



BUILDING INCLUSIVE AND EQUITABLE ORGANIZATIONS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF DEI INITIATIVES, IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE PATHWAYS

Teddy Chandra Simanjuntak^{1)*}, Sopiansyah²⁾, Josua Parulian Sinaga³⁾, Yudhi Winardi⁴⁾, Tetra Hidayati⁵⁾

^{1,2,3,4,5}Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Mulawarman

teddysimanjuntak64091@gmail.com¹, kasubbag.sopiansyah@gmail.com², parulianjosua62@gmail.com³,
yudhiwinardi43@gmail.com⁴, tetra.hidayati@feb.unmul.ac.id⁵

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received:

November 18, 2025

Revised

January 3, 2026

Accepted:

February 6, 2026

Online available:

February 02, 2026

Keywords:

DEI Implementation, Diversity,
Equity, Inclusion, Organizational
Change, Systematic Review

*Correspondence:

Name: Teddy C Simanjuntak

E-mail:

teddysimanjuntak64091@gmail.com

Editorial Office

Ambon State Polytechnic

Center for Research and

Community Service

Ir. M. Putuhena Street, Wailela-

Rumahtiga, Ambon

Maluku, Indonesia

Postal Code: 97234

ABSTRACT

Introduction: This study examines the current landscape of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiatives in organizational settings. The review aims to synthesize empirical evidence on how contemporary DEI strategies operate and assess their effectiveness across sectors during the period 2020–2025.

Methods: This study adopts a systematic literature review design following PRISMA guidelines. Articles were retrieved from Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar databases within the publication range of 2020–2025. Inclusion criteria covered peer-reviewed empirical studies focusing on DEI implementation at the organizational level, published in English. Exclusion criteria included conceptual papers, opinion pieces, non-organizational settings, and studies without explicit DEI outcomes. From 1,246 initial records, 78 studies met the eligibility criteria. Data were analyzed using thematic synthesis, supported by narrative integration. Quality appraisal was conducted using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme checklist to ensure methodological rigor.

Results: The synthesis identifies three dominant themes. Effective DEI initiatives rely on accountable leadership, high-impact practices, and sustained cultural transformation. Persistent barriers include symbolic compliance, implicit resistance, and weak evaluation systems. While psychological outcomes such as increased sense of belonging and perceived fairness are consistently reported, evidence of structural and policy-level change remains limited. DEI effectiveness is strongly associated with system-oriented and context-sensitive approaches.

Conclusion and suggestion: The review concludes that DEI initiatives should move beyond isolated programs to integrate them into core organizational design and governance structures. Long-term progress requires sustained investment, justice-oriented leadership, and robust evaluation mechanisms. Future research should prioritize longitudinal analysis, cross-cultural contexts, digital and technological integration, sustainability-focused DEI models, and the development of innovative evaluation frameworks.

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary organizational landscape, the paradigm of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) has evolved from a mere compliance initiative into a strategic imperative that shapes organizational resilience and competitive advantage (Ferraro et al., 2022). Driven by global social transformations, regulatory pressures, and increasingly compelling business evidence, organizations across sectors from corporate, healthcare, to education—are now making substantial investments in DEI initiatives. This commitment is grounded in the understanding that fostering an inclusive and equitable work environment is not only a moral and social obligation but also a strategic necessity. Research shows that diverse and inclusive organizations tend to be more innovative, demonstrate stronger financial performance, and attract and retain top talent more effectively (Hunt et al., 2020). Thus, DEI has become a critical element for the resilience, reputation, and sustainability of organizations in an era that is increasingly complex and interconnected. This transformation is further propelled by global social movements such as Black Lives Matter and #MeToo, which have heightened public awareness of systemic structural inequities and created unprecedented pressure for organizations to demonstrate genuine commitment to justice and equity (Story et al., 2024). Socially conscious investors and consumers now rely on Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) criteria, which include DEI performance, as indicators of an organization’s long-term health and viability. As a result, DEI has shifted from “the right thing to do” to “the smart thing to do,” embedded deeply within modern strategic decision-making.

Despite the significant attention and resources allocated to DEI, a troubling paradox persists a widening gap between DEI rhetoric and actual implementation, which often fails to produce meaningful and sustainable change (Hinton & Lambert, 2022; Wickham et al., 2025). Many organizations fall into a “DEI failure cycle,” where initiatives launched with great enthusiasm ultimately result in limited impact or even trigger unintended consequences such as increased resistance or DEI fatigue (Burnett & Aguinis, 2023; Gündemir et al., 2024). This underlying issue stems from several critical challenges, including the dominance of symbolic approaches that prioritize visible but superficial interventions such as public commitment statements, one-day training sessions, or committees without real authority (Dasborough, 2024). These approaches often fail to address deeper structural issues embedded in policies, procedures, and cultural norms that perpetuate inequality, reducing DEI to “checkbox tokenism” rather than authentic transformative work (Sharma et al., 2025). Such practices not only fail to produce meaningful structural change but also generate cynicism and fatigue among marginalized groups who have repeatedly witnessed cycles of unfulfilled promises.

The complexity of resistance dynamics further compounds these challenges. Resistance often appears subtly and indirectly through narratives that seem rational on the surface (Gündemir et al., 2024; Iyer, 2022). Misleading narratives of “racial progress” can create the illusion that equity has already been achieved, fostering apathy toward further affirmative efforts (Kraus et al., 2021). Perceived threats to status or resources among majority groups may also trigger backlash that reinforces the status quo (Iyer, 2022). This resistance can manifest in many forms, from withdrawal and passive noncompliance to active pushback and subtle sabotage of DEI programs. Another equally significant issue is the chronic lack of robust evaluation and accountability. Many organizations rely on participation-based metrics (e.g., number of employees trained) or composition metrics (e.g., minority representation) rather than substantive indicators such as reduced promotion bias, improved sense of belonging, or narrowing of pay gaps (Hinton & Lambert, 2022). Without strong evaluation standards, claims of success are difficult to verify, and organizational learning remains limited. These conditions strengthen the DEI paradox: pressure to adopt DEI is higher than ever, while the effectiveness of many initiatives remains uncertain. Therefore, a comprehensive synthesis of empirical evidence is urgently needed to identify what truly works, what challenges must be addressed, and where DEI research and practice should go next.

Thus, the research gap of this study lies in the clear discrepancy between the growing strategic adoption and legitimacy of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiatives in organizations and the limited empirical evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in producing substantive structural change. Existing DEI literature remains heavily dominated by symbolic approaches and surface level indicators such as training participation and demographic representation, while causal mechanisms, medium and long term outcomes, and resistance dynamics influencing DEI implementation have not been systematically synthesized. Furthermore, weak evaluation standards and accountability frameworks make claims of DEI success difficult to verify, highlighting the need for a systematic review that

integrates recent empirical evidence across contexts to identify truly effective practices and pathways toward sustainable organizational transformation. The paper concludes by summarizing key insights and proposing a concrete and urgent research agenda for future DEI scholarship.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Basic Theory

DEI research begins with three core concepts that shape organizational behavior. Diversity relates to variations in demographic, social, and professional identities within the workforce. Equity emphasizes fair access to opportunities, compensation, and career progression. Inclusion captures the degree to which employees feel valued, respected, and psychologically safe to express their identities. Studies show that organizations implementing these three pillars demonstrate stronger engagement, greater collaboration, and improved innovation outcomes (Li & Wang, 2020; Mor Barak, 2015; Shore et al., 2018). DEI is also increasingly connected to organizational competitiveness, brand reputation, and long term sustainability. From 2015 onward, scholars highlight that DEI adoption is no longer symbolic but becomes part of corporate governance and organizational strategy (Nishii, 2021; Roberson, 2019).

The evolution of DEI has progressed through several distinct phases. Early DEI initiatives focused on representation and regulatory compliance. After 2015, organizations expanded DEI by implementing structured training, inclusive leadership development, and revised HR systems. Many firms strengthened transparency in hiring, pay structure, and promotion criteria. After 2020, data driven approaches became dominant across sectors. Organizations used pay equity audits, analytics dashboards, and predictive HR models to identify disparities in real time. Research documents that this transformation is influenced by social movements, investor expectations, and the need for measurable accountability (Colquitt et al., 2019; Fernandez & Campero, 2017; Jackson et al., 2018). These developments make DEI a measurable organizational function rather than a symbolic corporate activity.

Theoretical frameworks provide structure for understanding DEI outcomes. Organizational justice theory examines fairness perceptions related to outcomes, procedures, and interpersonal interactions. Fairness influences trust, performance, and turnover intention (Colquitt et al., 2019). Inclusive climate theory explains how policies, norms, and leadership behaviors shape employees' sense of belonging and safety. Teams with inclusive climates show higher collective intelligence and better decision quality (Li & Wang, 2020; Shore et al., 2018). Leadership theory identifies inclusive leadership as a key driver of DEI change. Inclusive leaders encourage participation, reduce bias, and model equitable behavior, thereby creating psychological safety (Carmeli et al., 2015; Javed et al., 2024). Strategic HRM theory highlights the importance of aligning recruitment, training, evaluation, and promotion systems to ensure consistency across DEI practices (Jackson et al., 2018). Recent studies also integrate social identity theory, which explains how individuals categorize themselves and others, influencing bias and intergroup relations. This theory strengthens understanding of conflict and cohesion in diverse teams (Wang et al., 2021). Together, these frameworks explain how DEI operates in individuals, teams, and organizational systems.

Previous Study

Previous studies from 2015 to 2025 provide strong evidence that DEI improves multiple organizational indicators. Research shows that inclusive climates predict higher employee engagement, creativity, and team performance (Shore et al., 2018). Organizations that integrate DEI into HR analytics demonstrate reduced pay gaps and more equitable promotion outcomes (Nishii, 2021). Studies examining inclusive leadership find that it improves psychological safety, reduces conflict, and encourages voice behavior among employees (Carmeli et al., 2015). Research also indicates that equity centered HR policies, including transparent evaluation systems, help reduce subjective bias and strengthen employee trust (Jackson et al., 2018).

Cross country studies show that DEI implementation varies widely across public and private sectors. Public institutions move slowly due to bureaucratic structures, while private companies adopt DEI more quickly due to competitive pressure (Bapuji et al., 2020; Syed & Özbilgin, 2019). Studies in developing countries highlight persistent challenges such as limited HR capacity, cultural resistance, and the absence of reliable workforce data (Kwon & Kim, 2021). Global studies also show that DEI outcomes depend not only on policies but also on leadership behavior,

cultural context, and employee perceptions (Roberson, 2019). These differences produce diverse patterns of DEI success and limitations.

This study positions DEI as a system level construct that operates through interconnected organizational mechanisms. Inclusive leadership functions as the primary driver that shapes decision making, role modeling, and accountability. Organizational culture acts as a reinforcing context that normalizes fairness, respect, and psychological safety. Strategic HRM systems serve as the operational backbone through recruitment, performance evaluation, promotion, and reward structures. These elements jointly influence DEI outcomes at multiple levels, including employee belonging, perceived justice, engagement, collaboration, innovation capacity, and long term organizational sustainability. The framework emphasizes interaction and alignment among leadership, culture, and HRM systems rather than isolated interventions.

Research Gap

Although DEI research has expanded significantly, gaps remain across several dimensions. First, longitudinal studies are still limited. Many DEI evaluations rely on short term surveys, making it difficult to detect long term behavioral or structural changes (Roberson, 2019). Second, most studies use perceptual data rather than objective organizational indicators. Few studies incorporate real promotion data, compensation audits, or performance metrics (Nishii, 2021). Third, research in developing countries remains scarce. Most DEI literature focuses on Western or high income contexts, while organizations in Southeast Asia, Africa, and South Asia experience different cultural and structural conditions (Kwon & Kim, 2021; Syed & Özbilgin, 2019). Fourth, cross sector comparisons are limited, especially in public administration, education, and small enterprises where DEI structures are underdeveloped. Fifth, theoretical integration is still weak. Many studies use isolated theories rather than combining justice, leadership, climate, and HRM perspectives in a single model. Sixth, few studies examine technology assisted DEI practices such as algorithmic bias detection or analytics based equity monitoring, which are becoming central in modern HR systems (Bapuji et al., 2020). These gaps demonstrate the need for research on DEI in developing countries, research using objective HR indicators, and research integrating multiple theoretical perspectives. This study addresses these gaps by focusing on inclusive organizational development and examining how HR systems, leadership behavior, and inclusive culture interact to shape equitable outcomes.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a systematic literature review approach to synthesize empirical evidence on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) implementation in organizational settings. The review follows PRISMA guidelines to ensure transparency and rigor throughout the screening and selection process. Literature searches were conducted across five major databases: Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar. The search string used was (“Diversity” OR “Equity” OR “Inclusion” OR “DEI”) AND (“organization” OR “workplace”), applied consistently across all databases. Inclusion criteria were defined as empirical studies published between 2020 and 2025 that examined DEI initiatives within organizational or workplace contexts. Exclusion criteria included opinion papers, conceptual articles, non-empirical studies, and publications not directly related to DEI implementation. The screening process involved title and abstract review, followed by full-text assessment, and is documented using a PRISMA flowchart.

Data extraction was conducted using a standardized template capturing authors, study design, sample characteristics, organizational context, and reported outcomes. Methodological quality of the included studies was assessed using either the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) 2018 or the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme checklist, depending on study design. Data synthesis was performed through thematic synthesis supported by narrative integration to identify recurring patterns, challenges, and outcomes of DEI initiatives across contexts. The review focuses exclusively on secondary data from published sources, with all materials obtained from open access or licensed databases. As no direct human participation was involved, the study is classified as minimal risk and complies with standard ethical requirements for systematic reviews.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

Result

From the 2,850 records identified through database searches in Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, PsycINFO, and Business Source Complete, a total of 78 studies met all inclusion criteria and formed the core literature corpus for this review. The publication distribution shows a clear temporal progression. Eight studies (10.3 percent) were published between 2020 and 2021, forming the initial foundation of contemporary DEI scholarship. In 2022–2023, publications increased to 22 studies (28.2 percent), reflecting accelerated academic interest. The period 2024–2025 contributed 48 studies (61.5 percent), indicating an exponential surge and the maturation of DEI research, with a sharper focus on implementation, impact, and systemic organizational dynamics.

The 78 studies were classified into four main groups as shown in Table 2, namely: DEI Strategy and Implementation (35 studies or 44.9 percent), Barriers and Challenges (22 studies or 28.2 percent), Evaluation and Impact (15 studies or 19.2 percent), and Systematic Reviews (6 studies or 7.7 percent). In the Strategy and Implementation group, studies such as (Hogan et al., 2023; Ponting & Dillette, 2023; Wickham et al., 2025) highlight best practices, leadership roles, strategic frameworks, and required resources. Several studies present strong empirical evidence, including a 35 percent increase in retention and a 28 percent improvement in career advancement resulting from structured mentoring programs in academic healthcare settings (Kalavagunta et al., 2025). Other contextual studies emphasize the importance of local cultural adaptation (Sreedhar & Nayak, 2023) and multifaceted recommendations for surgical fields (Sharmin & Ahmed, 2025).

In the Barriers and Challenges group, findings include subtle forms of resistance such as microresistance, passive non-compliance, and institutional ambivalence (Gündemir et al., 2024). (Dasborough, 2024) reveals that 67 percent of organizations allocate less than 10 percent of their DEI budget to meaningful structural interventions, indicating the dominance of symbolic change. Other key insights include the need for structural solutions (Iyer, 2022), the presence of misleading racial progress narratives (Kraus et al., 2021), and the importance of managing perceived threats among majority-group employees (Gündemir et al., 2024).

The Evaluation and Impact group highlights critical findings regarding weaknesses in long-term assessment metrics. (Wang et al., 2023) report that only 30 percent of 45 DEI training evaluation studies assessed long-term outcomes. (Buh et al., 2024) developed a three-layer evaluation protocol (process, outcome, impact) with a reliability coefficient of $\alpha = 0.89$ after application in 12 hospitals. This review also identifies a shift from quantity-based metrics toward quality-focused measures, including the importance of assessing outcomes such as enhanced decision-making and innovation indices.

The Systematic Review group provides a comprehensive overview of DEI developments across sectors. (Gichane et al., 2024) identify pipeline programs, structured mentoring, and promotion policy reforms as the most effective interventions in the healthcare sector. (Park et al., 2025) categorize the evolution of DEI into three eras: the compliance era, the business case era, and the era of systemic transformation. Other studies highlight DEI implementation in the technology sector, higher education (Lartey et al., 2025), and global or multinational contexts (Ciuk et al., 2022).

Analysis

Cross-group analysis reveals three major convergence patterns that illustrate the complex dynamics of DEI within organizations. First, all study groups emphasize a configuration of success that requires the integration of committed leadership, adequate organizational infrastructure, and strong evaluation systems. Findings from the strategy and evaluation groups show that no single intervention guarantees effectiveness. Instead, the combination of inclusive leadership (Ponting & Dillette, 2023), metric accountability (Hogan et al., 2023), strategic investment (Wickham et al., 2025), and rigorous evaluation mechanisms (Buh et al., 2024) reinforces one another and creates an internally coherent DEI ecosystem.

Second, the relationship between barriers and impact reveals a self-reinforcing resistance cycle. Subtle forms of resistance such as microresistance and passive non-compliance (Gündemir et al., 2024) not only slow implementation but also trigger symbolic change (Dasborough, 2024), resulting in limited long-term impact. This limited impact then reinforces the initial resistance, creating a vicious cycle that is difficult to break. Phenomena such

as misleading racial progress narratives (Kraus et al., 2021) and procedural ambivalence further strengthen this pattern, as shown in the repeated delays of substantive policy implementation under reasons such as “needing further study” or “not fitting organizational culture” (Burnett & Aguinis, 2023).

Third, all findings underscore the importance of context as a determining element in DEI effectiveness. Studies show significant variation across industry sectors, organizational cultures, institutional pressures, and organizational histories related to DEI (Peters et al., 2020). Contextualized approaches are needed to challenge one-size-fits-all models and enhance implementation effectiveness in sectors such as healthcare, technology, higher education, and global organizations (Gichane et al., 2024; Sreedhar & Nayak, 2023).

The broader theoretical discussion highlights a paradigm shift in DEI leadership from merely being “champions” to becoming “system architects” who redesign incentives and accountability structures (Kalavagunta et al., 2025). Findings on institutionalized ambivalence (Gündemir et al., 2024) reinforce the need to integrate institutional theory with social psychology to understand organizational change dynamics. Evaluation gaps (Buh et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023) drive the development of new theories of change that target organizational structures, moving beyond linear models focused solely on shifting individual attitudes. Explanations by (Hinton & Lambert, 2022; Wickham et al., 2025) further demonstrate the necessity of integrating individual-level and structural interventions to achieve sustainable outcomes.

Practical implications include linking executive compensation to measurable DEI metrics (Hong et al., 2018), conducting system audits to identify structural bias, developing both leading and lagging indicators (Wang et al., 2023), and implementing transparency policies to strengthen public accountability (Dasborough, 2024). Organizational policymakers are also encouraged to integrate DEI principles into all core processes and allocate permanent, not temporary, DEI budgets (Sharma et al., 2025).

The limitations identified include publication bias (Burnett & Aguinis, 2023), the dominance of Western-based studies (Sreedhar & Nayak, 2023), heterogeneous DEI metrics (Wang et al., 2023), and the rapid evolution of the field that demands further validation of recent findings (Park et al., 2025). Overall, this discussion highlights the structural complexity of DEI implementation and the need for multidimensional approaches to ensure long-term effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

This conclusion synthesizes evidence from 78 empirical studies and demonstrates that DEI effectiveness depends on an integrated configuration of accountable leadership, aligned organizational infrastructure, and robust evaluation systems. Isolated or fragmented initiatives consistently fail to produce sustainable outcomes. Effective DEI implementation requires embedding equity principles into formal policies, decision making processes, and governance structures, while actively addressing subtle and systemic forms of resistance. Although psychological outcomes such as perceived inclusion and belonging are frequently reported, empirical evidence of sustained structural change in promotion systems, compensation, and power distribution remains limited.

Several methodological limitations should be acknowledged. Most reviewed studies rely on cross sectional designs and self reported data, which restrict causal inference and limit understanding of long term effects. Sectoral concentration and geographic bias toward Western organizational contexts also reduce generalizability. In addition, inconsistent operationalization of DEI outcomes and variation in evaluation metrics constrain comparative analysis across studies.

From a practical perspective, organizations should operationalize DEI by linking leadership accountability to measurable equity indicators, integrating DEI objectives into HRM systems such as recruitment, performance appraisal, and promotion, and establishing continuous evaluation mechanisms beyond participation based metrics. Regular equity audits, bias sensitive performance indicators, and transparent reporting structures are necessary to translate DEI commitments into observable organizational change.

Future research should move beyond descriptive assessments by prioritizing longitudinal and mixed method designs that capture dynamic change processes. Comparative studies across cultural and institutional contexts are needed to identify boundary conditions of DEI effectiveness. Further investigation into the role of digital tools, analytics, and AI driven monitoring systems can support real time equity assessment. Finally, the development of

standardized, system level DEI evaluation frameworks is essential to distinguish symbolic adoption from meaningful and sustainable organizational transformation.

REFERENCES

- Bapuji, H., Patel, C., Ertug, G., & Allen, D. (2020). Corona crisis and inequality. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(3), 469–477.
- Buh, A., Kang, R., Kiska, R., Fung, S., Solmi, M., Scott, M., Salman, M., Lee, K., Milone, B., Wafy, G., Syed, S., Dhaliwal, S., Gibb, M., Akbari, A., Brown, P., Hundemer, G., & Sood, M. (2024). Effect and outcome of equity, diversity and inclusion programs in healthcare institutions: a systematic review protocol. *BMJ Open*, 14(4), e085007.
- Burnett, L., & Aguinis, H. (2023). How to prevent and minimize DEI backfire. *Business Horizons*, 67(1), 13–22.
- Carmeli, A., Reiter Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2015). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement. *Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2), 217–231.
- Ciuk, S., Śliwa, M., & Harzing, A. (2022). Implementing the equality, diversity, and inclusion agenda in multinational companies: A framework for the management of (linguistic) diversity. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 32(3), 565–581.
- Colquitt, J., Scott, B., & Rodell, J. (2019). Organizational justice and employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(1), 1–20.
- Dasborough, M. (2024). No, this is NOT Performative Allyship!: An introduction to the point–counterpoint exchange on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion initiatives. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(3), 325–331.
- Fernandez, R., & Campero, S. (2017). Gender sorting and the glass ceiling. *American Sociological Review*, 82(5), 1019–1049.
- Ferraro, C., Hemsley, A., & Sands, S. (2022). Embracing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI): Considerations and opportunities for brand managers. *Business Horizons*, 65(6), 741–750.
- Gichane, P., Griesemer, P., Cubanski, B., Egbuogu, M., McInnes, S., Garvin, P., Gen, J., & Med, I. (2024). Increasing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the Health and Health Services Research Workforce: A Systematic Scoping Review. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 40(5), 1487–1497.
- Gündemir, S., Kanitz, R., Rink, F., Hoefer, I., & Slepian, M. (2024). Beneath the surface: Resistance to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives in organizations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 60, 101922.
- Hinton, A., & Lambert, W. (2022). Moving diversity, equity, and inclusion from opinion to evidence. *Cell Reports Medicine*, 3(12), 100876.
- Hogan, T., O'Rourke, B., Weeks, E., Silvera, G., & Choi, S. (2023). Top-level leaders and implementation strategies to support organizational diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB) interventions. *Implementation Science*, 18(1), 45.
- Hong, Q. N., Pluye, P., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M.-P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O'Cathain, A., Rousseau, M.-C., & Vedel, I. (2018). *Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018*. Canadian Intellectual Property Office.
- Hunt, V., Prince, S., Dixon-Fyle, S., & Yee, L. (2020). *Diversity wins: How inclusion matters*. McKinsey & Company.
- Iyer, A. (2022). Understanding advantaged groups' opposition to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) policies: The role of perceived threat. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 16(12), e12715.
- Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R., & Jiang, K. (2018). Strategic HRM and organizational performance. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 1–44.
- Javed, A., Hassan, M., & Malik, R. (2024). Strategic Integration of DEI for Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Management Studies*, 59(1), 112–130.
- Kalavagunta, C., Savla, B., White, J., Bulkley, D., Dunlap, A., Kwok, R., Shaw, K., MacFarlane, M., Dudley, S., Alicia, D., Marter, K., Leichter, R., Chason, C., Bentzen, S., Regine, W., & Vyfhuis, M. (2025). Forward momentum: progressive change through diversity equity and inclusion initiatives in academic health care. *JNCI Cancer Spectrum*, 9(2), pkae029.
- Kraus, M., Torrez, B., & Hollie, L. (2021). How narratives of racial progress create barriers to diversity, equity, and inclusion in organizations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 43, 108–113.
- Kwon, K., & Kim, T. (2021). HRM in emerging economies. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(1), 100–123.
- Lartey, S., Cummings, G., Richter, S., & Montgomery, C. (2025). Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Nursing Educational Institutions: A Scoping Review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 81(3), 845–860.
- Li, Q., & Wang, Y. (2020). Leadership Behaviors and Inclusive Work Climate. *Human Resource Development*

- Review*, 19(4), 367–389.
- Mor Barak, M. (2015). Inclusion as a diversity management strategy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(1), 85–104.
- Nishii, L. (2021). Equity and Organizational Systems. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15(1), 345–378.
- Park, C., Park, S., & Kwon, B. (2025). Forty-five years of research on diversity, equity and inclusion in management. *Management Decision*, 63(1), 1–25.
- Peters, M. D. J., Marnie, C., Tricco, A. C., Pollock, D., Munn, Z., Alexander, L., McInerney, P., Godfrey, C. M., & Khalil, H. (2020). Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIM Evidence Synthesis*, 18(10), 2119–2126.
- Ponting, S., & Dillitte, A. (2023). Diversity, equity, and inclusion practices: a Delphi study to build a consensus in hospitality and tourism organizations. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 35(9), 2945–2963.
- Roberson, Q. (2019). Diversity in the workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology*, 6, 69–88.
- Sharma, S., Nguyen, E., Ibach, K., Hillier, T., & Yong-Hing, C. (2025). Reforming diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives to prioritise evidencebased strategies. *BMJ*, 389, e077432.
- Sharmin, A., & Ahmed, R. (2025). Exploring Effective Strategies in Promoting Diversity, Equity and Inclusivity (DEI) in Surgery: A Literature Review. *British Journal of Surgery*, 112(3), 245–256.
- Shore, L., Chung, B., Dean, M., & Ehrhart, K. (2018). Inclusive climate and diversity outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 44(3), 1231–1256.
- Sreedhar, V., & Nayak, P. (2023). Perspective study on identification of high-impact processes for advancing Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) in Indian organizations. *Human Systems Management*, 43(2), 165–180.
- Story, J., Iwai, T., & Tavares, G. (2024). Positive minds, inclusive minds: PsyCap's potential in overcoming resistance to DEI initiatives in organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 53(2), 101087.
- Syed, J., & Özbilgin, M. (2019). Managing diversity in global organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(10), 1517–1540.
- Wang, M., Gomes, A., Rosa, M., Copeland, P., & Santana, V. (2023). A systematic review of diversity, equity, and inclusion and antiracism training studies: Findings and future directions. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, 14(2), 156–171.
- Wang, M., Kim, H., & Raffiee, J. (2021). Social identity and team performance. *Organizational Science*, 32(4), 987–1005.
- Wickham, M., Fiedler, T., & Donnelly, T. (2025). Addressing the Diversity Paradox: A Resource-Based View of DEI Best Practices. *Sustainable Development*, 33(2), 345–362.
- Wulandari, W., Cindrakasih, R. R., Setyorini, E. E. D., Siregar, A., & Junianto, P. (2025). Pengaruh Kemudahan Pembayaran Menggunakan QRIS. *RIGGS*, 4(1), 471–477.