reasons for the lack of progress, notwithstanding the proliferation of EDI policies and initiatives by employers globally, and reviews other complementary and/or contrasting approaches to advancing gender equality for women at work. While the chapter does not interrogate specific EDI policies or their outcomes (that is done elsewhere in this volume and in the academic literature emerging on this issue), it does present a synthesis of several issues which are important to understand EDI from a gender-aware perspective.

A key concern with EDI is that it represents a reframing of previous concepts such as discrimination. On the one hand, this reframing has the potential to draw attention to the ways in which organizational practices and climates can be transformed to have a positive impact on the underrepresentation of women and other marginalized and excluded groups in the workplace, with a focus on the important goals of equality, diversity, and inclusion. On the other hand, there

may be real consequences for women if EDI replaces other concepts such as women's rights, gender equality, affirmative action, employment equity, and gender discrimination.

This scoping review focusses on inequality faced by women as a group. Women have multiple social identities and experience multiple and concurrent levels of oppression, such as racism, which can result in additional challenges, exclusions, and inequalities at work (Campbell et al., 2018; Dennissen et al., 2020), thus the concept of intersectionality is important (Crenshaw, 1990; Woods et al., 2022). Many of these are also targeted by EDI initiatives in addition to women/gender, such as ethnic/racial identity, family status, age, disability, gender identity, sexual orientation, and indigenous status, among others. An analysis of EDI from a gender-aware perspective has implications for all historically disadvantaged or excluded groups as it can reveal the gaps and weaknesses of relying on EDI polices to achieve systemic change in formal sector workplaces.

EQUITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION

Over the past four decades, diversity management and related offspring such as EDI have evolved to become part of mainstream management practice. Current iterations of EDI can be viewed as an expansion of management diversity policies that emerged in the 1990s. For the purposes of this chapter, EDI is understood as "the specific programmes, policies and practices that organizations have developed and implemented to manage a diverse workforce effectively and to promote organizational equality" (Dennissen et al., 2020, p. 220). At their core, they are most often voluntary and employer-led (Woods et al., 2022). EDI can be characterized as being management-driven, voluntary, with multiple areas of focus (such as the workforce, clients, and suppliers), tied to the organization's public image and based primarily, but not exclusively, in the human resource management function. These are distinct from laws and government policies which require organizations to take certain steps in areas related to EDI, such as implementing pay equity (equal pay) legislation, promoting equal opportunity and affirmative action, addressing sexual and other forms of harassment, respecting regulations on workplace health and safety, maternity and parental leaves, and quotas for women on corporate boards.

The concept and management practice of EDI is still evolving and is highly contextual; a country's history, norms, and laws will impact on how EDI is understood locally (Klarsfeld et al., 2022). Notwithstanding numerous variations, there tends to be a common framework of ideas for implementing EDI policies; one observer noted a "rapid proliferation of cookie-cutter EDI firms and consultancies offering virtually the same services" (Zheng, 2022). Dennissen et al. concur: "[o]rganizations tend to implement similar practices …without much situational specificity…[suggesting] there is little variation in diversity management practices as if 'one size fits all'" (Dennissen et al., 2020, p. 220).

Within the academic literature, there are numerous evaluations of EDI as a concept and some are critical whilst others focus on best practices and operational tactics. Recent research has questioned the lack of progress on gender equality within EDI (Beghini et al., 2022; Dover et al., 2020; Fine et al., 2020). Unfortunately, there is still a dearth of in-depth comparative analyses of the types of EDI policies that exist within and across industries and sectors, as well as a dearth of research on the impact of these policies on women.

Another characteristic is "...the almost exclusive focus of diversity scholarship on the firm as the natural setting of diversity" which "has fundamentally limited our ability to produce knowledge that helps to envision and cultivate more equal and socially just, diverse organizations" (Janssens & Zanoni, 2021, p. 2). There is some research which tries to fill this gap (such as in Tamtik & Guenter, 2020), but the actual impact of diversity management policies does not get significant attention, apart from evaluating how many members of target groups have made it to management levels (Dennissen et al., 2020, p. 220).

It is important to note that EDI is not ahistorical. The emergence of workplace equality laws (employment equity, affirmative action, and similar initiatives) followed the expansion of civil rights for women, African Americans, and other historically disadvantaged groups through legislation in the 1960s, in the United States and some other jurisdictions (Ballard et al., 2020). Diversity management as a management policy or trend arrived later, starting predominantly in the 1980s and 1990s, and evolving since then. Some critics view EDI as "...a much more capital-friendly approach to manage differences in the labour force compared to legal rights which promoted affirmative action and anti-discrimination measures" (Romani et al., 2021, p. 9). Klarsfeld (2022) agrees and argues that the predominantly voluntary diversity policies and their descendants were conceived in part to provide "a more compelling narrative to organizations and managers" by moving attention away from existing legal rights such as those found in antidiscrimination and affirmative action laws, which "center on legal prescriptions and reparation of (past) injustices" (p. 2). This can be understood as a process of the disassociation of diversity rhetoric from civil rights law – "the managerialization of law," where "legal ideas are refigured by managerial ways of thinking as they flow across the boundaries of legal fields and into managerial and organizational fields" (Edelman et al., 2001, as discussed in Portocarrero & Carter, 2022, p. 2).

An important part of this transition from litigation, rights, and reparations included the development of the business case argument for EDI, where managing diversity can enhance a firm's bottom line (Romani et al., 2021). The academic literature on EDI mirrors this shift; Portocarrero and Carter have observed that where early diversity literature focused on workplace discrimination, recent research focusses more on general diversity and neglects to discuss the role played by affirmative action as a tool to combat discrimination based on characteristics such as race and gender (Portocarrero & Carter, 2022).

Core Concepts

One characteristic of EDI is the constant interrogation of what the concepts mean. There is significant debate about the E, the D, and the I. In terms of the E, some organizations use equality, such as the City of London, and others use equity, such as the US Chamber of Commerce (COC), which argues, like many organizations, that equity goes beyond equality, and equality is a limited concept which "refers to giving everyone the same thing" (*A Business Guide to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion*, 2021). Even organizations which use the same word – such as equity – have different interpretations of what that means in practice and whether there is a focus on inclusion or redistribution. Woods et al. (2022) note "the absence of a clear definition of equality [in organizations] and an insufficient and incomplete vision of how to define equality" (p. 93). A study of Canadian universities found that for most universities, an equal opportunity view of inclusion was part of the definition of equity, while a minority of universities considered fairness within the definition of equity, implying equality of outcome (Tamtik & Guenter, 2020). The D, diversity – which emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, is used by organizations in various ways – for example, Kirton and Greene (2021) suggest that it has been used to describe a specific workforce or an organizational policy, or as a way of understanding differences. This is discussed in greater detail below. In terms of the I, inclusion was added to diversity management more recently, when it was recognized that it was not enough to have a diverse workforce if all members of that diverse workforce did not feel as if they really belonged (as discussed, for example, in Mor Barak et al., 2016).

Other letters have been added to some organizations' EDI policies, such as belonging, which creates DEIB (The New DEI, n.d.). New York University has named their initiative GIDBEA – "global inclusion, diversity, belonging, equity, and access" (Global Inclusion and Diversity, n.d.). Others have added Justice (creating DEIJ or JEDI). Organizations in countries such as Canada which are dealing with the impact of colonialism on Indigenous Peoples have amended EDI to reflect this expanded scope. Some universities in Canada have added Indigeneity to their policy title – Wilfred Laurier University refers to "Indigeneity, Decolonization, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (IDEDI)" (Indigeneity, Decolonization, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion | Research Strengths | Wilfrid Laurier University, n.d.) and York, Calgary, and Western University in Canada refer to DEID: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Decolonialization.

Sometimes, even the acronyms are critiqued. Scientific American published an opinion piece entitled: "Why the Term *"JEDI" Is Problematic for Describing Programs That Promote Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion*": "They're meant to be heroes within the Star Wars universe, but the Jedi are inappropriate symbols for justice work" (Byrd et al., 2021). This article demonstrates that the names and acronyms are often viewed in symbolic ways and that these policies and initiatives can be challenged and dismissed by critics on name alone, without an evaluation or analysis of the actual implementation and impact of those policies.

Wolbring and Nguyen (2023) suggest that the constant evolution and modification of naming this policy approach is due to an awareness "that using any individual concept leads to limitations in fixing the problem" (p. 170). There is even debate about the word order for the policy (EDI, IDE, DEI). EDI is used more commonly outside of the United States, and DEI is used in the United States. The chapters in this volume and elsewhere address the varieties of EDI that can be found across industries, countries, and regions. It is not surprising that there is evidence of a constant evolution of management practices such as EDI. Lorbiecki and Jack (2000) summarized some of that evolution back in 2000. Much of what they described in the diversity management trends in the United States and the United Kingdom apply today.

EDI Target Groups

Because EDI policies are usually developed by organizations themselves, the groups targeted (target groups) can vary depending on the context of the organization and their goals for the EDI program (Alain et al., 2022; Köllen, 2021). Many organizations enumerate the specific target groups based on sociodemographic or identity-based characteristics, focusing on groups which have been historically disadvantaged. The number of groups included from this perspective often goes beyond the original targets (such as gender and ethnic minority status) of the 1960s era antidiscrimination and affirmative action laws mentioned above, to include characteristics such as religion, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, and even status as a military veteran (Sabharwal et al., 2018). The determination of who is included, while often left to the discretion of the organization, is sometimes influenced by social movements which advocate for the inclusion of specific groups (Köllen, 2021). It is important to note that not all historically disadvantaged groups receive the same attention (Austin, 2010) and that women as a group are not homogenous; many women have characteristics which include them in more than one target group or social category.

In contrast, other organizations base their EDI policies on aspects of diversity that are not linked to sociodemographic characteristics or a conceptualization of target groups based on historic disadvantage but instead are based on a more generic notion of diversity. Some organizations include the numerous ways in which individuals are distinct from each other, such as ways of thinking, personality traits, managerial styles, where someone went to university, previous work experience, etc. For example, the Irish Banking Federation stated in a lobbying document:

> We acknowledge...diversity requirements (with particular reference to gender diversity) are being introduced...Gender diversity is only one component of board diversity which should consider a wide range of issues including, but not limited to, skill mix, regional and industry experience, background and gender, and appointment on the basis of merit. (as quoted in Cullen & Murphy, 2018, p. 122)