COLOGNE BUSINESS SCHOOL

CBS | COLOGNE BUSINESS SCHOOL

Abegg Anja Karlshaus, Irene López, Ingvill C. Mochmann,
Ihar Sahakiants, Michael Stuber

Diversity and inclusion in Europe: analysing local specifics and international influences

WORKING PAPER 04

2018

Diversity and inclusion in Europe:

analysing local specifics and international influences

Anja Karlshaus, Irene López, Ingvill C. Mochmann, Ihar Sahakiants, Michael Stuber

Content

List of Tables

Diversity and inclusion in Europe:
analysing local specifics and international influences

Abstract

This working paper presents the results of five student studies dedicated to research on diversity and inclusion (D&I) in Europe and Turkey, under the joint supervision of the faculty of the Cologne Business School (CBS) and Michael Stuber, the founder of European Diversity Research and Consulting. By using content analysis technique to analyse information reported by major companies operating in the target countries and by building on the assumptions of neo-institutional theory, student researchers investigated the specifics of implementing D&I practices in these nations, as a result identifying a number of influencing factors determining such idiosyncrasies. The studies were conducted between autumn 2015 and spring 2016 and were presented in Bachelor or Master student theses. Each of the five student studies is presented as a short research report that includes a general description of the relevance of the topic for the analysed economies, the specifics of the local institutional context, a brief outline of the method used as well as a presentation and discussion of results.

1. Introduction

by Anja Karlshaus, Irene López, Ingvill C. Mochmann, Ihar Sahakiants

Demographic changes in developed countries and worldwide migration, resulting from an acceleration in globalisation, affect social structures and greatly increase heterogeneity within societies and organisations (Bendl, Hanappi-Egger and Hofmann, 2012; Beham, Straub and Schwalbach, 2011, 2012; Hunt, Layton and Prince, 2015). Thus, diversity in the workforce, related, for instance, to gender, age or ethnicity, is a given feature of today's organisational reality, and hence diversity management has become a wide-spread topic, at least among international blue-chip companies (European Diversity, 2017), and an essential human resource management (HRM) practice. While the original purpose of the related activities was to prevent any kind of discrimination within non-profit organisations and business enterprises, it is nowadays increasingly aimed at inclusion (Nkomo and Hoobler, 2014), which involves creating a harmonious working environment in which all employees can feel understood, welcomed and integrated. More business-focused models describe diversity and inclusion (hereafter referred to as D&I) as a value-creation process which contributes to corporate priorities (Stuber, 2014).

The aim of the student research projects presented in this working paper is to analyse, from a comparative perspective, country-specific traits in the D&I implementation by companies operating in the analysed countries. In particular, these studies seek to answer the question as to whether D&I practices vary across European regions. The research was initiated by European Diversity Research and Consulting, and carried out as a collaborative project involving five students at the Cologne Business School (CBS) who analysed D&I activities in selected European country clusters as part of their Master or Bachelor theses. The following five country groups, categorised by geographic location, shared history or shared cultural values, were covered: Cluster 1, consisting of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden; Cluster 2, including France, Belgium and Luxembourg; Cluster 3, incorporating the UK, Ireland and the Netherlands; Cluster 4, incorporating Turkey and Greece and, finally, Cluster 5, of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

In the following section of the introduction, a definition is given of D&I applied within the context of this paper, followed by a brief presentation of the theoretical and methodological framework used in the study. Although this general framework was to be followed by each

researcher, in some cases slight modifications were made, due to country- and region-specific circumstances. Summaries of the results from the respective country clusters analysed by the students follow in Chapters 2 to 6. Each of these project reports provides a specification of the related country cluster, including a short contextual analysis of the countries, an overview of the analysed local and international companies and findings on how organisational D&I practices vary within a country cluster as well as with regards to international best practices, and it also suggests first explanations for the analysed particularities. Finally, a concluding summary and an outlook follow in Chapters 7 and 8.

Definition of diversity and inclusion

Diversity, in essence, can be seen as "[…] the condition of being different or diverse" (Hankin, 2005, p. 67). However, over time, several researchers, including Kandola and Fullerton (1998), have felt the need to specify and develop further the most basic understanding of diversity. They state: "The basic concept of managing diversity accepts that the workforce consists of a diverse population of people. The diversity consists of visible and non-visible differences, which will include factors such as sex, age, background, race, disability, personality and work style. It is founded on the premise that harnessing these differences will create a productive environment in which everybody feels valued, where their talents are being fully utilized and in which organizational goals are met" (Kandola and Fullerton, 1998, p. 8). Those directly visible characteristics, such as gender and age, are also referred to as 'surface-level' characteristics, while non-visible characteristics are described by scholars as including personality, values, sexual orientation or religion (Harrison, Price and Bell, 1998; Voigt, 2001). Other scholars, however, differentiate between diversity associated with job-related characteristics, such as seniority and education, and non-job-related characteristics, including age, sex and cultural background (Jackson and Joshi, 2011). Yet again, other authors argue that diversity not only has internal and external dimensions, the former usually being of a permanent nature, whereas the latter are selective and subject to change, but also a work-related dimension (Gardenswartz and Rowe, 1994).

Although the above-mentioned definitions add complexity to the understanding of diversity, one can summarise the different characteristics of individuals within social categories, since the latter allow for systematic classification of individuals in terms of clusters, such as gender,

religion, age and ethnicity. Furthermore, these social categories set parameters for diversity dimensions/markers (Hanappi-Egger, 2012).

Similar to the definitions of diversity, those of inclusion have also been developed further over time. The term first gained popularity in the 1990s in the UK, when annual inclusion conferences were launched, "[aiming at] extending and refining ideas about integration", in order to "[eliminate] social exclusion that is a consequence of responses to diversity in race, social class, ethnicity, religion, gender and ability" (Hassanein, 2015, p. 32). Although the term 'inclusion' referred initially only to inequalities in school systems, it has come to be defined as the degree to which an employee is being accepted and also treated as a part by other members of the work-related system (Pelled, Ledford and Mohrman, 1998, p. 2).

While the terms 'diversity' and 'inclusion' are often combined in academic literature, this pairing often leads to confusion in relation to using the expressions interchangeably, as consecutive development steps or as synergetic elements. It has to be noted that diversity, for example, could be attained by hiring diverse staff, whereas inclusion requires a shift in the mind frame of all individuals within an organisation (Hanappi-Egger, 2012, p. 26; Vohra and Chari, 2015). Therefore, it can be argued that diversity is the input, while inclusion is the process of achieving the outcome. Inclusion "puts the concept and practice of diversity into action by creating an environment of involvement, respect, and connection where the richness of ideas, backgrounds, and perspectives are harnessed to create business value" (Hudson Jordan, 2015). Moreover, inclusion can be seen as a further development of the diversity concept, in order to abandon an existing minority-majority mindset that flourishes when focusing solely on differences between individuals (Hanappi-Egger, 2012). While studies of corporate practices show that an integrated view of diversity and inclusion (and/or equality) has become wide-spread among large multinational corporations (European Diversity, 2017), models suggest that a synchronised addressing of D&I can systematically propel performance (Stuber, 2014).

D&I in the context of this working paper refer to the following diversity dimensions: age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity or origin, disability and religion. These six characteristics are stated as the core dimensions used to eliminate discrimination within the EU (Ungleich Besser Diversity Consulting, 2016).

Theoretical framework

Over the last decades, popular, practitioner and academic discussions on the implementation and benefits of D&I practices in organisations have evolved to underscore the advantages of increased diversity for companies (Stuber, 2017a), which is summarised under the notion of "business case for diversity" (cf. Klarsfeld, 2009, p. 364). However, although there seems to be little room for fundamental doubts about the business value of well-managed D&I, there has been less agreement on theoretical explanations of the diffusion of such practices.

In their attempt to probe into the determinants of implementing diversity management practices, organisational research scholars have utilised a number of theoretical perspectives and approaches, including the resource-based view of the firm (Yang and Konrad, 2011), organisational demography (Everly and Schwarz, 2015), resource munificence and contingency theories (Pitts, Hicklin, Hawes and Melton, 2010). However, the prevailing theoretical lens used by researchers to explain the diffusion and adoption of diversity management practices has been the neo-institutional theory (Cole and Salimath, 2013; Everly and Schwarz, 2015; Klarsfeld, 2009; Pitts et al., 2010; Süß and Kleiner, 2008; Yang and Konrad, 2011), in particular the theory of institutional isomorphism, which was coined by DiMaggio and Powell (1983).

The above perspective foregrounds the important role of institutions as "multifaceted, durable social structures, made up of symbolic elements, social activities, and material resources" (Scott, 2001, p. 49). According to this theoretical view, one of the most important aspects driving the implementation of organisational practices – which is also discussed frequently with respect to D&I practices – is striving toward legitimacy, defined by Suchman as "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (1995, p. 574). For instance, Dobbin, Kim and Kalev (2011) refer to the seminal work on sociological neoinstitutionalism by Meyer and Rowan (1977), who see the equal opportunity recruitment and selection processes as "legitimized procedures" (p. 349) and state that "institutionalists have described…[diversity programs] as window-dressing, adopted largely to win legitimacy" (Dobbin et al., 2011, p. 387). According to Scott (2001), institutions rely on three main elements or pillars related to different bases of legitimacy: the regulative pillar is based on legal sanctioning, the normative pillar corresponds to moral governance and the cultural-cognitive

pillar of institutions is characterised by bases of legitimacy such as comprehensiveness, recognisability and cultural support.

An additional advantage of the institutional theory as a theoretical lens for the analysis of the respective diversity management practices within the research projects presented in this working paper lies in its benefits for understanding the international differences in specific organisational practices, including diversity management (Ferner, Almond, and Colling, 2005; Özbilgin, Syed, Ali, and Torunoglu, 2012). Here, the proponents of this approach underscore the embeddedness of the respective organisational practices in local institutional contexts (Sippola and Smale, 2007; Süβ and Kleiner, 2007), which include laws, regulations, education systems or specifics of industrial relations.

The above considerations on the benefits of using the institutional theory of organisations to study the issue of dissemination and the adoption of diversity management practices build a strong argument in favour of implementing this perspective as the major theoretical lens in the student research projects presented in this working paper. Here, the focus lies on the major mechanisms of institutional isomorphism, or homogenisation within organisational fields, proposed by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), including coercive, normative and mimetic influences as summarised in the conclusion section.

Methodology

In order to facilitate a comparison within the respective country clusters as well as between regional clusters, the methodological framework was developed and discussed between members of the research group in several meetings. One of the challenges was to obtain good and valid data at the country level that would still allow for valid comparisons across countries and regions.

In order to select companies for the study, in a first step, organisations' websites, research papers, conferences and other sources were sought. Topics and concepts were selected, both in English and to whatever extent possible in the respective native languages, which were considered to be of relevance to D&I, such as equality, gender, age, ethnicity, etc. As most of the countries analysed in the study are members of the European Union, the companies located in these countries have to adhere to European Union anti-discrimination directives. Furthermore, companies headquartered outside of Europe, e. g. the USA, were expected to also

apply the requirements and laws of their home countries in European subsidiaries. Thus, by using a multi-layered search approach as a starting point, it was assumed that companies could be selected for the study that represented both national (and sometimes regional) and international standards and practices regarding D&I. In addition, various lists such as those provided by UN Global Compact, Financial Times Stock Exchange (FTSE) or DiversityInc were used to select companies – even though such a selection process, to some extent, might be tautological.

Nonetheless, by applying the above-described approach, the research question, namely whether the understanding and application of D&I practices vary across European regions and to what extent these differ from international best practices, could be answered and some explanations for country specifics suggested. Although this systematic approach was applied by all students in their research projects, access to sources and companies turned out to be distributed quite unequally across the countries. Thus, in some cases, the challenge was to select from amongst a large number of available companies, whereas in other countries those few that could be found had to be included in the analysis. In neither case, however, could the samples presented in the country analyses in Chapters 2 to 6 be considered as representative but rather as the results of applying a convenience sampling strategy through which results are derived from readily available data (Bryman, 2012). In particular, information about D&I practices in the companies found in the first step had to be available for analysis in step two (see below). However, as this was not always the case, some companies were excluded from the analysis.

In the second step, all available data on the selected companies were collected, coded and analysed. First, all quantitative and qualitative data sources addressing D&I practices of the preselected companies were collected. *The Implementation Checklist for Diversity Management*, published by the European Commission within the framework of the project "Support for voluntary initiatives promoting Diversity Management at the workplace across the EU" (European Commission, 2012b, p. 3), was used for selecting relevant measures regarding D&I practices addressed in the various company sources. The checklist includes the following areas: the positioning of diversity within the corporate context, management structures for diversity, measurement and monitoring, top-down implementation, bottom-up implementation, external outreach, integration of diversity in HR, integration of diversity in communication as well as integration of diversity in purchasing (ibid.). All of these areas are split further into

subtopics to facilitate, monitor and evaluate the implementation of D&I at the company's operational level, in particular into the dimensions of diversity management: age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity or origin, disability and religion. Gender is considered a given core topic with the EU framework. For the students, this checklist thus served as a coding scheme that could be applied when studying the data sources, where a "1" was given if a dimension was addressed explicitly in any company source, and a "0" if not. The data were entered into an Excel table with references to the sources where they were found. Deviations from this procedure are documented and explained in the respective country cluster reports in the subsequent sections.

Although cumbersome data collection and time constraints formed research barriers, the results are to be seen as an explorative analysis upon which further in-depth qualitative and quantitative studies can build.

2. Diversity and inclusion practices in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden

by Merle Wilperath

Introduction

For McKinsey & Company (2015), diversity is an undeniably influential matter. Through progressive globalisation and worldwide migration especially, "it is an undeniable fact that diversity is a societal reality in modern western societies […], a reality that is inevitably mirrored in the workforce population […]" (Gotsis and Kortezi, 2015, p. 1) and which challenges established corporate structures. Along with continuing change toward greater heterogeneity in societal structures, the ongoing demographic also shifts employees' priorities, thereby further affecting organisations and transforming today's companies (Charta der Vielfalt, 2016).

Organisations active in European competition share a duty to follow the path paved by the European Union's motto "United in Diversity" (European Union, 2016). However, "diversity is dealt with in different ways across Europe" (Nougayrède, 2016), and one cannot help but feel that "[…] the debate is happening within national silos" (ibid.). This assumption is worthy of analysis and underlines the reason for examining commonalities as well as differences in the way organisations located in different countries implement/address D&I practices. Beyond this point, further investigation into the potential interrelation between a country's individual context factors, such as the legal, social and cultural landscape and its engagement in D&I, will be presented and discussed.

Being commonly considered as welfare states with "[…] relatively low levels of inequality" (Righard, Johansson and Salonen, 2015, p. 8), Scandinavian nations especially are confronted with the shift from "[…] traditionally homogenous populations […]" (Bengtsson, Strömblad, and Bay, 2010, p. 1) to rather heterogeneous structures, making this group of countries particularly interesting for examination.

The context of D&I in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden

Apart from their geographic and cultural proximity, as well as their strong historical, ethnic, linguistic and religious connections (cf. Knutsen, 2017), Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland (often referred to as Scandinavia or the *Nordic* nations) are embedded in the legal

context of the European Union, requiring them to "[…] transpose EU directives into national law" (Danowitz and Claes, 2012, p. 34). In the case of Norway, however, this only holds for specific areas as Norway is a member only of the European Economic Area (EEA) and not the EU. Furthermore, all four countries are members of the Council of Europe, which commits its member states to Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights, i.e. banning "[…] discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, color, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status" (Council of Europe, 2016, p. 12).

Although all three EU members Denmark, Finland and Sweden – and to some extent the EEA member Norway - act under the European Union's legislative rules, the incorporation of EU provisions into individual legal systems can vary across these countries. To this effect, country-specific context factors, such as culture, demographics, laws or politics, influence the local perceptions, interpretations and values involved in managing D&I (Danowitz and Claes, 2012).

Being widely considered a benchmark amongst social and economic systems, the *Nordic model* is the key influencer in the understanding of D&I in all four countries (Andersen et al., 2007). Deeply rooted in this system, Nordic states (to which also Iceland belongs as well as the islands) not only form a cluster of their own, but they also further constitute role models in terms of welfare, employment, equality and quality of life (Nordic Centre for Welfare and Social Issues, 2013). Although all four countries present relatively incomprehensibly weak economic incentives, an answer can be found within the welfare state ideology. Although taxation levels are already among the highest globally, at the same time, these countries have the highest social expenditure among European countries, with their governments strongly supporting primary education, social services, care for the elderly as well as kindergarten, childcare and preschool education and care – thus enormously contributing to citizens' quality of life (Kommunekredit et al., 2012).

Besides promoting citizens' overall satisfaction, the Nordic countries focus extensively on gender diversity. By offering childcare and free education as well as favourable parental leave policies and post-maternity re-entry programmes (World Economic Forum, 2013), Nordic governments have made it easier for women to participate in the workplace, leading to high employment levels in all four countries (Nordic Centre for Welfare and Social Issues, 2013).

Accordingly, these nations "[…] emerge as top performers and true leaders on gender equality" (World Economic Forum, 2013, p. 20).

Gender equality and diversity generally has been considered primarily from "a historical perspective, as a question of social class" (Bengtsson, Strömblad and Bay, 2010, p. 1). Having experienced a gradual shift towards highly diverse populations, it can be assumed that "this increasing diversity may represent a particular challenge to the Scandinavian political and social model" (Bengtsson, Strömblad and Bay, 2010, p. 1). Instead, according to the Migrant Integration Policy Index 2015, measuring "[…] migrants' opportunities to participate in society" (Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2015), Nordic countries have been rated favourably, or at least mostly favourably, in terms of their local integration policies. In this regard, differences occur primarily between Sweden and Denmark. While Sweden is shaped by a very supportive migration policy and immigrants are assumed to have "[…] full rights while maintaining some cultural differences" (Danowitz and Claes, 2012, p. 48), in Denmark, they are rather "[…] expected to assimilate to cultural norms" (Danowitz and Claes, 2012, p. 48). Nevertheless, in general, Nordic countries' tolerance of minorities has proven to be among the highest in the world (OECD, 2011). Highlighted by the Social Progress Index, especially with regard to ethnic minorities and homosexuals, these nations strongly demonstrate tolerance and inclusion (Social Progress Imperative, 2016).

As stated previously, ongoing changing demographics will constitute a huge challenge for Scandinavia in the near future. While Norway features the youngest population, Finland's population has the oldest age composition; but simultaneously experiencing an increase in youth unemployment, Finland has already started a pioneer programme to support young people entering the job market, thus decreasing overall unemployment.

Looking back at the diversity dimensions addressed above, it is noticeable that the understanding of D&I in these four countries seems to be rooted deeply in the Nordic model and people's positive attitudes towards diversity. Beyond that, diversity represents an essential tool for securing the welfare state.

Sampling and data collection method

In order to analyse the given country group of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland with regard to their D&I practices, companies in the respective nations were chosen based on a convenience sample, as described in the "Methodology" section of this working paper.

The selection process for companies in Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland started with an analysis of the European Commission's website in the autumn of 2015. By inserting queries such as "Diversity", "Diversity and Inclusion", "Diversity Management" or "Anti-Discrimination", corresponding data such as reports and summaries were found on the website. Furthermore, diversity charter newsletters informing about latest news, initiatives and conferences in the field of diversity and inclusion were found. In this context, best organisational practices, initiatives, conferences or specific network groups, as well as corporations in the field of D&I, were used to elaborate the following findings. In order to complement the results from this selection method, national diversity charters as well as subject-related, professional journals served as further sources of potential samples.

In the next step, the final selection was based on the availability of English-language data on a specific enterprise. Nevertheless, before withdrawing a company from the list, every effort was made to work with the national language. In this regard, inserting search terms such as "mångfald", "mangfoldighed" or "diskriminerings" indicated the general availability of potentially useful material. Based on the described sample selection methods, the following companies were chosen for the Scandinavian country group:

Table 1: Sample group: International best practice in Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland

Norway	Sweden	Denmark	Finland	International best practice
Hydro	Ericsson	Arriva	ISS	AT&T
DNB	Volvo	Arla	Kesko	Marriot
Telenor	Scandic	Danske Bank	Kone	P&G
Posten	Swedbank	Ecco	Nokia	Deloitte
ManpowerGroup	Axfood	IBM	ManpowerGroup	Novartis
	Skanska			MasterCard

Source: Own Illustration

In order to identify an international comparison group for later analysis, the 2016 DiversityInc Top 50 Companies for Diversity list was taken as a source for sample selection. As one of the leading publishers of diversity websites and an initiator of several diversity awards, this list can be assumed a reliable and an independent source of best practice examples in the field of D&I. The following six of the top 20 organisations listed were chosen for the international sample group: AT&T, Marriott, P&G, Deloitte, Novartis and MasterCard.

When it comes to collecting relevant data for analysis, the relative corporate websites of the chosen organisations were the starting point for data gathering. Moreover, annual reports from the last five years of each company provided valuable information. Since companies did not always supply the same material on their websites, data acquisition was expanded to CSR reports, sustainability reports, codes of conduct and codes of business ethics. Finally, missing information was complemented through selective research on external websites such as those promoting diversity conferences, events, journals or magazines.

Findings

After having collected relevant data on each of the companies, results were translated into the Implementation Checklist for Diversity Management, an acknowledged tool for assessing organisations' diversity engagement (for details, see Chapter 1). Interpreting the results from this checklist, several similarities as well as differences between the diversity and inclusion practices of the Scandinavian and international sample organisations were identified. The following table provides a broad overview of the main results:

Table 2: Similarities and differences between practices in Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland compared to the international comparison group

Criterion	Norway	Sweden	Denmark	Finland	Int. comparison group
Integration in corporate structures	Incorporation in business strategy as well as code of conduct and business ethics, emphasis on all dimensions protected by Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights				
Focus of internal programmes	Gender	Gender (Age, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation)	Gender (Age, Disabled, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation)	Gender	Gender (Age, Disabled, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation)
Focus of measurements/ monitoring	Varied	Varied	Varied	Varied	Gender (Age, Ethnicity)
Focus of external partnerships	Ethnicity, Disabled	Ethnicity, Youth, Disabled	Youth, Disabled	Disabled, Youth	Diverse

Source: Own Illustration

With regard to organisations' integration of diversity and inclusion in their corporate structures, the results appear to be similar across the Scandinavian and the international sample groups. While only a minority explicitly linked their diversity and inclusion engagement to their overall business strategy, all companies referred to the six core dimensions of diversity in their code of conduct, code of business ethics or business policies. In some cases, organisational commitment to diversity and inclusion was expressed further by complementary anti-discrimination, equal opportunities or diversity policies. Additionally, most of the analysed organisations further recognised diversity as a crucial part of their vision, values, corporate culture and identity. Moreover, the majority of the companies attached great importance to diversity in their future scenarios.

When it comes to organisational focus concerning internal initiatives such as employee resource groups, training or mentoring programmes, the results already seem to be a bit more diverse. While all companies show a clear focus on female support programmes, organisations in Sweden and Denmark established additional special training sessions or networks for different

age groups, cultural backgrounds or people with limited capacities to work. Organisations from the international comparison group stood out particularly by offering various employee networks such as veteran or parents' groups.

With reference to organisations' participation in selected indexes, surveys and ratings demonstrating their engagement in D&I, the analysis only showed a few positive results. In contrast, findings concerning the regular measuring and monitoring of diversity dimensions led to more findings, albeit they were quite varied with respect to diversity dimensions. While nearly all organisations reported gender mixes within their staff cohort, only companies from Sweden mentioned that they frequently measured the percentage of sexual minority and LGBT people as well. In both Denmark and Finland, only one of five organisations noted that they actively monitored the percentage of younger, middle-aged and older employees. If mentioned at all, the focus of the other countries lay rather in measuring the share of the youngest generation only. About half of the reviewed organisations further covered dominant ethnic, racial or cultural groups in their internal diversity assessments. The results on organisations' participation in external measurements appear to be quite even across the international comparison group. Accordingly, all of the companies are represented in at least one internationally recognised index, survey or rating concerning their diversity and inclusion management.

Differences were identified further in terms of the organisations' focus on external partnerships. In the case of Scandinavian companies, positive results concerning diversity-promoting private-public partnerships only appear sporadic across the country group. In contrast, companies across all Scandinavian countries generally show great support for external diversity activities and events. Another distinguishing point is that most initiatives focus on alleviating disability burdens. While companies from the international comparison group considerably outperform Scandinavian organisations in terms of external communication such as social media, results concerning diversity-related partnerships also appear to be quite scattered.

Discussion

Relating results from the analysis of D&I practices in Scandinavian organisations to information gained on the Nordic understanding of D&I, in most of the cases, similarities and differences can be explained by local country specifics and organisational factors as well as the

supra-national environment of these countries (e.g. EU law). Contrasting with common international D&I practices, the Scandinavian examples reveal the strong influence of national conditions that shape national D&I accordingly. The end result is evidenced in differences in management styles, enforced values and idiosyncrasies.

Generally, with the exception of certain nuances in their focus, D&I appears to be present quite equally in Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland – once again matching the strong historical and ideological connection of this Nordic quartet. In this regard, sharing the values of a welfare state is most likely to be an environmental influencing factor explaining the countries' overall intersection regarding D&I. However, differences most presumably can be explained by the specifics of local contexts. While Sweden, for instance, as the country with by far the highest proportion of foreign-born citizens among the Scandinavian states, demonstrates a great commitment to ethnic minorities, Denmark does not seem to concentrate on this topic too much. Macro-environmental context factors such as the existing political situation or migrant history of both countries could possibly be an explanation for these discrepancies.

While such macro-environmental factors are very likely to be linked to similarities or differences between organisations' D&I practices, the actual influence can only be presumed. In the case of incorporating D&I in businesses strategies, visions or guidelines, for instance, it remains questionable whether this results from internal motivation or from legal requirements as macro-environmental context factors. Instead, the impact of macro-environmental context factors such as EU legislation or global demographic change is noticeable and even measurable across all countries. Differences are particularly visible when comparing the macro-environment of Scandinavian countries with those of the international benchmarking group.

3. Diversity and inclusion practices in France, Belgium and Luxembourg

by Judith Dükert

Introduction

"United in diversity" is a motto followed closely by nations like France, Belgium and Luxembourg and binds them together in striving toward forecasted globalisation challenges (European Commission, 2016).

This chapter analyses how organisations' D&I practices in France, Belgium and Luxembourg may vary and whether they differ from international best practices. It was decided to cluster these countries together because according to the World Values Survey (2008) they all belong to Catholic Europe, implying a common ground concerning traditional values versus secular values, e.g. emphasis on religion, as well as survival values versus self-expression values, e.g. emphasis on tolerance of foreigners (WVS, 2008). Additionally, there is a strong homogeneity with respect to geographic location and spoken language.

Since each country in the group is embedded in a unique legal, cultural and social context, organisational approaches toward D&I differ across borders (Danowitz and Claes, 2012). Therefore, the chapter first summarises the national understanding of D&I in each of these countries, then describes how the companies were selected for the study, and finally presents the key findings and concludes with a discussion of the results.

The context of D&I in France, Belgium and Luxembourg

Apart from shared legislative fundamentals through the EU framework, France, Belgium and Luxembourg have developed their own understanding of D&I (Nougayrède, 2016). In France, the diversity concept is rooted in the idea of banning discrimination in the workplace through the French labour law anti-discrimination framework, which prohibits employers making discriminatory decisions based on gender, opinion, ethnicity or union affiliation. Over time, the adoption of EU directives has expanded such discrimination criteria. With respect to diversity dimensions such as gender, union activity, disability, age and social deprivation, the French legislation includes some form of affirmative action. However, no form of affirmative action exists for the areas of sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity and race, because they fall under

the French equality of rights framework. Based on an increasing awareness of difficulties linked to the French model of equality and integration (e.g. colour blind policy), the general notion of diversity has evolved around ethnic diversity. In addition, the diversity debate in France focuses on equal opportunities between men and women, but ambiguities surrounding public policies in the field of conciliation of work and the family make the implementation of professional equality a concern (Bender, Klarsfeld and Laufer, 2010).

Similarly, the commitment to D&I in Belgian organisations concentrates mainly on ethnic minorities and gender equality. While for ethnic minorities the focus is on access to employment and avoiding prejudice and administrative barriers in the process of finding a job, the gender diversity debate is concerned with equal opportunities (Cornet and Zanoni, 2010). Although the gender pay gap in Belgium is below the EU average, there is a strong underrepresentation of women in managerial positions and on supervisory boards (European Commission, 2012a). However, similar to the majority of European countries, Belgium has an extensive legislation that aims at combating discrimination. The most recent national legislation consists of the laws of May 10, 2007, which include amendments and new regulations concerning the equal treatment of men and women, anti-discrimination and anti-racism. These laws implement the directives of the Council of the European Union (Cornet and Zanoni, 2010).

For Luxembourg, no specific information could be found about the understanding of diversity. The fact that 43% of the population of Luxembourg are foreigners has a strong effect on the perception of the diversity dimension 'ethnicity' (Callens, Meuleman and Valentova, 2015, p. 18). To prevent discrimination, Luxembourg signed and ratified the European Convention on Human Rights, which prohibits discrimination on any ground (Hoffmann, 2015), and even though there is a significant underrepresentation of women on supervisory boards and in management positions, which leads to the assumption that in the context of the discrimination discussion, special focus is also placed on the dimension "gender" (European Commission, 2013b). With the Law of 28 November 2006, earlier legislation aiming at gender equality in all areas of employment was extended. This law transposes EU directives and amends Luxembourg's Labour Code, which grants provisions relating to positive action with respect to ethnic origin, religion, disability, age, and sexual orientation (IMS Luxembourg Association, 2016).

To meet the challenges of diversity in a non-legislative way, governmental institutions, organisations and associations in each country initiated different charters or labels, each guiding and rewarding companies for exceptional diversity and inclusion practices. For instance, each nation has its own diversity charter, which has been signed by numerous enterprises committing themselves to cultural, ethnic and social diversity as well as to raising awareness of anti-discrimination (Diversity Charter, 2016). Other examples include France's Equality Label, Belgium's Equality and Diversity Label and Luxembourg's participation in the Equal Pay Day (European Commission, 2012a, 2013a, 2013b).

Description of the sample

For the described country cluster, a convenience sample was chosen in order to examine better the best D&I practices applied by international organisations within the focus group. To identify organisations, the use of the DiversityInc Top 50 Companies helped to select, analyse and discuss the following organisations. Precisely, the sample consisted of six from the top 20 organisations on the list: AT&T, Deloitte, Marriott International, MasterCard, Novartis and Procter & Gamble (DiversityInc, 2016), all of which were selected to represent different industries and to avoid a one-sided perspective.

To identify organisational best practices in France, Belgium and Luxembourg, a multi-layered approach was used. Since all three countries belong to the EU, European Commission webpages provided a first reference to recognise D&I initiatives as well as companies and their best practices within the country group. On these websites, all available materials, including diversity management newsletters, surveys, reports, case studies and conference scripts, were searched for country- or company-specific information and hints. To collect more specific data and generate findings about D&I practices in the selected sample organisations, secondary data, including corporate websites, annual reports, CSR reports, human capital reports and D&I reports, were utilised.

Thereafter, the information collected from the European Commission websites in 2016 was used to gather deeper insights and to identify further best practice organisations. For that purpose, the relevant publications were searched for diversity and inclusion charters, labels, awards, conferences and events. Researching the specific terms separately helped identify

additional organisations that were mentioned as initiators, partners or best practice examples within the countries. For an overview, all organisations that stood out because of their commitment to D&I were included in a table; however, since the table contained too many organisations to analyse, only those that were mentioned most often by independent sources were included in the sample. It was assumed that organisations that were cited most frequently offered the most prominent D&I commitment. Table 3 presents the selected organisations for the three countries. The companies are arranged in descending order, starting with those mentioned most often in the analysed materials.

Table 3: Sample group: France, Belgium and Luxembourg and international best practice

France	Belgium	Luxembourg	International best practice
BNP Paribas	BNP Paribas Fortis	BGL BNP Paribas Fortis	AT&T
Orange	Randstad	ING	Marriot
AXA	Sodexo	CTG	P&G
L'Oreal	AXA	Orange	Deloitte
Sodexo	L'Oreal		Novartis
Total	Proximus		MasterCard
Accenture			
Groupe Casino			

Source: Own Illustration

In Luxembourg and Belgium, the sample could be limited to the organisations presented in Table 3, since all the other companies were mentioned in the various sources only once, which would have made a further selection procedure purely subjective. Since the search for recognised organisations in France yielded far more output, the sample size is larger than in Luxembourg and Belgium and disregards companies that were mentioned fewer than three times in the analysed materials.

Findings

When evaluating the partnerships and agreements of the analysed enterprises with external institutions, it became obvious that the studied companies in France and Belgium focused on

promoting the development of young people. For instance, companies would sponsor networking events or offer job training to encourage and prepare young people to follow certain career paths. In Luxembourg and in the international best practice group, no clear focus could be identified.

Another difference was identified with regard to internal development and support programmes for employees in the own organisation. In France, several organisations offered mentoring programmes, networks and awareness training for people with disabilities. In doing so, the sampled companies in France seem to emphasise the dimension of disability more than those in Belgium, Luxembourg and the international best practice group. These findings, along with other main differences and similarities, are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4: Similarities and differences between practices in France, Belgium and Luxembourg and with regard to the international comparison group

Criterion	France	Belgium	Luxembourg	International best pratice group
Focus of external partnerships	Youth	Youth	Varied	Varied
Focus of internal programmes	Disabled workers	Varied	Varied	Varied
Main focus of employee support programmes	Diversity dimension of gender			Gender, Ethnicity, Age, Disability, Sexual Orientation
Integration in business strategy	Incorporation in code of conduct or business policies, emphasis on different diversity dimensions			
Commitment to charters or labels	Participation in local diversity charters and labels			Not mentioned, focus on private rankings, indices, surveys

Source: Own Illustration

According to the previous table, just as French organisations have a relatively strong inclination toward commitment to disabled employees, another dimension is worth further discussion. In fact, the dimension "gender" was most referred to within support programmes such as training,

networks and mentoring sessions across all sample companies in comparison to Luxembourg and Belgium. Moreover, the conducted study showed that the group of international best practice organisations does not highlight the diversity dimension of gender to a similar extent. Instead, best practice companies emphasise gender, ethnicity, age, disability and sexual orientation almost equally when it comes to employee support programmes.

A similarity that applies to all examined sample organisations was found when evaluating how D&I is integrated into the overall business strategy. All of the studied organisations emphasised D&I in their corporate codes of conduct or in guidelines such as an anti-discrimination or equal opportunities policy. Thereby, all sample organisations refer to the six core dimensions of diversity. Beyond that, some variances in referring to additional dimensions exist. For example, companies from the best practice group included in their policies that they do not discriminate against veterans, whereas France's sample organisations stated that they do not discriminate against any individual based on his/her union activities.

To expand their commitment further, nearly all organisations in the country group signed their nation's Diversity Charter and obtained federal diversity labels. However, Table 4 illustrates that none of the sample companies from the international best practice group referred to any local diversity charter or label in the examined materials; instead, all best practice sample organisations mentioned that private rankings, indices or surveys recognise them, such as the DiversityInc Top 50 list or the Great Place to Work Institute.

Discussion

In summary, most of the differences and similarities uncovered herein can be explained through the contextual factors surrounding organisations. As a result, the macro-environment consists of supra-national context factors that influence organisations in a specific geographic area. In the study, the EU's legislative framework, as well as directives concerning anti-discrimination and workplace diversity, creates a macro-environmental factor that causes all analysed organisations in the country group to include D&I in their business strategies and policies. The fact that organisations in the country group highlight some diversity dimensions different to international best practice enterprises results from individual context factors. National circumstances such as local employment laws or certain values might further shape

organisational culture and diversity management (Danowitz and Hanappi-Egger, 2012). This explains why French organisations' emphasis on not discriminating against employees based on their union activity can be seen through the nation's influence of particularly strong unions, whereas international best practice organisations' focus on not discriminating against veterans results from their national contexts, which might also be explained by the US focus of the chosen best practice companies. However, the need to have a closer look at the cultural and political context of the companies when analysing D&I initiatives becomes obvious.

Moreover, the international best practice group's preference for private rankings, and the country groups' trust in diversity and local charters, awards and initiatives, can be explained through different contextual factors. After the Diversity Charter was introduced in France in 2004, 3,200 companies committed to it, which resulted in great effects on French society (KMU Forschung Austria, 2015, p. 126). Based on the positive effects of the charter, employers and employees in the country group trusted it; furthermore, France's leaning towards federal initiatives results from the state's role as a key actor in economic life (Castel et al., 2012). Due to the state's interference in the economy (Uterwedde, 2013), organisations in France are ready to embrace state-initiated labels. In Belgium, the confidence in federal diversity labels could result from an above average confidence in national governments (OECD, 2013), which indicates that a label awarded through a governmental institution builds trust and benefits an organisation's reputation.

The finding that France and Belgium focus their external support initiatives on the professional development of young people may result from the factor of an above EU average youth unemployment rate in both nations. Therefore, both countries feel obliged to provide young people with necessary support to facilitate their workforce entry. With 15% youth unemployment, Luxembourg's rate lies under the EU average (Statista, 2016), which explains why the analysed organisations in Luxembourg emphasise external initiatives that foster the professional development of youth to a lesser extent.

In addition, the commitment to D&I practices targeting disabled persons in the sample French companies can be explained by a nation-specific context factor. The organisations' focus on disability initiatives comes from a legal quota that requires companies with more than 20 workers to employ at least 6% of disabled individuals (Takagi, 2011). The legal quota

influences the way organisations in France approach D&I practices. Although enterprises in Belgium and Luxembourg face similar quotas, the examined companies did not emphasise development programmes addressing disabled employees.

However, the study showed that all examined organisations in the country group mostly emphasise the diversity dimension of gender with regard to training, networks and mentoring programmes. The contextual factor of existing inequalities between women and men in the workplace is present in all three nations and substantiates the focus on gender. Therefore, organisations strive to prevent gender discrimination through educational measures and development programmes.

4. Diversity and inclusion practices in the UK, Ireland and the Netherlands

by Mona Blauen

Introduction

As globalisation is an omnipresent topic in today's world and national boundaries seem to be disappearing, the notion of diversity gains in importance in the same manner. A diverse workforce is a given in almost every company in developed nations (The Economist, 2009). The UK, Ireland and the Netherlands are prime examples for such an occurrence. This article aims to analyse differences in company D&I initiatives in the UK, Ireland and the Netherlands and to establish whether they differ from practices used in international companies. First, a brief summary of the D&I understanding in the three countries will be presented, following which the sample selection will be explained, followed by a description and discussion of the main findings.

The context of diversity and inclusion in the UK, Ireland and the Netherlands

At the time of study, the country cluster belonged to the European Union (EU). Therefore, all countries need to comply with the EU legislation. However, it is also critical to gain an insight into the way diversity is understood by each country to comprehend further implications. It is also important to identify factors possibly influencing and shaping D&I in each country.

In the UK, diversity management has played a significant role since the beginning of 1990. It is argued that it emerged in this country because of changing forces such as the economy and politics (Greene and Kirton, 2009). Even though it is a fairly young concept, when exploring UK company webpages, it is most likely that some sort of statement will be found about the appreciation and valuation of workforce diversity. Moreover, their commitment is not simply about valuing the different dimensions of diversity such as gender or ethnicity – companies claim to value, respect and care about the individual employee (Greene and Kirton, 2009).

When considering the economic sphere in the UK, it is important to emphasise the changing economy and labour market. An important topic in this regard is gender diversity. In the recent decade, female participation in the full-time labour market has grown steadily. However, many women still work part-time, due to the fact that they have to take care of children. The UK

provides expensive daycare options, so it is often more lucrative for women to take care of their children rather than to work full time. There is still a gender pay gap in the UK, and especially women who have part-time jobs earn the smallest hourly wages. Women working in full-time positions receive 82% of a male's wage on average; however, this may vary depending on the sector (Greene and Kirton, 2009).

In Ireland, the topic of D&I management has gained more significance in the last decades, whereas it used to be fairly homogeneous (BizLabs, 2016). However, this country has changed into a multicultural society building on a more diverse community. Irish employment and discrimination law is just one of the indicators of this development. Immigration in the country evolved at the end of the 1990s, when the country experienced an economical surge, which also promoted the alteration of labour laws (Ruhs and Quinn, 2009). The Census in 2011 stated that 12% of employed people were immigrants (Office of the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2016).

Furthermore, gender inequality is present in Ireland, since females are still underrepresented in certain sectors such as public administrative systems and are not treated equally in the labour market. Even though there are laws in place to prevent discrimination, they are not duly implemented in practice, the reason for which may be found in the constitution, as it views women's main role as staying at home and taking care of the household. Women are still confronted with a pay gap compared to men, in that on average they receive 14% less salary than men working in a similar job (European Parliament, 2015).

Diversity also plays an important role in the Netherlands, one reason for which is considered to be immigration, which has a long history and is still ongoing. Migration into the country began after the Second World War. In the first wave, Dutch-Indonesian people moved to the country from 1949 to 1985. Furthermore, people of Caribbean origin, formerly living in Dutch colonies, migrated to the Netherlands in the hope of gaining an education and living in a country with economic and political stability. Finally, immigrants from Turkey and Morocco, who arrived in the 1960s and 1970s, were originally understood as guest workers but turned themselves into long-term immigrants (Bleijenbergh, van Engen and Terlouw, 2010).

Another important topic in this country relates to gender diversity. At almost 17%, the gender pay gap is one of the highest in the EU (European Commission, 2014). The relatively low participation of women might be explained by the historical context, as women were expected to take over the role of housewives and stay at home. Furthermore, this country is said to be one of the most liberal countries in the EU. It used to be quite conservative, but this outlook changed around the 1970s. Nowadays, sexual orientation is a liberally treated topic and plays a significant role in Dutch politics and in Dutch society; in fact, it could almost be argued that it has become a feature of the national identity (Hekma and Duyvendak, 2016, p. 104).

Description of the sample

The sample was selected using a convenience sampling. The total sample size in this thesis consists of 17 companies within the country cluster. A full list of the companies is presented in Table 5. For the UK, seven companies were assessed. A diversity charter established by the EU Commission did not exist in this country; therefore, the selection of the companies in the UK was based upon the Financial Times Stock Exchange (FTSE) list as well as the DiversityInc. awards list. In Ireland, five companies were investigated. The signature of the Irish Diversity Charter by companies was the reason for the sample selection in this country, as well as their inclusion on the DiversityInc. list. Lastly, in the Netherlands, six corporations were evaluated. All investigated companies were signatories of the Dutch Diversity Charter. Moreover, six international companies were examined and selected based on their position in the top 20 ranking on the DiversityInc. list in 2015.

Table 5: Sample group: UK, Ireland and Netherlands

UK	Ireland	Netherlands	International best practice
BP	An Post	Shell Royal Dutch	AT&T
Unilever	Dublin Bus	ING Group	Marriot
Bank of England	IBM	ABN Amro	P&G
AVIVA	Ulster Bank	Post NL	Deloitte
Vodafone Group	Accenture	L'Oreal	Novartis
Dell			MasterCard
Sodexo			

Source: Own Illustration

Secondary data are the main source used in this paper, in order to generate information and results about the different D&I initiatives; hence, data from existing literature, media and corporate webpages were gathered and investigated. However, it is important to point out that only contents of company webpages, annual reports (AR), corporate social responsibility reports (CSRRs), codes of conduct/ethics (COC) or, if existing, D&I reports were used. No further sources were applied.

Findings

When investigating the country cluster companies, it was noticeable that they often mention the importance of D&I initiatives but do not state specific initiatives or dimensions. This also becomes obvious when considering the finding that most training offered by the companies did not state a specific dimension they wished to serve. Moreover, employee networks are a commonly used D&I practice in these companies. In contrast, it stood out that international companies have better established programmes in place, as they tend to be more specific regarding the diversity dimension.

To be more precise, several similarities were found in the country cluster regarding their D&I practices, though some differences were also observed. In the majority of cases, the main dimension covered by D&I practices in the UK and Ireland seems to be that of gender and ethnicity, while the Netherlands tends to focus on the LGBT dimension.

Some specific practices used in UK and Irish companies are flexible work options, such as home office working, to create a work environment that might be more family friendly, and offering training related specifically to gender. Furthermore, almost all companies located in the UK, such as BP, Unilever and Dell, and three-quarters of companies operating in Ireland offer employee networks solely for women. All companies in the UK display their diversity results publicly. When analysing the results in the Netherlands, it is noteworthy that companies located in the Netherlands often offer training regarding LGBT matters. Additionally, many companies located in this country have in place an equal pay policy.

The analysis of the country cluster compared to international best practices showed furthermore that international companies often use a global D&I approach, though the applied approaches are not very specific, as they have to work in several companies. Moreover, diversity is most often a crucial part of their strategy and is embedded in such. Communicating the notion of diversity in the societies in which they operate, through events such as roadshows, has also been found to be a frequently used practice. Lastly, policies and training seem to be quite similar when investigating both international and country cluster companies.

Discussion

This investigation into the country cluster has demonstrated several similarities in companies concerning established D&I practices and initiatives. This may be a surprising finding, but it can be explained by the fact that all countries at the time of writing were members of the EU and thus had to follow and implement EU directives. Hence, these countries have constructed laws based on EU directives, and therefore companies need to comply accordingly. Another explanation for the similarities in the country cluster is institutional isomorphism, because when looking at the EU as an external environment and the main institution, it can be argued that the companies adopt similar behaviours after a while. This might be caused mainly by coercive isomorphism, as the EU provides directives that force companies to act accordingly. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see what has caused these differences to occur.

Moreover, a significant difference, compared to the other two countries, was that all companies located in the UK present diversity indicators. Most of them belong to the public sector, and the nation's Equality Act forces public sector companies to publish results regarding diversity

each year. This requirement is supervised by the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), and so companies are forced to present diversity-related progress and results. Once again, one can explain the behaviour of these companies by referring to the institutional theory, as they have to comply with forces emanating from the external environment in which they operate.

In summary, the analysis showed that businesses in the UK and Ireland have a strong focus on gender equality and ethnicity, among others caused by e.g. still-existing gender pay gaps. However, the established Equality Act 2010 in UK forces companies in the public sector to prevent discrimination. In the Irish labour market, women are still underrepresented, so the government wants companies to promote D&I. Additionally, the institutional theory can also be applied to explain the rationale behind this difference, as companies experience environmental forces from the government to put D&I initiatives in place in order to comply with the law.

Moreover, the UK has experienced a long history of immigration, which possibly explains the ethnicity focus discovered in this nation's companies. As the labour market presents a diverse workforce with black and minority ethnics (BMEs), companies have to act accordingly and implement D&I initiatives. Moreover, as 17% of the UK's GDP growth is caused by the non-white community, it is important to include ethical minority groups in order to support economic growth. However, the Netherlands also has a high percentage of immigrants, though a focus on ethnicity was not revealed during the investigation. Furthermore, Ireland has been confronted with waves of immigration in the past two decades, which has created a more diverse labour market. Therefore, companies focus on this diversity management dimension and have in place specific D&I initiatives. Once again, it can be seen that the institutional theory can be used to explain the occurrence of D&I initiatives, as it is stated that "[n]eo-institutional theory views Diversity Management as a consequence of environmental pressures exemplified in isomorphic change processes" (Gotsis and Kortezi, 2015, p. 71).

Other dimensions were also covered partially in the UK and Ireland, but the above-described two dimensions demonstrate the main difference compared to the Netherlands. Even though companies operating in the Netherlands present some gender-related activities, this area does not seem to be overly important compared to companies in the other two countries. Instead,

those located in the Netherlands demonstrated focus regarding the LGBT dimension; for instance, this focus is demonstrated by many businesses actively involved in the Gay Pride event. This difference can be explained by the following. First, the Netherlands is one of the most open-minded countries in the EU and LGBT people are widely accepted in society, thus allowing them to be open about their sexuality. Companies in the Netherlands have to adapt accordingly and create an inclusive culture at work for LGBT employees. Secondly, mimetic forces can be applied here – as society presents such an open-minded culture, businesses are forced to implement diversity management practices concerning the LGBT dimension.

To summarise, this chapter has shown that countries located in the UK and Ireland tend to focus on the ethnicity and gender dimensions when it comes to D&I initiatives such as training, networks and mentoring programmes. The immigration backdrop as well as institutional isomorphism explain the focus on these two dimensions. In the Netherlands, attention paid to LGBT topics when it comes to D&I initiatives was revealed, due to the country's open-minded culture.

5. Diversity and inclusion practices in Turkey and Greece

by Levent Saran

Introduction

While diversity is widely applied and appropriately researched in the context of the USA and (Western) European countries, it lacks research and implementation in the country group Turkey and Greece (Mellahi et al., 2013). In a globalised world, where workforce diversity is increasing and potential employees and customers face fewer and smaller barriers to moving wherever they desire, new perspectives on the topic need to emerge (Önday, 2016, p. 31, Sürgevil, 2010, p. 373). Therefore, the aim of this chapter is to examine similarities and differences between D&I practices in companies located in Turkey and Greece, in a cross-national, comparative research. The study builds on the application of the 'Four Layers of Diversity' model, by Gardenswartz and Rowe (1994), as well as on the application of the institutional theory to analyse the findings. This article summarises the current state of D&I in the country group, describes the sampling procedure and then presents the findings and the discussion of the thesis.

The context of diversity and inclusion in Turkey and Greece

The research related specifically to Turkey and Greece can be divided into literature focusing on the transfer of general human resource policies to one of the two countries and into some research into diversity management. It is apparent that the emergence of the topic of D&I is rather a new development in Turkey and Greece. Wasti (1998), Özbilgin et al. (2012) and Mellahi et al. (2013) have discussed the transferability of human resource practices of multinational corporations in the Turkish context. On the other hand, in the Greek context, the transfer of human resource management practices has been studied by researchers such as Myloni, Harzing and Mirza (2004, 2007) and Björkman and Lervik (2007). Other relevant literature such as Önday (2016), Ozgener (2008) and Sürgevil (2010) investigates the development of diversity management in this region of the world. However, specific literature on diversity management in Greece is missing, and it is also worth mentioning that no diversity charters exist in either of the countries.

Description of the sample

The sampling procedure used in the study of Greece and Turkey can be categorised as a combination of convenience sampling and generic purposive sampling. It is important to make this distinction, since the study was conducted under time and budget limitations. However, it should be emphasised that no company was added to the sample simply because it was easily accessible; on the contrary, a variety of criteria had to be met by the respective companies in order to be relevant for the purpose of the study. The pre-setting of these certain criteria ensured that even though it cannot be denied that convenience sampling played a major role during the process, only companies that would most probably add value to the analysis were included in the study. Bryman (2012) refers to this type of sampling as 'criterion sampling'.

The data collection process turned out to be quite cumbersome in the country contexts of Turkey and Greece. As mentioned above, the companies that were to be selected had to fulfil a range of criteria in order to be added to the sample. One criterion was that the companies had to have their headquarters in one of the countries (except for international companies included in the sample) belonging to the country group. Additionally, the company had to have reported on its D&I or equal opportunities practices and commitments, either on its website or in its annual report, corporate social responsibility report or sustainability report, since these documents constitute the basic foundation of the analysis in this study. Only those companies that published the most were selected for the sample. Furthermore, prospective companies had to participate in either a diversity or a similar ranking. Country-specific lists from the Great Place to Work Institute available in autumn 2015 provided rankings for both countries. In order to identify companies publicly reporting their D&I or equal opportunities commitments thoroughly, the author used the sustainability disclosure database of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and membership lists published on the websites of the UN Global Compact and the UN Women's Empowerment Principles available at the time of data collection in the autumn of 2015. Unfortunately, even though international conferences with respect to D&I have been held in both countries, no companies supporting such conferences could be identified. The final study sample consisted of 20 companies: eight companies for Turkey and Greece each, and four companies operating in either Turkey or Greece but originating from a third country. A list of the entire sample can be observed in Table 6.

Table 6: Sample group: Turkey, Greece and international best practice

Turkey	Greece	International best practice
Aselsan	Alpha Bank	Coca-Cola Tria Epsilon
Aygaz	Hellenic Petroleum	Ernst & Young
Borusan	INTRALOT	Vodafone Greece
Bursagaz	Kleemann	Vodafone Tukrey
Eczacibasi	OTE Group	Coca-Cola Tria Epsilon
Ford Otosan	Public Power Corporation	
Sabanci	Titan Cement	
Turkish Airlines	WIND Hellas	

Source: Own Illustration

Findings

After having collected relevant data on each of the 20 companies, results were translated into the Implementation Checklist for Diversity Management, which comprises the categories (1) positioning of diversity, (2) measurement and monitoring, (3) top-down implementation, (4) bottom-up implementation, (5) external outreach and (6) integration of diversity in human resources (for details, see Chapter 1). Interpreting the results from this checklist, several similarities as well as differences between the D&I practices between Turkey and Greece were identified.

Positioning of diversity

Comparing the results of the Turkish and Greek companies regarding the first category on the implementation checklist illustrates that a gender focus can be observed in companies from both countries. In both Turkey and Greece, the commitment stated by companies in the context of their vision, future scenarios or corporate strategy is restricted to the gender dimension, albeit the gender focus in this category seems to be more distinctive in the Turkish context. This assumption can be derived from the results in the subcategory "self-commitment to public documents," which shows that Greek companies signed only the UN Global Compact, whereas

half of the Turkish companies additionally signed the UN Women's Empowerment Principles. Furthermore, companies in both countries show a major commitment to the field of equal opportunities and anti-discrimination policies, as revealed by analysing the specific policies and business agreements of the companies. All enterprises in both countries follow an equal opportunities policy. Lastly, communality can be observed regarding codes of conduct, demonstrating a lack of interest in addressing the LGBT dimension in both countries.

Measurement and Monitoring

Broad similarities among Turkish and Greek companies could be observed in the tracking workforce diversity category. While in both countries, most companies tracked their workforce diversity in terms of gender and age, only two tracked statistics on disability. Finally, also seen in the paragraph above, little attention is given to tracking the share of ethnic or sexual minorities; not a single company in either country tracked numbers in this regard.

Top-Down Implementation

Besides similarities related to an emphasis on the gender dimension in both countries, not much information had been published by the companies in this category. The gender focus, however, is extremely dominant. Out of three companies in Turkey that offer diversity training, all of them do so only with respect to the gender dimension. The same is true for the only Greek company that had published information in this context.

Bottom-Up Implementation

As only one Turkish company provided information about employee networks and only one company in Greece reported about a mentoring programme, no substantial comparison can be made in this category. Consistency is still observed in the gender dimension, since the Turkish company provided an employee network in this dimension only.

External Outreach

In both countries, companies do not use social media to promote externally their activities relating to D&I. While in the Turkish context, two companies engaged in public events to

promote gender equality in the workforce, nothing similar could be found in the Greek context. In both countries, companies had voluntarily signed public-private partnerships concentrating in both cases on the gender dimension. Once again, it becomes evident that the gender dimension dominates the D&I efforts of companies in both countries, with slightly more pronounced engagement in the Turkish environment.

Integration of Diversity in Human Resources

Employee benefits and flexible work options in both countries have also been almost exclusively focusing on enhancing the workplace for women and thereby concentrating on the gender dimension. The case of creating disability-friendly workplaces is more an exception than a rule, but it could still be observed in two companies – the only other dimension of any relevance here.

To summarise, it can be said that there are substantial similarities in terms of how companies in both countries approach the field of D&I. The results suggest that the omnipresent dimension of gender is of most importance to both country contexts, and at the same time, it is the only dimension that has seriously been integrated into various company strategies.

Comparison of country group companies with international companies

In the following, the country cluster Turkey and Greece will be compared with the International Best Practice Group again based on the Implementation Checklist for Diversity Management (Chapter 1).

Positioning of diversity

On the one hand, the fact that more international companies integrate the terms 'diversity' and 'inclusion' into their strategies or mission and vision statements, and the fact that all international companies mention explicitly a diversity policy, shows greater maturity and acceptance of concepts. On the other hand, when comparing international companies in the sample with local enterprises, it is clear that the general focus on the gender dimension persists. Additionally, the trend that anti-discrimination and equal opportunities policies are pursued by most of the companies in the sample continues, too. No outstanding policy beyond anti-

discrimination and equal opportunities could be found that would verify the further differentiation of international companies.

Measurement and monitoring

Surprisingly, the tracking of workforce diversity does not confirm the notion of greater maturity and the development of diversity management in international firms as indicated above. While at least two local companies considered the disability dimension, no international company in this sample did so; however, all international companies tracked gender diversity, which is in line with local companies.

Top-down implementation

By providing training in diversity management to its top management, international companies show a notable distinction against local companies, thereby fuelling the assumption that higher priority is given to the serious implementation of D&I in international companies in the sample. No local firm indicated such special training for top management.

Bottom-up implementation

Also in this category, there is significantly more engagement of international companies. The implementation of mentoring programmes and employee networks, which cover several dimensions of diversity, provides clear evidence that the international companies in the sample are a step ahead when it comes to actual training in and the implementation of D&I measures compared to local companies.

External outreach

There is a growing amount of evidence that, while local companies are limited in their public activities to the dimension of gender, international companies show substantially greater variety in their programmes. In this regard, two international companies publicly supported events that were directed at LGBT and disability, two dimensions of diversity that received little attention in the local context.

Integration of diversity in human resources

International companies do not differ as much as in the previous categories from local companies in this category. In fact, less information regarding flexible work options could be found. However, e.g. a large image film of an international company on how D&I is integrated in the organisation confirms the trend that D&I is more developed and integrated in the international companies in this sample.

While international companies are most often similar to their local counterparts with respect to the form of reporting and the scope of policies or publicly signed documents, there are substantial differences when it comes to the range of dimensions that are being covered and the level of implementation of diversity programmes. Local companies undoubtedly focused predominantly on the dimension of gender and equal opportunities, as they published very little information on training and mentoring programmes or on public events in relation to the studied subject. International companies, however, showed this commitment through implementing employee networks and mentoring programmes and by paying attention to other dimensions such as LGBT or disability.

Discussion

The dimensions of diversity analysed in this chapter are not taken into consideration equally by international and local companies. The Implementation Checklist for Diversity Management determined initial result bias that may have occurred by giving most attention to dimensions belonging to the internal dimensions seen in the categorisation by Gardenswartz and Rowe (1994). Still outstanding are findings on external and organisational dimension implementation and their impact on D&I within the focus group. With respect to internal dimensions, the country group focus has become clear. The gender dimension is by far most prominently covered, which is followed by sporadic commitments to age and disability. International companies have shown far higher variety in terms of internal dimensions. External dimensions that have been covered by local companies are marital status and parental status. As these are inextricably linked to the gender dimension, this is of no surprise, but instead it implies that local companies in Turkey and Greece do not engage in actions covering external dimensions. It is noteworthy that organisational dimensions have been covered exclusively by international

companies in the sample. In particular, division/department unit and management status has been dealt with through the creation of a diversity department or by providing diversity training exclusively to top management. Such advanced forms of D&I could not be found at local companies in either country in the group.

Since the findings suggest that D&I is still in its infancy in the country group, normative isomorphism, which derives from a professionalisation of the topic, is not observable. However, some inferences can be drawn relating to mimetic and coercive isomorphism. For instance, the commitment to anti-discrimination and equal opportunities policies throughout the sample is not to be attributed to a country-specific development in D&I; rather, it can be assumed that coercive isomorphism, i.e. the law, forces companies to mention such policies. The same goes for the implementation of codes of conduct, which often refer to all dimensions. The companies themselves mention precisely in these corporate codes of conduct that they comply with the law by implementing such rules of conduct. The finding that D&I is still getting off the ground in Turkey and Greece also contributes to an environment of uncertainty that results in mimetic behaviour, which, in turn, becomes entwined with coercive forces. The equality at work platform, initiated by the Turkish Ministry of Family and Social Policies, especially symbolises such a construct by pushing the involvement of women in the workforce and yet implicitly forcing companies to adopt related policies by offering them the ability to comply voluntarily with this aim, in order to legitimise themselves.

In regards to the research question, it is evident that Turkish and Greek company engagement follows international basics in diversity management by only serving the internal dimensions and by barely fulfilling global standards. Furthermore, these initiatives remained restricted to a gender and equal opportunities mandate. Based on the findings of the study, no specific policies aimed at any kind of minority could be found, which resonates with the above-stated missing engagement in truly innovative, country-specific approaches to D&I on which the research aimed to shed light. It seems, nonetheless, that the topic has gained increasing importance in both countries. In 2013, an international conference on equality, D&I was held in Athens – as was the case in 2015 in Istanbul. The future development of D&I will also depend on the emergence of related charters in Turkey and Greece, similar to many European countries that can serve as examples in this instance.

6. Diversity and inclusion practices in the Baltic States and Poland

by Caren Börsch

Introduction

The analysed country group is composed of four states belonging to Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), namely Poland and the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The overall goal of this study is to provide an analysis of what activities, programmes or initiatives are used in the given countries to promote D&I in the workplace, and to establish what kind of instruments are used to do so. All four countries joined the EU in 2004, thus opening up their labour markets to the rest of Europe, which is likely to have increased the importance of human resources departments within organisations and made the topic of D&I management a greater priority. To understand how D&I develops and differs within the group, the article summarises the national understanding of thereof, describes how sample organisations were selected, presents key findings and discusses the results.

The context of diversity and inclusion in the Baltic States and Poland

According to Buchowski, Chlewińska and Mickiewicz (2012), in today's Poland, "'tolerance and multiculturalism' serve rather as a myth that legitimizes current politics than actual administrative and political practice" (p. 11). A report showed that in 2011, immigrants made up 0.1% of the population (Schwarz-Woelzl, Manahl and Zadęcka-Cieślik, 2015). Furthermore, whilst Polish law has been adapted to EU requirements, law enforcement is somewhat limited, and to date, no anti-discrimination bodies have been established (Buchowski, Chlewińska and Mickiewicz, 2012).

Meanwhile, 'The Baltics' was a political invention of the West in the 20th century that has little to do with the historical or cultural identity of the three countries – Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia. It was during the 1990s that the West grouped these historically and culturally diverse states together as a single geopolitical entity and imposed Baltic unity (Palauskas, 2005).

Regarding ethnicity and religion, Poland and Lithuania have a fairly homogenous population, whereas Latvia and Estonia are more diverse; nonetheless, they have all faced problems inherent in European demographic change. Poland and Lithuania share a strong historical bond

through the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, ruling a large amount of land in CEE until the end of the 18th century (Rozniak, 2012), and all four countries have a shared communist past. Although the Baltic states declared independence in 1991, communist values remain rooted in today's society (Rozniak, 2015); consequently, today's workers still adhere to some of these values, with older generations more prone than younger ones in this regard, as in an example of attitudes to work and the use of resources. How this affects today's labour market is seen in the following example. In the 1950s, Lithuanian farmers were exploited in order to accumulate the primary capital needed to build up a strong industry. The generation that experienced these events raised today's workforce and passed on some of the values mentioned above (Girnius, 1986). Alternatively, Poland was under martial law, starting in 1981 due to the Solidarity Movement, and Soviet troops started to leave the country in 1991 (British Broadcasting Corporation, 2016). This again demonstrates how long these countries were under communist rule, shaping not only the people, but also the economic and political systems and processes of these countries. Additionally, it demonstrates that the countries' systems have only recently had to be rebuilt, in order to adapt to the EU. Thus, it is hypothesised that D&I cannot be as advanced in the given country group as in other international best practice organisations.

Sample description

In total, 16 companies were analysed, four per country. Of those four companies, three were of local origin and one was international. To choose the companies, the 2015 report of the 500 largest organisations in Central Europe was analysed (Deloitte, 2015), following which the companies were chosen according to whether or not they were signatories to a diversity charter. Another crucial criterion for selection was that an English website was available. The chosen companies are portrayed in Table 7.

Table 7: Sample group: Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia

Poland	Lithuania	Latvia	Estonia
PKN Orlen	Maxima	Elko LV	Tallink
Orange Polska	Energija	Rimi	Eesti Energija
PGNiNG	Achemos Group	Latvenergo	Tallinna Kaubamaja Grupp AS
Jeronima Martins	PKN Orlen Lietuva	Maxima	Ericsson
		Elko LV	

Source: Own Illustration

In order to present the status of D&I of each country in the best possible way, and to allow a comparison, three out of the four selected companies were founded within the respective country and the fourth was an international organisation. Here, one limitation has to be given: PKN Orlen is a national company in Poland and an international concern in Lithuania. As expected, organisations representing Latvia are the smallest, whereas the larger organisations are found in Poland.

Findings

Despite the fact that D&I have been identified as beneficial, and the fact that some analysed organisations are signatories of a diversity charter, it was difficult to obtain a wide range of valuable information from the organisations' websites. Throughout the analysis, it became clear that the influence of diversity charters exists with limitations, a notion that is also supported by secondary literature (Walkowiak and Maj, 2015). D&I as a concept is quite new, especially when implemented by an HR department, and so far it has only been implemented successfully in relatively mature organisations (Forbes, 2015a). The research conducted also confirms this point when looking at the different categories derived from the Implementation Checklist for Diversity Management, created by the European Commission in 2012 (European Commission, 2012b). Diversity, as well as the measurement and monitoring category, is represented most often – almost all organisations measure their diversity, even if it is only related to age or gender. 'Implementation Top Down' and 'Integration of Diversity in HR' are the least used tools for diversity implementation. Obviously, it is easier to communicate a position that an

organisation takes on D&I, or how many employees of a specific age group work for a company. However, specific details about training, workshops and HR policies seem to be quite opaque, as these are facts that an organisation may not wish to share with the external environment. The following two tables illustrate the implementation of diversity within the country group (Table 8) and the total dimensions of diversity for all companies in all countries (Table 9).

Table 8: Percentage of implemented aspects of diversity in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia

	Poland	Lithuania	Latvia	Estonia	Total
Positioning of Diversity	16%	4%	0%	8%	28%
Measurement and Monitoring	11%	4%	2%	7%	24%
Implementation Top-Down	5.5%	2.5%	0%	1.5%	9.5%
Implementation Bottom-Up	6%	3%	1%	3.5%	13.5%
External Outreach	7%	2%	0.5%	7%	16.5%
Integration of Diversity in HR	5%	2.5%	0.5%	1%	9%

Source: Own Illustration

Table 9: The cumulated percentage of diversity aspects of all four countries (Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) together

Age	Gender	Disability	Ethnicity	Sexual Orientation	Religion
39%	29%	21%	11%	0%	0%

Source: Own Illustration

Nevertheless, it is interesting that none of the studied diversity dimensions included religion or sexual orientation. As for sexual orientation, this finding is not particularly surprising, as the LGBT agenda is also relatively new and not yet accepted by everyone, especially in countries with religious populations. The fact that religion also has not been addressed may be explained by the argument, that Poland and Lithuania have quite a homogenous religious culture.

Therefore, addressing religion as a topic of diversity may not be seen as relevant. The citizens of Europe are growing older due to different factors, including technology and healthcare, and yet fewer people are being born (negative growth rates can be observed throughout the country group). Therefore, issues such as retirement and pensions become an issue, along with remuneration and family assistance (supported the most in the Polish company PKN ORLEN), in order to address the subject of fertility rate and gender inequality.

Discussion

It is notable that there is a clear trend in relation to what dimensions of diversity receive the most support. Within this research, it can be stated as true, as it tends to be age and gender that are supported most often in D&I practices. These dimensions are also related to significant pressure from the external environment, for example due to demographic changes, which are seen in the population growth rate, total fertility rate and dependency ratios. This can be explained by using the theoretical approach elaborated by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), who posit factors contributing to the similarity of organisations. Political pressure, such as mandated women's quotas, is part of the discussion and an example of coercive isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). The constant drive for change that leads to isomorphism is connected to an organisation's evolution, which includes the constant development of HR processes (Stiles et al., 2006). Therefore, it is logical that organisations will focus on the same key aspects, to keep pace with the competition. This is a clear demonstration of what was described within the theoretical framework: "Organisations in a structured field respond to an environment that consists of other organisations responding to their environment, which consists of organisations responding to an environment of organisations' responses" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p. 149).

Overall, the results of the study can be summarised as follows. Larger, internationally influential organisations have a more mature approach towards D&I than smaller, local organisations. This may be due not only to larger financial resources available for the implementation of the related strategies, but also to the fact that their communication tools, such as websites and different reports (CSR, annual reports, etc.), have mature and more complete content, thereby making it easier to obtain more detailed results from these larger organisations. As Poland and Estonia are represented by organisations with a larger headcount,

the information obtained from these companies is thus more detailed than that obtained for Lithuania and especially Latvia. In order to collect results that are somewhat equal and comparable, secondary literature was taken into consideration to find out what activities, programmes or initiatives are used within the given countries to promote D&I in the workplace, and what kind of instruments are used to do so.

The status quo of D&I in the respective countries can be summarised as follows. Poland and Estonia are quite advanced, due to the fact that they are represented by large organisations with international influence. Information on Latvia and Lithuania's status quo, in comparison, fell short, which is also supported in the secondary literature (Latvian Centre for Human Rights, 2008). The dimension named most often is age (39%), not only within the research conducted for this thesis but also in the secondary literature (Walkowiak and Maj, 2015). Furthermore, dimensions that follow are gender (29%), disability (21%) and ethnicity (11%).

In conclusion, research has shown (Walkowiak and Maj, 2015) that D&I help organisations foster and grow, while issues that are addressed by D&I are vital to solving socio-economic problems. Therefore, it is crucial to implement D&I practices successfully as a strategy, in order to accommodate today's workforce and manage steadily growing organisations.

7. Conclusion

by Anja Karlshaus, Irene López, Ingvill C. Mochmann, Ihar Sahakiants

The aim of the student research projects presented in this working paper was to analyse, from a comparative perspective, country-specific traits in the D&I implementation by companies – in particular whether D&I practices vary across selected European regions. As a main finding, the student papers, summarised and presented in this working paper, showed that D&I initiatives in the analysed European countries and Turkey actually vary to a great extent with respect to both scale and scope.

Some of the main findings, for instance, are that the analysed Scandinavian companies (Cluster 1) focused on the gender dimension of diversity, followed by initiatives oriented at younger employees. Furthermore, internal training on D&I is also mentioned more frequently across Scandinavian countries. Companies operating in Belgium and France (Cluster 2), in another example, emphasise the development of young professionals. French enterprises also focus on

the employment of disabled employees, whereas the main dimension accentuated in all three Cluster 2 countries (including Luxembourg) is gender. Findings relating to Cluster 3 (the UK, Ireland and the Netherlands) show several similarities between the countries, though important differences were also identified with respect to desired future developments. All companies located in the UK and the Netherlands have objectives related to the gender dimension as well as a special LGBT focus in the Netherlands. The same is true for the dimensions age and ethnicity, though this finding barely applies to any company in Ireland. Moreover, only a few Irish companies have a diversity and/or inclusion policy, but all companies in the other countries of the cluster have implemented one. A main result of the analysis of Cluster 4 (Turkey and Greece) is that there are substantial similarities in terms of how companies in both countries approach the field of D&I. The results suggest that the dimension of gender is of utmost importance to both country contexts, and at the same time, it is the only dimension that has been integrated seriously into various company areas. In the Baltic states and Poland (Cluster 5), the analysed companies focus mainly on the dimension of age and – to a lesser extent – on gender. However, whereas the discussion of D&I in Poland and Estonia is quite advanced, due to the fact that these countries are represented by large organisations operating on an international scale, there is much less information on the importance of this issue and the implementation of related practices in Latvia and Lithuania.

In their studies, the students concentrated mainly on the neo-institutional theoretical approach (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) to explain country-specific particularities. As summarised in Table 10, the findings of the student projects highlighted the importance of coercive mechanisms, above all, in the form of local laws and regulations such as legislation on the equal treatment of employees in the respective countries, which in turn were driven ostensibly by the initiatives of the European Union. Moreover, the crucial role of mimetic factors related to striving to copy the practices of successful competitors were underscored. Although hardly any references to normative isomorphism were made in the discussion of the student project results, it can be assumed nevertheless that the increased adoption of the D&I practices in the analysed countries might well be the outcome of such a mechanism of homogenisation within organisational fields, which builds on an increased professionalisation of human resource managers and specialists promoted by higher education establishments or professional associations.

Table 10: Mechanisms of institutional isomorphism and diversity management practices

	Coercive Isomorphism	Normative Isomorphism	Mimetic Isomorphism
Definition by DiMaggio and Powell (1983)	Isomorphism stemming from "political influence and the problem of legitimacy" (p.150)	Isomorphism related to professionalisation	Homogenisation "resulting from standard responses to uncertainty" (p.150)
Examples of the influence (in the student research in this working paper)	Country-specific legislation on quotas for women in managerial positions (Caren Börsch), EU regulations related to diversity and inclusion (Mona Blauen), local laws and regulations on equal treatment (Mona Blauen, Levent Saran)	No influences of this mechanism could be identified	Implementation of similar workplace practices within an organisational field as a response to common competitive challenges (Caren Börsch), adoption of gender equality practices (Mona Blauen)

Sources: DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p.150, student papers in this working paper

Overall, notwithstanding limitations related to the methodological approach outlined in the previous sections of this working paper, the studies presented herein might provide interesting and valuable insights into the particularities of D&I practices in the analysed countries. Thus, they may inform future aspiring researchers and serve as a basis for prospective qualitative or quantitative investigations in this area.

8. Outlook from a long-term corporate practice perspective
by Michael Stuber

After more than twenty years of practical research and implementation of D&I, it is quite obvious that discussions, perceptions and approaches in the field have changed quite significantly over this time. While in the early years, it was doubtful for many, if the 'new' concept would work at all and hence if it would be sustained beyond a temporary fashion, D&I soon became a household programme – mostly initiatives, mostly in the HR context – among large multinational corporations. The expanded EU legal framework and hefty compliance issues in the US, where some of the global players are headquartered, might well have played

a role in integrating D&I more firmly in processes and tools along the HR value-chain (recruitment, development, retention). The landscape changed further when the business case for D&I became more robust and companies began to understand how they can leverage a comprehensive, pro-active Diversity Management to improve productivity, agility, innovation and eventually market success as well as their overall business success and hence stock performance (SHRM, 2009).

More recently, severe backlashes occurred (partly as a result of *nationalist,* populist or *post-truth campaigns*) including incidents such as the so-called *Google Memo* case or anti-diversity statements of in-office politicians, including in the UK, France, Poland, Hungary, Turkey or the US (c.f. e.g. SHRM, 2017 or FRA, 2018). In the light of such manifold developments and with an increasing body of research-based insight into D&I management practices, it appears to be interesting (and important) to analyse the possible future of Diversity Management both on international levels as well as regionally or locally.

Practical implications of the 2016 Diversity & Inclusion in Europe research project

One key question of the 'Diversity & Inclusion in Europe' research project was to better understand if the implementation of Diversity Management was generally similar within and across country clusters. The totality of studies was hoped to provide some overall European picture as to whether in Europe, D&I practices generally reflected the specifics of their local contexts – and hence differed a lot – or if they were generally more similar to each other (as European practices) or even to an international standard practice. Some of the findings suggest that company practices are influenced by a mainstream D&I framework that reflects international good practices as well as supranational legal frameworks which particularly exist in the European Union. The research also found evidence that D&I practices are as well clearly influenced by specific local context factors which may include demographics, values, local legislation, partnership opportunities or specific economic challenges. While both findings might not be surprising, it has been the first time that a series of comparative D&I studies, following a similar approach, led to some consistent findings. Moreover, they point out two development paths, which D&I is likely to continue to take, going forward:

- D&I management practices can rely on a vast amount of experiences (and learnings) that other organisations have made – in their country, industry, region or internationally. While this clearly presents an opportunity that was not available in the early years of D&I, it would be dangerous to assume that an effective Diversity Management can be based on good practices or that the future lies in spreading these practices. The author has repeatedly warned in various columns about the dangers of both *blueprints* and *echo chambers* in the field of D&I and at the same time emphasised the need to understand the very nature of the organisational and cultural development process that D&I requires – particularly in a stage when many of the basic programmes have already been put in place and many of the general conditions for D&I have been created (e.g. regarding processes or tools).

- Several of the intra-cluster comparisons of the 'Diversity & Inclusion in Europe" research concluded that the EU offers a coherent non-discrimination framework that leads to a number of consistent approaches in implementing D&I. This framework, however, is still an unfinished symphony as the EU Commission had proposed, initially in 2008, a more comprehensive, so-called 'horizontal directive', which has since been opposed by a few member states. In 2015, Germany was the last and only EU member state that continued to block even the negotiations of the directive – claiming the country had no issue with discrimination while apparently ignoring how a new directive could improve situations across the EU and at the same time make D&I implementation clearer, easier and more accepted (due to the horizontal and hence 'equal' mechanisms as opposed to the different ones currently in place through various directives). This intention in combination with the new findings suggest that a horizontal EU directive is likely to have a propelling effect on the implementation of D&I in Europe – and it would serve as a new impetus to mature existing approaches. Arguably, one future perspective of D&I in Europe might be that a more coherent EU framework (which has had effects on nonEU countries already in the past) will serve as an impetus to build broader foundations for D&I across the board on which country, industry and company specific programmes will be built.

On the other side, ongoing globalisation is considered to continue to be a change driver for the business world so that a wider context (also) needs to be considered to understand the future of

D&I. In fact, global D&I frameworks have started to emerge in the early 2000s and have since then been under discussion regarding their relevance or applicability (e.g. Stuber, 2017b). For years it has been argued by many that global commonalities are relatively small compared to the vast differences found around the world. But then, many so-called global D&I frameworks cover those parts of the world that are economically more active and inter-connected. However, taking a global perspective – in addition to a local, regional or European, will increasingly be relevant and necessary, going forward.

At the same time, understanding how to localise D&I programmes or how to tailor them to particular industry needs is likely to be another trend that can be extrapolated from this research. In this respect, it should be noted that in-company diversification of D&I programmes – to reflect the needs of various internal units, functions or locations – has already started in some of the more innovative large corporations.

Future perspectives based on longer-term diversity practice research

Another research approach provides clues for the future of D&I management: A series of bi-annual analysis examined the Corporate communication of large European companies, starting in 2008. Over time, the individual studies became more sophisticated and paid increasing attention to differences and similarities across countries and industries. According to Stuber (2018*)*, the findings of the series of studies shows clearly that D&I has been firmly embedded in corporate realities since quite a few years. Prevalence, quantity and quality of the information provided has been increasing consistently overall and with some volatility for some of the countries. This effect is partly attributed to the fact that some companies are excluded from and others are included in the various indices on a quarterly, half-yearly or yearly basis. Individual over or underperformers can have strong effects on smaller subsamples, especially if and when the consistency within a country or industry sample is (yet) low.

The research series showed that the foci or positioning of D&I can change over the years. At some point in time, the analysed corporations communicated D&I more intensely in the Annual Reports, i.e. in their business communication to investors than in the CSR Reports, i.e. public sustainability communication.

In 2014, the quantity of the D&I information provided did not vary a lot across report types or sub samples so that the analysis was expanded to examine the nature and depth of the information provided more closely. The latest research included both Stoxx®50 Europe and Euro Stoxx®50 indices, which resulted in a sample of 75 companies (25 of which were included in both indices). This larger sample, in combination with a detailed analytical approach, allowed for country and industry specific analysis, particularly for the large subsamples France (N=20), UK (N=18), Germany (N=14) or the Financial (N=19) or Consumer (N=16) industries. These showed, e.g., that German companies tend to communicate more and more comprehensively on D&I in the CSR reports, whereas British companies have the reverse focus. French companies, on the other hand are most likely to present concrete successes they have achieved with the D&I work. For Spain, it was found that all companies report gender and some other data in their corporate reports and tend to convey a very broad understanding of Diversity.

A few aspects have changed over the ten years that this research series have covered while others remained more stable. The terminology to communicate diversity-related programmes emerged from a quite narrow choice of terms (diversity, equality, equal opportunities and related paradigms) to a wider spectrum where a combination of Diversity with another paradigm (mostly Inclusion) has become the most frequent branding. On the other hand, the proclaimed foci on gender, ethnicity/origin/nationality and age have remained unchanged, including the specific programmes that are communicated (e.g. development/support formats or events). More general D&I education or training, e.g. on unconscious biases, has become a more recent focus that cuts across the traditional dimensions of Diversity.

As this research series specifically analysed D&I content as part of corporate communication (and hence did not examine actual programmes or activities), some projections can be made for that area:

- It appears to be relatively safe to assume that D&I will continue to be a firm element of different types of corporate communication, namely investor / financial communication (e.g. Annual Reports), public communication (e.g. CSR Reports) and employer branding (e.g. career websites).

- The long-term trends suggest that the level of detail of the information provided will continue to increase, e.g. requiring more details on specific activities, in more thematic areas and including more information on impact, success or progress made.

- The raising expectations from various external stakeholders (candidates, interest groups, politics) is also likely to lead to much greater demands in regards to transparency of workforce, and potentially workplace, data. This is an area where the studies already showed an increase of data reporting since this item was included in the analysis in 2014. Data reporting has quickly expanded beyond the traditional gender split in management and now often includes general workforce data and data on nationalities, age groups, disability and other dimensions.

- Another more high-level projection builds upon remarks made earlier in this article. In times when an increasing number of D&I programmes has already been implemented for a longer time and in most organisations, there is less and less sense from a communication perspective to include such 'standard practices' (as they might not be new nor different). This is likely to increase the pressure – at least on the leading corporations – to continue to be inventive and raise the bar. It is important to note that this type of 'positive peer pressure' is likely to create positive momentum, whereas political pressure to set or fulfil quote has shown to be often counterproductive and sometimes caused a limiting effect on the D&I agenda (which focused on compliance rather than making the most of differences).

- Finally, the megatrends of ongoing digitalisation and globalisation as well as further risks coming from nationalist, post-truth or populist campaigns will require D&I to communicate more inclusive, more carefully and better aligned with the general business paradigms and language. First trends in this direction have already been identified in the most recent communication study (2016) and have also been explored by some global D&I pioneers who have analysed learning and reflected on related perspectives for D&I.

Contextualising the results in global learning and predictions from other D&I pioneers

While the results from the presented "Diversity and inclusion in Europe: analysing local specifics and international influences" research project and from other studies mentioned in this

chapter show the need to keep exploring local, regional and European specifics in the development of Diversity, the discussion should also be seen in the wider context of global developments. This appears to be relevant due to the ongoing globalisation of the business world, where many of the D&I practices are developed and deployed. In addition, it has become apparent that diversity is phenomenon that creates – often biased – dynamics in all parts of the world and that responses vary a lot, depending on local or political context factors. This is exemplified by the global gender gap reports issued by the World Economic Forum (WEF, 2017). The political and societal climates have received increasing attention in recent years against the backdrop of populist and right-wing political shifts.

However, the author's long-term (yet non-scientific) observation of D&I publications suggests that global paradigms and developments are (still) not so prevalent among D&I researchers or practitioners. Similarly, looking at the contributions at international D&I events, it seems that most experts are working locally or regionally on D&I while the supranational perspective appears to be quite rare. In order to shed some light on the current pulse of the longer-term, global discussion, key themes are extracted from a series of articles: In 2007, 'Profiles in Diversity Journal' featured leading experts who described the future of D&I from their perspectives at the time. Ten years later, ten global D&I pioneers were asked to summarise what the global D&I community had learned and what (still) lied ahead in the international development of Diversity management (PDJ, 2017). As the author was one of the ten authors, his input is presented along with perspectives of the other experts.

Numbers and inter-group competition

In the light of current developments, it was little surprising that a few experts described the downside of the (ongoing) representation focus in D&I. While Edward Hubbarb suggests a stronger emphasis on the utilisation of difference, Trevor Wilson points to the negative effect of inter-group competition. Stephen Young and Michael Stuber both criticise the use of numbers combined with a pledge for active – although not prescribed – inclusion to contribute to business-related performance goals. However, three experts present an alternative perspective.

Ethics and sustainability

Julie O'Mara, George Simons and Jude Smith Rachele propose to reframe D&I with a stronger linkage to ethics or sustainability. While O'Mara claims that D&I could no longer stay away from politics, Simons calls for a humanisation of the entire framing. Smith Rachele discusses the need to stand up against unethical behaviour, tying in with populism and referring to backlash from those who feel left out.

Majorities and privileges

In his contribution, Stuber requests dedicated strategies to engage what he calls 'mainstream groups', while Judith Katz points to existing privilege and demands 'active allies for change' from that side. To emphasise the wider agenda and benefits, Wilson speaks about 'equity for all'. However, most authors agree or point out that many of the D&I goals from the past have not been met in the way it was hoped.

Deficits and challenges

Judith Katz flags out (blatant) discrimination and exclusion that still exist and also Mary Francis Winters describes how challenges and opposition were underestimated. Several experts argue that more efforts (and resources) are required to address prevailing issues in an effective way. Stuber recaps his pledge that D&I practitioners need to be role models for the inclusive cases and the ethical standards they set and O'Mara even observes that many in the D&I field "do not have the competencies required to be effective".

More process less interventions

Another thread that appears in several articles is the need to facilitate more holistic development journeys rather than focused interventions. Several experts, including Winters, Stuber and Young, criticise the wide-spread unconscious bias training which often does not provide enough action-oriented impetus beyond intriguing insights. O'Mara and Stuber show how D&I change processes can have universal elements while both insist on the need for careful (regional or industry) tailoring.

D&I in Europe: A complex 'glocal' future between purpose and metrics

Comparing the themes that have emerged from the European studies mentioned in this chapter with those extracted from the global trend articles, a few observations are likely to point out future areas of attention.

In the European landscape, the focus on representation and hence disadvantaged groups is visible as it is an emphasis on programmes or interventions. The future development might see paradigm shifts that may include more attention on majority groups (and hence privilege), on open mind-sets and inclusion as well as on a more holistic view on change processes (in order to create more measurable impact from interventions) (Buchhorn, 2018).

It remains to be seen if the European understanding and approach that the current research has shown will gain a higher profile and how this regional level can position itself between local specifics and global developments going forward.

Another question that has appeared refers to the ethical, social and sustainable aspects of D&I. These have become quite visible in some of the (European) analysis presented and seem to resonate particularly well in some European countries. On the other hand, the global experts' extract includes some warning about softening, blurring or watering down the strength of a business-driven D&I agenda. D&I might find itself (again) at the crossroads of a social and a business-focused avenue.

Where and how D&I will develop in Europe, locally and globally, will also depend on how other fundamental developments – above all digitalisation – will continue to change the business world and hence workforces and workplaces.

9. References

Andersen, T.M., Holmström, B., Honkapohja, S., Korkman, S., Söderström, H.T. and Vartiainen, J. (2007). *The Nordic model. Embracing globalization and sharing risks*. Retrieved 29.04.2016 from http://economics.mit.edu/files/5726.

Beham, B., Straub, C., and Schwalbach, J. (2011). Managing diversity in organizations. *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft [Journal of business economics]*. 82 (2), 1-2.

Beham, B., Straub, C. and Schwalbach, J. (2012). *Managing diversity in organizations*. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Bender, A., Klarsfeld, A., and Laufer, J. (2010). Equality and diversity in the French context. In A. Klarsfeld (ed.) *International handbook on diversity management at work* (pp. 83-108). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.

Bendl, R., Hanappi-Egger, E. and Hofmann, R. (2012). *Diversität und Diversitätsmanagement [Diversity and diversity management]*. Wien: Facultas Verlags- und Buchhandels AG.

Bengtsson, B., Strömblad, P. and Bay, A. (2010). *Diversity, inclusion and citizenship in Scandinavia*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

BizLabs (2016). *Cultural diversity. A toolkit for organisational success*. Retrieved 12.02.2016 from http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/AXBN-7UNJAV1453206-en/$File/IMI%20Cultural%20Diversity.pdf.

Björkman, I. and Lervik, J. E. (2007). Transferring HR practices within multinational corporations. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 17 (4), 320-335.

Bleijenbergh, I., van Engen, M. and Terlouw, A. (2010). Laws, policies and practices of diversity management in the Netherlands. In A. K. Editor (ed.) *International handbook on diversity management at work* (pp. 179 – 197). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th edition). New York: Oxford University Press.

Buchhorn, E. (2018). Diversity blues. *Manager Magazin*, 2.

Buchowski, M., Chlewińska, K. and Mickiewicz, A. (2012). *Tolerance of cultural diversity in Poland and its limitations*. Retrieved 20.04.2016 from http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/24381.

British Broadcasting Corporation (2016). *Poland profile. Timeline*. Retrieved 04.05.2016 from http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-17754512.

Callens, M.S., Meuleman, B. and Valentova, M. (2015). *Perceived Threat, Contact and Attitudes Towards the Integration of Immigrants. Evidence from Luxembourg*. Retrieved 14/04/2018 from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2694572

Castel, P., Deneire, M., Kurc, A., Lacassagne, M., and Leeds, C. (2012). Universalism and exceptionalism. French business leadership. In J. S. Chhokar, F. C. Brodbeck, and R. J. House (eds.) *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies* (pp. 547-580). New York and London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Charta der Vielfalt (2016). *Vorteile. [Advantages]*. Retrieved 14/04/2016 from http://www.charta-der-vielfalt.de/diversity/vorteile.html.

Cole, B., and Salimath, M. (2013). Diversity identity management. An organizational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 116, 151-161.

Cornet, A., and Zanoni, P. (2010). Diversity management in Belgium. In A. Klarsfeld (ed.) *International handbook on diversity management at work* (pp. 45-67). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.

Council of Europe (2016). *European convention on human rights*. Retrieved 21.04.2016 from http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf.

Danowitz, M. A. and Claes, M. (2012). Diversity in Europe. Its development and contours. In M. A. Danowitz, E. Hanappi-Egger and H. Mensi-Klarbach (eds.) *Diversity in organizations. Concepts & practices* (pp. 33-62). Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Danowitz, M. A. and Hanappi-Egger, E. (2012). Diversity as strategy. In M. A. Danowitz, E. Hanappi-Egger and H. Mensi-Klarbach (eds.) *Diversity in organizations. Concepts and practices* (pp. 137-160). Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Deloitte (2015). *Central Europe 2015 TOP 500*. Retrieved 01.04.2016 from http://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/central-europetop500.html.

DiMaggio, P. J., and Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited. Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*. 48, 147–160.

Diversity Charter (2016). *French diversity charter history*. Retrieved 20.04.2016 from http://www.diversity-charter.com/diversity-charter-history.php.

DiversityInc (2016). *The 2015 Diversityinc Top 50 companies for diversity*. Retrieved 11.04.2016 from http://www.diversityinc.com/the-diversityinc-top-50-companies-for-diversity-2015.

Dobbin, F., Kim, S. and Kalev, A. (2011). You can't always get what you need. Organizational determinants of diversity programs. *American Sociological Review*. 76, 386-411.

European Commission (2012a). *The current situation of gender equality in Belgium. Country profile*. Retrieved 22.04.2016 from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/epo_campaign/130911_epo_country_profile_belgium.pdf.

European Commission (2012b). *The implementation checklist for diversity management. Support for voluntary initiatives promoting diversity management at the workplace across the EU*. Retrieved 28.02.2017 from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/checklist_ diversitymanagement_en.pdf.

European Commission (2013a). *The current situation of gender equality in France. Country profile*. Retrieved 22.04.2016 from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/epo_campaign/131203_country-profile_france.pdf.

European Commission (2013b). *The current situation of gender equality in Luxembourg. Country profile*. Retrieved 22.04.2016 from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/epo_campaign/130911_country-profile_luxembourg.pdf.

European Commission (2014). *Tackling the gender pay gap in the European Union*. Retrieved 12.04.2016 from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/gender_pay_gap/140319_gpg_en.pdf.

European Commission (2016). *The EU motto*. Retrieved 27.04.2016 from http://europa.eu/about- eu/basic-information/symbols/motto/index_en.htm.

European Diversity (2017). *Diversity in STOXX® Europe 50 corporate communication. annual reports and CSR reports*. Cologne: European Diversity.

European Parliament (2015). *The policy on gender equality in Ireland update 2015*. Retrieved 25.04.2015 from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2015/536450/IPOL_IDA(2015)536450 _EN.pd.

European Union (2016). *Das Motto der EU. [European Union's motto]*. Retrieved 15/04/2016 from http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/symbols/motto/index_de.htm.

Everly, B. A., and Schwarz, J. L. (2015). Predictors of the adoption of LGBT-friendly HR policies. *Human Resource Management*. 54, 367-384.

Ferner, A., Almond, P. and Colling, T. (2005). Institutional theory and the cross-national transfer of employment policy. The case of 'workforce diversity' in US multinationals. *Journal of International Business Studies*. 36, 304-321.

Forbes (2015). *Why diversity and inclusion will be a top priority for 2016*. Retrieved 03.05.2016 from http://www.forbes.com/sites/joshbersin/2015/12/06/why-Diversity-and-Inclusion-will-be-a-top-priority-for-2016/#11f0154d4bd4.

FRA (2018). *Challenges facing civil society organisations working on human rights in the EU*. Vienna: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights.

Gardenswartz, L. and Rowe, A. (1994). *Diversity teams at work*. Irwin: McGraw-Hill.

Girnius, K. (1986) Soviet terror in Lithuania during the post-war years. *Lituanus*. 32(4). Retrieved 04.05.2016 from http://www.lituanus.org/1986/86_4_04.htm.

Gotsis, G. and Kortezi, Z. (2015). C*ritical studies in diversity management literature. A review and synthesis*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Greene, A. and Kirton, G. (2009). *Diversity management in the UK. Organizational and stakeholder experiences*. New York: Routledge.

Hanappi-Egger, E. (2012). Theoretical perspectives on diversity in organizations. In M.A. Danowitz, E. Hanappi-Egger and H. Mensi-Klarbach (eds.) *Diversity in organizations. Concepts and practices* (pp. 9-31). Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hankin, H. (2005). *The new workforce. Five sweeping trends that will shape your company's future*. New York: American Management Association.

Harrison, D.A., Price, K.H. and Bell, M.P. (1998). Beyond relational demography. Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*. 41(1), 96-107.

Hassanein, E. E. A. (2015). *Inclusion, disability and culture*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Hekma, G. and Duyvendak, J. W. (2016). The Netherlands. Depoliticization of homosexuality and homosexualization of politics. In M.Tremblay, D. Paternotte and C.Johnson (eds.) *The lesbian and gay movement and the state. Comparative insights into a transformed relationship* (pp. 104 – 115). London and New York: Routledge.

Hoffmann, T. (2015). *Country report non-discrimination Luxembourg 2015*. Retrieved 26.04.2016 from http://www.equalitylaw.eu/downloads/3738-2015-lu-country-report-ln-final.

Hudson Jordan, T. (2015). *Moving from diversity to inclusion*. Retrieved 20.03.2016 from http://www.diversityjournal.com/1471-moving-from-diversity-to-inclusion/.

Hunt, V., Layton, D. and Prince, S. (2015). *Diversity matters. McKinsey&Company*. Retrieved 16.02.2018 from https://assets.mckinsey.com/~/media/857F440109AA4D13A54D9C496D86ED58.ashx.

IMS Luxembourg Association (2016). *The legal framework*. Retrieved 26.04.2016 from http://www.chartediversite.lu/en/legal-framework.

Jackson, S. and Joshi, A. (2011). Work team diversity. In S. Zedeck (ed.) *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, pp. 651-686. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Kandola, R. and Fullerton, J. (1998). *Diversity in action. Managing the mosaic* (2nd edition). London: IPD House.

Klarsfeld, A. (2009). The diffusion of diversity management. The case of France. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. 25, 363-373.

KMU Forschung Austria (2015). *Case studies of initiatives*. Retrieved 20.04.2016 from http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5366&langId=en.

Knutsen, O. ed. (2017). *The Nordic Models in Political Science. Challenged, but Still Viable?* Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Kommunekredit, MuniFin, Kommuninvest and Monday Morning (2012). *The Nordic model. Local government, global competitiveness in Denmark, Finland and Sweden*. Retrieved 29.04.2016 from https://www.munifin.fi/sites/default/files/content_block/field_file/nordic_model_mediumres.pdf.

Latvian Centre for Human Rights (2008). *National activity report Latvia anti-discrimination and diversity training*. Retrieved 01.05.2016 from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/antidiscrimination_training_latvia_en.pdf.

McKinsey & Company (2015). *Why diversity matters*. Retrieved 23.08.2016 from http://www.mckinsey.com/business-funktions/organization/our--insights/why--civersity--matters.

Mellahi, K., Demirbag, M., Collings, D.G., Tatoglu, E. and Hughes, M. (2013). Similarly different. A comparison of HRM practices in MNE subsidiaries in local firms in Turkey. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 24 (12), 2339-2368.

Meyer, J. W. and Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations. Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*. 83, 340-363.

Migrant Integration Policy Index (2015). *What is MIPEX?* Retrieved 30.04.2016 from http://www.mipex.eu/what-is-mipex.

Myloni, B., Harzing, A. and Mirza, H. (2004). Human resource management in Greece. Have the colours of culture faded away? *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*. 4 (1), 59-76.

Myloni, B., Harzing, A. and Mirza, H. (2007). The effect of corporate-level organizational factors on the transfer of human resource management practices. European and US MNCs and their Greek subsidiaries. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 18(12), 2057-2074.

Nkomo, S. and Hoobler, J.M. (2014). A historical perspective on diversity ideologies in the United States: reflections on human resource management research and practice. *Human Resource Management Review*. 24(03), pp. 245-257.

Nordic Centre for Welfare and Social Issues (2013). *Focus on the Nordic welfare model*. Retrieved 29.04.2016 from http://www.nordicwelfare.org/PageFiles/7117/Nordic_Welfare_Model_Web.pdf.

Nougayrède, N. (2016). *Diversity could be the making of Europe. Let's talk about it*. Retrieved 15.04.2016 from http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jan/05/europes-citizens-need-start-debate-diversity.

OECD (2011). *Social cohesion indicators*. Retrieved 30.04.2016 from http://www.oecd.org/berlin/47570353.pdf.

OECD (2013). *Government at a glance 2013*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Office of the Promotion of Migrant Integration (2016). *Managing diversity in Ireland today*. Retrieved 20.04.2016 from http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/managingdiversity-en.

Önday, Ö. (2016). Global workforce diversity management and the challenge of managing diversity. Situation on world and in Turkey. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*. 4 (1), 31-51.

Özbilgin, M. F., Syed, J., Ali, F. and Torunoglu, D. (2012). International transfer of policies and practices of gender equality in employment to and among muslim majority countries. *Gender, Work & Organization*. 19, 345-369.

Ozgener, S. (2008). Diversity management and demographic-based discrimination. The case of Turkish manufacturing industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 82, 621-631.

Pelled, L. H., Ledford, G. E. and Mohrman, S. A. (1998). Individual Demographic Dissimilarity and Organizational Inclusion: A Field Investigation. *Academy of Management Proceedings & Membership Directory*. P. A1–A17.

Pitts, D. W., Hicklin, A. K., Hawes, D. P., and Melton, E. (2010). What drives the implementation of diversity management programs? Evidence from public organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 20, 867-886.

Profiles in Diversity Journal (2017). *What have we learned?* 72, 52 – 64.

Righard, E., Johansson, M. and Salonen, T. (2015). *Social Transformations in Scandinavian Cities. Nordic perspectives on urban marginalization and social sustainability*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Roczniak, W. (2012). *The Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth*. Retrieved 15.05.2016 from http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195399301/obo-9780195399301-0119.xml.

Ruhs, M. and Quinn, E. (2009). *Ireland. From rapid immigration to recession*. Retrieved 15.05.2016 from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/ireland-rapid-immigration-recession.

Schwarz-Woelzl, M., Manahl, C. and Zadęcka-Cieślik, E. (2015) *Tuned up. Diversity and diversity management in Austria, the Czech Republic, Poland and Spain*. Vienna: Erasmus.

Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations* (2nd edition). London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

SHRM (2009). *Global diversity & inclusion. Perception, practices and attitudes*. Alexandria: SHRM.

SRHM (2017). *Top 7 diversity & inclusion trends in 2017*. Retrieved 11.05.2017 from https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/behavioral-competencies/global-and-cultural-effectiveness/pages/top-7-shrm-online-di-articles-from-2017.aspx.

Sippola, A., and Smale, A. (2007). The global integration of diversity management: a longitudinal case study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 18, 1895-1916.

Social Progress Imperative (2016). *Social progress index 2015*. Retrieved 30.04.2016 from http://www.socialprogressimperative.org/data/spi#performance/countries/com11/dim1,dim2,dim3,com11.

Statista (2016). *Youth unemployment rate in EU member states as of February 2016* (seasonally adjusted). Retrieved 23.04.2016 from http://www.statista.com/statistics/266228/youth-unemployment-rate-in-eucountries/.

Stiles, P., Trevor, J., Paauwe, J., Farndale, E., Wright, P., Morris, S., Stahl, G. and Bjorkman, I. (2006). *Best practices and key themes in global human research management: project report*. Retrieved 14.04.2016 from http://www.cihrm.jbs.cam.ac.uk/research/ghrra.html.

Stuber, M. (2014). *Diversity & Inclusion. Das Potenzial-Prinzip [Diversity & inclusion. The principle of potential]* (3rd edition). Aachen: Shaker.

Stuber, M. (2017a). Bigger, better, business case: mapping the business benefits of D&I. *Diversity Best Practices*. Retrieved 11.05.2017 from http://www.diversitybestpractices.com/mapping-business-benefits-di.

Stuber, M. (2017 b). *Standardised global diversity, US diversity or differentiated European diversity?* Retrieved 11.05.2017 from http://www.linkedin.com/pulse/standardised-global-diversity-u-differentiated-european-stuber/.

Stuber, M. (2018). International vergleichende Studien der Diversity-Managementpraxis in Europa [International comparative studies of diversity management practices in Europe]. *Personal Quarterly*. 70 (1), 12 – 17.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy. Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*. 20, 571–610.

Sürgevil, O. (2010). Is diversity management relevant for Turkey? Evaluation of some factors leading to diversity management in the context of Turkey. In J. Syed and M. F. Özbilgin (eds.) *Managing Cultural Diversity in Asia. A Research Companion* (pp. 373-392). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Süß, S. and Kleiner, M. (2008). Dissemination of diversity management in Germany: A new institutionalist approach. *European Management Journal*. 26, 35-47.

Takagi, J. (2011). The challenge of diversity: example from France. In C. Leicht Scholten, E. Breuer, N. Tulodetzki and A. Wolffram (eds.) *Going diverse: innovative answers to future challenges* (pp. 77-87). Leverkusen: Budrich UniPress Ltd.

The Economist (2009). *Global diversity and inclusion. Perceptions, practices and attitudes*. Retrieved 29.02.2016 from http://graphics.eiu.com/upload/eb/DiversityandInclusion.pdf.

Ungleich Besser Diversity Consulting (2016). *Diversity als Notwendigkeit. Rechtlicher Wandel [Diversity as necessity. Legal changes]*. Retrieved 11.05.2017 from http://www.diversity-informationen.de/unternehmen/businesscase/.

Uterwedde, H. (2013). *Das französische Wirtschaftsmodell. Marktwirtschaft mit starkem Staat [The French economy model. Market economy with a strong state]*. Retrieved 23.04.2016 from http://www.bpb.de/internationales/europa/frankreich/153309/wirtschaftsmodell.

Vohra, N. and Chari, V. (2015). Introduction. In N. Vohra and V. Chari (eds.) *Inclusive Workplaces. Lessons from Theory and Practice* (pp. 324-362). Vikalpa: *SAGE Publications.*

Voigt, B. (2001). Measures and benchmarks. Komparatives diversity-measurement [comparative diversity measurement]. *Presentation at 3rd International Managing Diversity Conference*. 5-6 June, 2001. Potsdam, Germany.

Walkowiak, Ł. and Maj, J. (2015). Diversity management in Polish organizations. *The 4th Advanced Research in Scientific Areas*. 79-82.

Wasti, S. A. (1998). Cultural barriers in the transferability of Japanese and American human resources practices to developing countries: the Turkish case. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management.* 9 (4), 608-631.

World Economic Forum (WEF) (2013). *The global gender gap report 2013*. Retrieved 29.04.2016 from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GenderGap_Report_2013.pdf.

World Economic Forum (WEF) (2017). *The global gender gap report 2017*. Geneva: World Economic Forum. Retrieved 29.04.2018 from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GenderGap_Report_2017.pdf.

World Values Survey (WVS) (2008). *Findings and Insights*. Retrieved 29.04.2018 from http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp.

Yang, Y. and Konrad, A. M. (2011). Understanding diversity management practices: implications of institutional theory and resource-based theory. *Group & Organization Management*. 36, 6-38.